



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022

by L Douglas BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/W/21/3274006

Land west of Linden, Fullers Road, Rowledge, Farnham GU10 4LB

Grid Ref Easting: 481452, Grid Ref Northing: 143557

- 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 Piers Gilbert, Gilbert Homes against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 50463/001, dated 23 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the development of 10 dwellings with parking and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the development of 10 dwellings with parking and landscaping at Land west of Linden, Rowledge, Farnham GU10 4LB (Grid Ref Easting: 481452, Grid Ref Northing: 143557) in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 50463/001, dated 23 July 2020, subject to the attached Schedule of Conditions.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development proposed in the application form is different to that provided in the appeal form. I have referred to that provided in the appeal form in the banner heading above as it is a more concise description of the same development.
3. The appellant submitted a Hydraulic Modelling Report¹ as part of the appeal to address the Council's third reason for refusal. The Local Lead Flood Authority subsequently confirmed that this satisfied their initial concerns regarding surface water management and local flood risk². Subject to an appropriately worded condition being imposed were the development otherwise acceptable, there is nothing before me to suggest otherwise.
4. I have been provided with a copy of a Unilateral Undertaking³ (UU) dated 29 November 2021 which commits to providing affordable housing and the future maintenance and management of common parts of land as part of the proposal. The Council confirmed that, following consultation with the Highway Authority, they no longer seek a pedestrian crossing on the A325 as referred to in the decision notice, and a previous version of the UU⁴ would have satisfied

¹ Rowledge Hydraulic Modelling Final Report by JBA Consulting, dated April 2021

² Letter dated 28 April 2021 from Flood and Water Management Team, Hampshire County Council (ref: SWM/2020/0451)

³ Under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

⁴ Dated 9 November 2021

their fourth reason for refusal, subject to amendments. Those amendments were made to the copy of the UU before me.

5. An amended landscaping plan was submitted as part of the appeal⁵, to demonstrate the extent of useable amenity space proposed to serve Plot 10. There is, however, no need for me to consider the amended plan due to my findings on the third main issue in respect of Plot 10.
6. An appeal should not be used to evolve a proposal, and as set out through this decision, in some respects new or updated elements of the scheme have been put forward at appeal. However, the appeal process has afforded the opportunity for comments to be made on all those elements, which are understandable responses to detailed matters of concern raised by the Council. Moreover, none of the evidence before me significantly alters the proposal, but rather relates to minor aspects of the scheme which could fall to be addressed by conditions. As such, no party would be prejudiced by my having regard to them.

Main Issues

7. Taking the above into account, the main issues are: i) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; ii) the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of Linden, with specific regard to outlook; and iii) whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for the future occupants of Plot 5 and Plot 10, with specific regard to light and garden space.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

8. The appeal site is a large, roughly square shaped area of land covered in thick vegetation including small trees, on the southern side of the junction of Fullers Road and the A325, at a lower level to the highway. It forms part of the settlement of Holt Pound on the outskirts of the village of Rowledge. As a large corner plot at a main entrance to Holt Pound, the appeal site is highly prominent. I note the comments of a previous Inspector⁶ who described it as a very important and sensitive site which establishes a strong context for the rural character of the village, to which they attached substantial weight.
9. I agree with the observations of the previous Inspector in that the site has some importance to the surrounding context of the village. Nonetheless, it is seen in conjunction with the substantial infrastructure feature of the A325 and in the context of other residential development, and as such there is some contextual development to it. Its principal contribution to the area is, I saw, in respect of its undeveloped nature and the experience of those travelling along the A325. In that context, whilst the natural qualities of the appeal site are important in terms of local character, those intrinsic characteristics would not necessarily be eroded unacceptably by a low density and sensitively designed scheme. Furthermore, I note that the site is allocated for housing in Policy VL5 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Housing and Employment Allocations (2016) (HEA).

