



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 November 2021

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F2360/W/21/3271976

Land at Cottage Gardens, Bamber Bridge, Preston, Lancashire PR5 6AG

- 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 Dorbcrest Homes Ltd against the decision of South Ribble Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 07/2020/00443/FUL, dated 9 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of 11no. dwellings with associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of 11no. dwellings with associated works at Land at Cottage Gardens, Preston, Lancashire, PR5 6AG, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 07/2020/00443/FUL, dated 9 April 2020, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Background and Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site comprises a parcel of largely unmanaged land to the north of Cottage Gardens. Prior to the construction of Cottage Gardens in the early 2000s, there was a fishing pond on the appeal site and before that a plant nursery and garden centre. The site is bounded to the east, north and west by land being developed for housing (planning permission allowed on appeal, refs APP/F2360/W/18/3202604 and APP/F2360/W/18/3198822 respectively, referred to as the Persimmon and Bellway schemes).
3. A signed and dated planning obligation (the S106) pursuant to section 106 to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has been submitted with the appeal. It includes a planning obligation to secure a financial contribution towards Public Open Space. As it is completed, I have taken it into account accordingly.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - i) The effect of the proposal on trees protected by Tree Protection Order;
 - ii) The relationship of the proposal to the wider Site S (Land off Brindle Road) residential allocation; and
 - iii) The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of nearby residential occupiers.

Reasons

Trees

5. The appeal site boundaries comprise trees, hedges, fences and seasonally wet ditches. The western and northern boundaries are characterised by tall and closely spaced hybrid poplar trees that were planted as a shelter belt for the former plant nursery, together with a smaller number of mature oak trees. All of the trees on these 2 boundaries are protected by Tree Preservation Order (area 4 of TPO 2014 No 7 Land to the North of Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge).
6. The TPO relates to an area and not to individual trees, groups or woodlands. The Planning Practice Guidance indicates the area category is intended for short-term protection in an emergency and it protects only those trees standing at the time the Order was made. Authorities are advised to only use this category as a temporary measure until they can fully assess and reclassify the trees in the area. In this case, the TPO was made to avoid any pruning or removal for purely development reasons as the Council considers the tree area has significant amenity value which would increase if the land was developed. The neighbour representations confirm that the trees have local amenity value.
7. As part of the proposal, all of the poplar trees and 1 oak tree would be removed. The poplars are considerably taller than the native deciduous trees and 2 storey dwellings in the surrounding area. By virtue of their height, they are visible from Cottage Gardens and in longer views across the landscape. They are rendered further conspicuous by their dense spacing, homogenous size and structure and artificial L-shape linear arrangement. Consequently, the lines of poplars are a prominent feature in the local area. Taking into account the previously undeveloped nature of the land enclosed by the settlement boundary and the motorways, the shelter belt will have made a positive contribution to the rural and verdant character and appearance of the area. In this context, the loss of the lines of poplars would be a significant visual change and an adverse effect on amenity.
8. According to both arboricultural reports¹ submitted with the appeal, the oak tree proposed for removal is in decline, in poor physiological condition and it has limited remaining life expectancy. While the poplar trees are not in poor physiological condition, the arboricultural consultants both agree that they are unsuitable for retention as part of residential development.
9. The hybrid poplars are mature specimens of a fast growing species that has a life expectancy of roughly 50-70 years. None of the poplars is individually significant and they are even-aged and with a limited remaining useful safe lifespan. They are already very tall and they are interdependent due to their close spacing, resulting in suppressed growth forms. While the trees have withstood high winds in the past, the species is known to decay rapidly and to be at risk of branch and limb failure. Trees on the northern boundary at least are growing on the edge of the ditch bank below the ground level of the appeal site and where the seasonally waterlogged soils, exacerbated by the infilling of

¹ Tree Survey and Development Implications, Cottage Gardens (Phase 2) Bamber Bridge (Working Woodlands, April 2020), and Assessment of Arboricultural Issues in Relation to Planning Application and Subsequent Planning Appeal (Yew Tree and Gardens, March 2021).

the fishing pond during construction of Cottage Gardens, increases the risk of tree failure. Therefore, taking into account their age, size and growth form, I find that the hybrid poplars are not suitable for retention close to housing as part of the residential development of the area.

10. I have also taken account of the development of the wider area, including the approved layouts for the neighbouring Persimmon and Bellway schemes. The plans illustrate that the poplar trees would be in close proximity to dwellings to the east and west. Future occupiers of those schemes would be likely to seek to prune or remove poplar trees due to the conflict from branch, limb and tree failure, overshadowing and leaf fall. Significant tree works or removal of trees, which would be difficult to resist on safety grounds, would compromise remaining trees due to differential wind loading and changes in soil conditions. Therefore, even in the absence of the proposal, the evidence indicates that the poplar trees protected by TPO would be unlikely to survive in the longer-term. In the absence of substantive evidence to the contrary, I am satisfied that the loss of the hybrid poplar trees would be unavoidable.
11. A landscaping scheme was submitted, and it was amended during the processing of the planning application. The scheme that was ultimately considered retains the significant mature oak trees and it includes replacement boundary tree and hedgerow planting together with ornamental shrub planting.
12. Although hedgerows are a priority habitat for conservation, the existing hedgerows are species-poor and they have been poorly maintained. The replacement hedgerows would comprise beech, hawthorn, hazel and holly, which would be locally appropriate native species, and they would be managed.
13. Replacement trees would be a mixture of field maple, birch, hornbeam and rowan. Inevitably the replacement trees would not reach their full potential, in terms of their visual contribution, for a good many years. Moreover, even at maturity, the tree planting would not replicate the uniformity of height and structure of the shelter belt. However, the wider spacing of the trees would ensure that they were not suppressed or interdependent on neighbouring trees. Furthermore, while they would not achieve the height of the hybrid poplars, the mix of tree species would provide structural variety and visual interest.
14. There would not be an equal or greater number of trees planted to replace the roughly 40 hybrid poplars that would be lost. However, I note that the Council's arborist considers the replacement planting would be acceptable. Moreover, the Council's ecological adviser is satisfied that a 2 for 1 replacement planting ratio would not need to apply in the case of the hybrid poplar trees. Taking into account the close spacing and suppressed growth form the poplar trees, I am also satisfied that the replacement tree planting would be adequate.
15. The tree planting would not result in the same visual impact or strong landscape feature as the existing shelter belt. However, unlike the overly tall and densely planted shelter belt, the proposed landscaping scheme would be appropriate to the increasingly urban residential setting. The replacement trees would serve to soften and screen the hard built environment and they would make a contextually appropriate contribution to visual amenity.
16. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would result in the loss of trees protected by TPO. However, the loss would be unavoidable and there would be replacement tree and hedgerow planting to mitigate the loss. Consequently,

while there would be tension with the restrictive part of Policy G13 of the South Ribble Borough Council Local Plan (2012-2026) Adopted July 2015 (the LP), which does not permit proposals that would adversely affected trees protected by a TPO, there would be no conflict with the overall aims of LP policy G13. The proposal would not conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in relation to the important contribution that trees make to the character and quality of urban environments.

Conformity with the wider 'Site S' allocated site

17. LP Policy D1 lists the sites allocated for residential development over the plan period. In this regard, the appeal site forms part of Site S Land off Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge. This is a large residential allocation that extends to approximately 22.7ha with an estimated capacity of 250 dwellings and that was previously Safeguarded Land in the South Ribble Local Plan (2000).
18. The reason for refusal states that the proposal would be piecemeal development which would not be integrated with development of the wider Site S allocation and that access to it should be through the wider Site S and not through Cottage Gardens. Notwithstanding, I note the Council is also of the opinion that the proposal would complete an existing cul-de-sac and it would be unlikely to unacceptably compromise future development of the larger site.
19. Irrespective of whether or not it would be piecemeal development, I am not aware of a masterplan or design guide for the development of Site S. There is already planning permission, with approved layouts, for other parts of Site S. Moreover, while the proposal would be developed independently of the neighbouring Site S developments, it would be well related and integrated with the cul-de-sac of Cottage Gardens. I note that the LP considers that, taking into account its scale, 2 access points are likely to be required to Site S. However, the LP does not establish the position of any access, nor does it appear to preclude additional access points including through existing developed areas.
20. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the Site S residential allocation. It would not conflict with LP Policy D1, which sets out the sites allocated for development over the local plan period.