⁵ GIL22813 11 A Rev B dated 12 March 2021

⁶ Appeal decision APP/M1710/W/15/3006484

10. Fullers Road is made up of a mix of large, detached houses with generous gardens and parking areas to the front, with heavily planted boundaries creating a spacious, verdant edge of village setting bounded to the northwest by the main road. Development along Fullers Road is broadly in a linear pattern, as are houses immediately to the north of the junction with the A325. There are offshoots from Fullers Road close to the appeal site providing access to small clusters of houses back from the road.
11. Plots 1 – 3 of the proposed development would continue the linear form of development along Fullers Road, set back from the highway behind a large shared driveway and parking spaces. This arrangement and the two storey scale and bulk of Plots 1 – 3 would sit comfortably alongside other houses of varying large sizes. They would be of greater size than the adjacent bungalow at Linden, but they would not appear notably large compared to other neighbouring properties. They would be at a lower level than the highway and the design of their hipped gables and dormers would reflect the mix of architectural styles locally.
12. The proposed driveway and parking areas to Plots 1 – 3 would be similar to the expansive off-street parking arrangements for neighbouring houses and would be separated from the highway by soft landscaping. The parking areas would be seen from the highway due to the drop in levels, but these would not dominate views of the proposal or otherwise detract from the appeal site's semi-rural surroundings.
13. The layout of Plots 4 – 10 would be different to the prevailing arrangement of development along Fullers Road, but it would mirror the linear form of development north of the junction with the A325 and would be experienced in the context of other nearby offshoots from Fullers Road. The overall layout and in-depth form of the proposal would allow for a mix of detached and semi-detached houses within spacious plots, sympathetic to the local area.
14. The gardens of Plots 6 and 7 would appear to be smaller than the majority of gardens I saw locally, but this would not be clearly appreciable from outside those spaces, including from the bus stop directly behind those plots, and would not have a particularly harmful effect on the character or appearance of the wider area. The smaller sizes of these gardens would be proportionate to the dwellings they would serve without appearing unduly cramped or densely arranged for their surroundings.
15. I accept that the scheme would inherently change the nature of this prominent junction; however, many of the varied styles and positions of large houses along Fullers Road already share a somewhat suburban appearance, set within rural wider surroundings. The scheme would not be inconsistent in that character. The mix of detached and semi-detached houses in the layout proposed would offer generous plot sizes and separation distances between buildings comparable to those seen elsewhere in the village.
16. The low-density layout, form, scale and bulk of the proposed development would accord with the established character and appearance of the area, the quality of which relies to a large extent on long views of the countryside surroundings and established planting between large plots. Those characteristics of Holt Pound would not be significantly affected by the proposal, which would be wholly different to the layout and density of 17 dwellings considered by the previous Inspector. Much of the natural

characteristics of the site would be preserved, including through the low density layout and new landscaping. Summarising my reasoning above, the proposal would therefore be consistent with the prevailing arrangement of the village and its sensitive approach to trees and landscaping would not unacceptably undermine the rural character of it or its surroundings.

17. The proposed development would therefore accord with Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014) (JCS) and Policy VL5 of the HEA. Policy CP29 requires, amongst other things, all new development to seek exemplary standards of design and architecture, with high quality external appearance and a layout sympathetic to its setting. Policy VL5 applies specifically to the appeal site, which was allocated for 'about 12 dwellings' in the HEA and requires the appeal site to be developed in accordance with specific criteria, including the need to provide a design and layout of high quality and character which respects the characteristics of the village. I have reasoned above that this would be achieved.
18. The Council's decision notice also refers to the Framework⁷, which has since been revised. The proposal would accord with the guidance at Paragraph 130⁸ of the Framework, which advises that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive, sympathetic to local character, maintain a strong sense of place and optimise the potential of sites.

Living Conditions of the Occupants of Linden

19. Linden is a large bungalow located directly to the southeast of the appeal site. The bungalow is set in from the boundary shared with the appeal site and I noted two windows along its northwestern elevation which serve habitable rooms, according to the main parties. The single storey garage proposed at Plot 1 would be set in from the shared boundary, which would be planted. The separation distance between Plot 1 and Linden would be typical for the area and there would be a substantial distance between the two storey element of Plot 1 and the shared boundary.
20. The proposed street scene comparison plan⁹ shows only part of the chimney pot of the proposed dwelling at Plot 1 would breach a 25° sight line from the centre of the west elevation windows of Linden. However, Linden is served by a large garden to the rear, in addition to the small garden areas to its front and side, and its occupants benefit from spacious surroundings and a wide, open outlook to countryside at raised levels to the rear. This outlook would not be significantly affected, and the proposed development would not appear overbearing, visually dominant or as an intrusive form of development in views from Linden on account of the height of Plot 1 and the intervening distance and planting.
21. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable effect on the outlook of the occupants of Linden due to its sympathetic siting and scale, in accordance with Policy CP27 of the JCS. This seeks to avoid development which would have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, amongst other things.