Living conditions

21. There would be a single highway access to the appeal site from Brindle Road through Cottage Gardens and the proposal would effectively extend the cul-de-sac. As such, there would be disruption to the residents of Cottage Gardens during the construction phase. However, this would be a relatively short-term impact and, subject to mitigation of construction phase impacts, it would not result in significant harm to the living conditions of existing or future residential occupiers of Cottage Gardens.
22. The proposal would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy between habitable room windows or private outdoor space. The new dwellings would not result in overshadowing and there would be no loss of outlook or overbearing impact to neighbouring residential occupiers.
23. Inevitably, there would be an increase in traffic on Cottage Gardens as a result of domestic and commercial vehicles associated with the occupation of the dwellings. I understand that this would be an unwelcome change for the

residential occupiers of Cottage Gardens who have enjoyed living on a quiet cul-de-sac, with low levels of vehicular activity, and where their children could safely play in the street.

24. While the increase in traffic would be likely to mean that children could no longer play in the carriageway, the existing and proposed dwellings have outdoor space to both front and rear and there are accessible green spaces in the wider area. The increased use of the road by vehicles would not result in the loss of private or public open children's play space.
25. The additional traffic would be a noticeable increase above existing levels, but it would not be excessive or unusual in the context of residential streets including cul-de-sacs in settlements. I understand that the existing residential occupiers would perceive the increased traffic to be an adverse effect on their residential amenity. However, while I am sympathetic, there is little evidence that the proposal would result in detrimental levels of noise or disturbance. Furthermore, having regard to the development over its lifetime, future occupiers would be unlikely to consider the cumulative traffic arising from the proposal to be excessive or detrimental to their living conditions.
26. The Council's evidence to the appeal suggests that its concerns in relation to loss of residential amenity do not relate so much to the occupation of the dwellings as to the potential increase in traffic if the proposal was to be opened into Site S in the future. However, the internal access would not be a through route into the neighbouring residential development. There is little evidence that the appellant, or the neighbouring developers, would seek to alter access arrangements in future. In any case, if any such proposals were advanced at a later date, the Council retains the right to consider any future scheme on its individual merits.
27. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the living conditions and it would not result in a poor standard of residential amenity for existing or future residential occupiers of Cottage Gardens. It would not conflict with the residential amenity aims of LP Policy G17. It would not conflict with the residential amenity aims of the Framework.

Other Considerations

28. The Council can demonstrate a 5 year deliverable supply of housing land. However, this does not preclude additional homes coming forward. Moreover, taking into account the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, the additional dwellings would be a benefit of the scheme.
29. The dwellings would be 2 storey detached properties. They would be finished in brick with contrasting window heads and cills and grey roofs tiles to hipped, pitched and gable fronted roofs. Properties would be set back on similar building lines to the Cottage Garden properties, with similarly sized outdoor space to the front and rear. The Council has no concerns with the design of the dwellings or their visual relationship to the Cottage Garden properties and I see no reason to disagree. The proposal would provide an adequate standard of living conditions for future occupiers in terms of both internal space and private outdoor space and there would be adequate parking provision. As discussed above, the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal would not harm the safe operation of the highway and there would be adequate parking provision.

30. Although parts of the site have been cleared in the relatively recent past, the boundary trees and hedges continue to provide habitat for nesting birds and foraging bats and the site is of local biodiversity value in the increasingly built-up surrounding context. There would inevitably be a reduction in biodiversity following tree and hedgerow removal and until such time as the replacement planting matures. However, the Council's ecological adviser has no fundamental objection to the proposal, subject to the imposition of planning conditions to secure mitigation measures and I see no reason to disagree.
31. Public open space would be required as part of the new development, in accordance with the Central Lancashire Supplementary Planning Document Open Space and Playing Pitch Strategy, final version August 2013. However, it could not be provided on site and therefore the completed S106 makes provision for a public open space contribution of £20,306. The contribution would be used to provide or enhance public open space facilities at Bracken Close, Furtherfield and Worden Park. On the basis of the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to it in scale and kind. The statutory tests in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations would be met.
32. I have had regard to the neighbour representations, including from members of the Brindle Road Action Group. The representations include background information relating to the development of the area, including the infilling of the former pond, the recent creation of a gated access to the appeal site and the clearance of vegetation and associated loss of wildlife. The concerns and objections in relation to the planning application and the appeal include the loss of the boundary trees, the relationship of the proposal to the Site S allocation and impacts on residential amenity. These matters formed the basis for the Council's reasons for refusal, which have been addressed above. Some of the other matters raised are not issues to be dealt with as part of this appeal. Other matters, including in relation to drainage, can be satisfactorily addressed by the imposition of planning conditions. While I am sympathetic to the local residents, the representations do not weigh significantly against the proposal.