⁷ National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

⁸ Previously Paragraph 127, as referred to by the Council's decision notice

⁹ 20-J3224-11

Living Conditions of Future Occupants

22. Plots 4 and 5 would comprise a pair of semi-detached houses arranged in an 'L-shape'. The side elevation of Plot 4 would form part of the northeastern boundary of Plot 5. The ground floor of Plot 5 would be at a lower level than Plot 4, meaning this part of its northeastern boundary would be formed by a tall wall. However, the depth of that wall along the boundary would only be 2.8m from the rear elevation of Plot 5. The Council have explained that the arrangement of Plot 4 would breach a 45° sight line from the centre of a pair of French doors which would serve the kitchen/dining area at ground level and a window which would serve Bedroom 1 at first floor level of Plot 5.
23. It is claimed the arrangement of Plots 4 and 5 and differences in land levels would lead to overshadowing and a loss of light experienced by the future occupants of Plot 5. As demonstrated by the appellant's sunpath plan¹⁰, however, the orientation of the building is such that this would not be the case. Any loss of light would be minimal and only experienced in large rooms with other windows. Moreover, on account of the generous length and width of the garden, I am satisfied that the positioning of Plot 4 at a higher level along a short part of the shared boundary would not create unacceptable living conditions for the future occupants of Plot 5.
24. Plot 10 would be served by a large garden lined by existing trees along the southwestern and northwestern boundaries. The Council has suggested that trees in the southwestern corner of the plot would create a very shaded and limited useable garden space. The appellant's Arboriculturist has described these as 'Category U' trees forming part of a group (referred to as 'G3' in the Arboricultural Report¹¹) which are of an average 6.5m height, poor quality and unlikely to make any contribution for more than 10 years. I inspected these trees from within the heavily overgrown appeal site and am satisfied that the Arboriculturist's description would apply to those trees which would form part of the boundary of Plot 10.
25. The appellant has suggested that three trees in the southwestern corner could be removed to satisfy the Council's concerns and has provided an amended proposed site plan to show this. However, there would be no need to remove the trees suggested as I am satisfied that they would not cause any unacceptable overshadowing, and the proposed garden would provide good quality useable outside space for future occupants. This would be on account of the large size of the garden which would serve Plot 10 and the limited sizes of the trees forming part of G3 shown to be retained.
26. The proposed development would therefore provide acceptable living conditions for the future residents of Plots 5 and 10 in accordance with Policy CP27 of the JCS. This states, amongst other things, development will not be permitted if it would have an unacceptable effect on amenity through excessive overshadowing.

Other Matters

27. Views of the proposal from within the SDNP would be limited and seen in the wider context of development within Holt Pound, and would not therefore cause

¹⁰ Plan 20-J3224-201 dated April 2021, Appendix 3 of the appellant's Statement of Case

¹¹ Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement dated 8 July 2020 by ACD Environmental (ref: GIL22813aia-ams)

unacceptable harm to the setting of, or views from, the SDNP. I am also satisfied that the appellant's Ecological Impact Assessment addresses the effects of the proposal on biodiversity, and that an Ecological Management Strategy could be required by condition.

28. Although traffic movements would increase in close proximity to the junction of Fullers Road and the A325, the proposal would not affect visibility along that junction. In any case, the increase in traffic movements would be small, relative to the likely numbers of vehicles using that part of the A325, and I do not consider the proposal would be likely to adversely affect highway safety in this area.
29. I have also read concerns from neighbours commenting on the distance of the appeal site from local services, which would encourage reliance on car use, and suggesting the proposal could limit future infrastructure development choices in respect of the junction of Fullers Road with the A325. I am aware that the appeal site is allocated for housing within the HEA and I note the Council's suggestion that this allocation may be removed from the emerging local plan, but that is at an early stage of preparation and subject to change prior to adoption. I do not therefore consider these concerns to be justified in the context of the pattern of surrounding development and the adopted status of the HEA; they are to some extent hypothesis at this stage, absent robust evaluation.
30. The UU refers to affordable housing and future maintenance and management of proposed common parts within the appeal site and includes a commitment to the payment of a monitoring and administrative fee. Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and Paragraph 57 of the Framework state that planning obligations must only be sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
31. The proposal would include the provision of 4 affordable units, and large areas of open space, landscaping and driveways would comprise common parts of the appeal site. The affordable housing proposed would accord with Policy CP13 of the JCS and the UU provides a mechanism for securing those units. The common parts of the proposal would also need to be maintained and managed appropriately in future to ensure the high quality, sympathetic layout proposed is fully implemented and retained, in accordance with Policies CP29 and CP32 of the JCS and Policy VL5 of the HEA.
32. The monitoring and administrative fee specified in the UU would be reasonable and proportionate for its purposes of ensuring the commitments secured by the UU are realised. I am therefore satisfied that the commitments set out in the UU would be essential to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms, are directly relevant to the proposal, and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposal.

Conditions

33. In addition to requiring commencement within the standard time period, I have also imposed a condition requiring compliance with the supporting plans in the interests of certainty. In imposing conditions I have revised some compared to those suggested by the council, without altering their fundamental aim, to

ensure compliance with the requirements of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.

34. It would be reasonable and necessary to require the approval of further details in respect of how the future occupants of the proposed dwellings would be protected from noise from the A325 prior to the commencement of development due to its proximity. A Construction Method Statement should also be approved prior to the commencement of development in the interests of highway safety and to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents during construction works. Further details of existing and proposed levels across the site would also need to be approved to ensure the proposal is constructed appropriate to its surroundings as shown in the submitted plans.
35. A landscaping plan was submitted as part of the application. I am satisfied, however, that further details would be required to be approved to show the full specification of hard and soft landscaping and how they would be implemented, including planting, but it would be unreasonable to seek to control the minimum height to which any hedgerows should grow, as has been suggested. There is no need for an additional condition requiring hard surfaces to be made of porous materials or to direct water run-off to a porous surface within the site, as these specifications can be required as part of the hard landscaping details to be approved.
36. The appellant has already submitted a revised Ecological Impact Assessment which outlines proposed mitigation measures where necessary and explains how biodiversity enhancements would be achieved. Further details of an Ecological Management Strategy to comprehensively explain how mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures will be achieved would need to be approved prior to the commencement of development to protect and enhance biodiversity. Appropriate tree protection measures have already been specified and these could be secured by condition to ensure they are carried out.
37. On account of the potential for land contamination and archaeological interest within the appeal site, it would be reasonable and necessary for further details in these regards to be approved prior to the commencement of development. This would be to protect residents from any harmful effects associated with any contamination and to ensure effects of the proposal on any potential archaeological interest are addressed appropriately, respectively. A condition requiring remediation of any contamination found prior to the commencement of development would also be necessary and proportionate.
38. A condition requiring the construction of the proposed accesses and sightlines first, and the retention of sightlines, would be reasonable to protect highway safety. The proposed parking spaces, including garages, should be provided prior to the first occupation of any dwelling and thereafter retained, also in the interests of highway safety. As the garages contribute to the number of parking spaces needed to meet the Council's standards it would be reasonable for the condition to apply to them too.
39. Details concerning decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy supplies should be required to be approved prior to the commencement of development above slab level, and details of bicycle storage facilities to Plots 4 – 7 should be required to be approved prior to the first occupation of those dwellings. This would be to ensure compliance with the development plan in respect of the sustainability of the proposed development.

40. Samples of external facing materials of the proposed buildings should be approved prior to the commencement of development above slab level too. This would be to ensure the proposed buildings are finished appropriately to their design and the surrounding area. Further details in respect of obscure glazing to side windows at Plots 1 and 6 – 9 would be required to be approved and implemented prior to the first occupation of those dwellings to prevent the potential for unacceptable levels of overlooking which could harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents.
41. It would be reasonable and necessary to attach a condition requiring the completion of drainage works prior to the first occupation of any dwellings to ensure the proposal would not adversely affect flood risk on or off site.
42. The Council has suggested a condition which would prevent the erection of any extensions or outbuildings which otherwise may be authorised under the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B and E of the GPDO¹² to prevent any adverse effects upon the character of the area and occupants of neighbouring properties. Paragraph 54 of the Framework advises against the use of such conditions unless there is a clear justification to do so, and I do not consider such a condition would be reasonable or necessary in this instance as the proposed dwellings would be sited within sufficiently spacious plots amongst ample landscaping.

Conclusion

43. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L Douglas

INSPECTOR

¹² The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

SCHEDULE OF 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: 20-J3224-010, 20-J3224-01D, 20-J3224-02A, 20-J3224-03A, 20-J3224-04A, 20-J3224-05, 20-J3224-06, 20-J3224-07A, 20-J3224-08A, 20-J3224-09A, 20-J3224-10A, and 20-J3224-11A.
- 3) No development shall take place until a scheme for mitigating noise to acceptable levels in respect of the A325 for future occupants of the dwellings hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All works which form part of the noise mitigation scheme shall be completed before any dwelling hereby permitted is occupied and retained thereafter.
- 4) No development shall take place until the following information has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - a full site survey showing: the datum used to calibrate the site levels; and levels across the site at regular intervals and floor levels of adjoining buildings; and
 - full details of the proposed finished floor levels of all buildings, hard landscaped surfaces and retaining walls.

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

- 5) No development shall take place until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include:
 - boundary treatments;
 - hard surfacing materials;
 - a planting scheme;
 - an implementation and management/maintenance programme.

The landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before any part of the development is first occupied. The completed scheme shall be managed and maintained in accordance with an approved scheme of management/maintenance.

- 6) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition or site preparation, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
 - a programme of methods and phasing of demolition (if any) and construction work;
 - the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - delivery, demolition and construction working hours;
 - access and egress for plant and machinery;
 - protection of pedestrian routes during construction; and
 - the location of temporary site buildings, compounds, construction material, and plant storage areas.

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

- 7) No development shall take place until a single ecological management strategy, including full details of all ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures, has been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall be in accordance with the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed within the Ecological Impact Assessment GIL22813_EcIA Rev B by ACD Environmental, dated 15 October 2020. The ecological management strategy shall include, but not be restricted to: plans showing location, extent and composition of all proposed ecological plantings and enhancement features; a timetable and methods for the management of all ecological features; details of management responsibility for implementing the strategy; and details of lighting. All such measures shall be implemented and managed in accordance with the approved details.
- 8) No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological assessment and mitigation in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation that has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. Following completion of archaeological fieldwork a report will be produced in accordance with an approved programme including where appropriate post excavation assessment, specialist analysis and reports, publication and public engagement.
- 9) No development shall take place until an assessment of the risks posed by any contamination has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This assessment must be undertaken by a suitably qualified contaminated land practitioner, in accordance with British Standard BS 10175: Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of Practice and the Environment Agency - Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination (CLR 11) (or equivalent British Standard and Model Procedures if replaced), and shall assess any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site.
- 10) No development shall take place where (following the risk assessment set out in condition 9) land affected by contamination is found which poses risks identified as unacceptable in the risk assessment, until a detailed remediation scheme shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an appraisal of remediation options, identification of the preferred option(s), the proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, and a description and programme of the works to be undertaken including the verification plan. The remediation scheme shall be sufficiently detailed and thorough to ensure that upon completion the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to its intended use. The approved remediation scheme shall be carried out and upon completion a verification report by a suitably qualified contaminated land practitioner shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the development is occupied.
- 11) No development shall take place, other than works in association with the proposed accesses, until the most easterly access, including the footway and/or verge crossing shall be constructed and sightlines of 2.4 metres by 43 metres provided and the most westerly access, including the footway and/or verge

crossing shall be constructed and sightlines of 2.4 metres by 43 metres provided in an easterly direction and 2.4 metres by 37 metres in a westerly direction provided, in accordance with Plan A20079-201 Rev P3 as set out in Appendix B of the Transport Statement V3.0 A20079 by Patrick Parsons, dated June 2020. The sightline splays shown on the approved plan shall be kept free of any obstruction exceeding 0.6 metre in height above the adjacent carriageway and shall be subsequently maintained so thereafter.

- 12) No development above slab level shall take place until a scheme (including a timetable for implementation) to secure at least 10% of the energy supply of the development from decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented and thereafter retained in operation. Before any dwelling hereby permitted is first occupied a verification report and completion certificate shall be submitted in writing to the local planning authority confirming that the development has been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 13) No development shall commence above slab level until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwellings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples.
- 14) The dwellings annotated 'Plot 4', 'Plot 5', 'Plot 6' and 'Plot 7' on Plan number 20-J3224-01 Rev D hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until details of bicycle storage facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any of those dwellings and those facilities shall thereafter be retained as such.
- 15) The dwellings annotated 'Plot 1', 'Plot 6', 'Plot 7', 'Plot 8', and 'Plot 9' on Plan number 20-J3224-01 Rev D hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the side elevation windows at first floor level of those dwellings have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the windows are installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.
- 16) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement GIL22813aia-ams by ACD Environmental, dated 8 July 2020 and Tree Protection Plan GIL22813-03 dated 8 July 2020. The approved tree protection measures shall be retained for the duration of construction works.
- 17) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be first occupied until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with Plan numbers 20-J3224-01 Rev D, 20-J3224-02 Rev A, 20-J3224-03 Rev A, 20-J3224-04 Rev A, 20-J3224-07 Rev A, 20-J3224-08 Rev A for 28 cars to be parked, including within garages, and that space shall thereafter be kept available at all times for the parking of vehicles.
- 18) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be first occupied until all drainage works have been completed in accordance with the Drainage Strategy 2.0 A20079 by Patrick Parsons dated 9 July 2020, the Schematic Drainage Layout A20079/300

Rev P3 dated 14 October 2020 and the Rowledge Hydraulic Modelling Final Report S3 P02 by Patrick Parsons dated April 2021, and those drainage works shall be retained thereafter. Surface water discharge to the watercourse shall be limited to 3.1 l/s.