Conditions

33. The Council has suggested planning conditions in the event the appeal was allowed. I have assessed these against the relevant tests set out in the Framework and I have amended the wording accordingly where I consider this is necessary.
34. In addition to the standard condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission, I have specified the approved plans in the interests of certainty. I have not specified the Community Infrastructure Levy documentation as this is subject to separate regulations. As the relevant parts of the ecology report and design and access statement are the subject of separate conditions, I have not specified these documents in their entirety.
35. Planning conditions relating to ground contamination and remediation, the importation of soil, and sustainable drainage are necessary in the interests of environmental protection, including avoidance of flooding and pollution, and human health. Conditions securing mitigation for impacts on nesting birds, repeat surveys for protected species, tree protection, and measures for the

control of invasive species are necessary in the interests of protection of biodiversity and the environment.

36. Conditions relating to construction management, piling activity, the hours of working, bin storage, boundaries and parking are necessary to safeguard residential amenity and the living conditions of nearby residential occupiers. Conditions relating to construction management, parking, retention of garages and satisfactory site access arrangements are also necessary in the interests of highway safety. Conditions relating to materials, tree protection, landscaping and bin storage are necessary in the interests of visual amenity and character and appearance.
37. Conditions relating to dwelling emission rates and Electric Vehicle Recharge points are necessary in the interests of energy efficiency and sustainable transport for environmental and climate change mitigation.

Conclusion

38. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR

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: Site Location Plan ref 3002/P2-LP; Proposed Development Site Layout ref 3038-DPC; Proposed Landscape Plan ref 3038-LPC; Proposed House type Plans and Elevations: The Beeley ref BE001, The Fairhurst ref FA001, The Newby ref NE001, The Norwood ref NO001, The Redfearn ref RE001, The Ribchester ref RI001; Garage Proposed Plans and Elevations ref GAR001; External finishes schedule ref 3038-09.04.20; Proposed Car Parking Plan ref 3002/P2-CP; Proposed Boundary Plan ref 3038-BP; Proposed Bin Store Location Plan ref 3038-BS; Appendix 1 – Plan Showing Location of Trees, RPA & Protective Fencing Positions, Working Woodlands Tree Survey and Development Implications April 2020; Outline Drainage Philosophy ref G3323/OD/01.
- 3) No development above finished floor level of the dwellings hereby permitted shall commence until details / 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 details / samples.
- 4) No development shall commence until an assessment of the risks posed by any contamination, carried out 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), shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. If any contamination is found, a report specifying the measures to be taken, including the timescale, to remediate the site to render it suitable for the approved development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The site shall be remediated in accordance with the approved measures and timescale and a verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. If, during the course of development, any contamination is found which has not been previously identified, work shall be suspended and additional measures for its remediation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The remediation of the site shall incorporate the approved additional measures and a verification report for all the remediation works shall be submitted to the local planning authority upon completion and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any and all remediation works shall be completed prior to the occupation of the first dwelling.
- 5) Prior to the importation of any subsoil and/or topsoil material into the proposed development site, a Desk Study shall be undertaken to assess the suitability of the proposed material to ensure it shall not pose a risk to human health as defined under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The soil material shall be sampled and analysed by a Competent Person. The details of the sampling regime and analysis shall be submitted to and agreed

in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the work taking place. A Verification Report which contains details of sampling methodologies and analysis results and which demonstrates the material does not pose a risk to human health shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing.

- 6) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
- Details of the site access for construction;
 - Provision for the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - Provision for the loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
 - Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction, including wheel washing facilities;
 - A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
 - Delivery, demolition and construction.

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

- 7) No development shall take place except for site clearance and remediation until details of all piling activity together with all mitigation measures to be taken have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved piling activities shall be limited to between 0930 to 1700 hours.
- 8) All dwellings are required to achieve a minimum Dwelling Emission Rate of 19% above Building Regulations 2013. With the exception of site preparation and remediation works, no development shall take place until details demonstrating that each dwelling will meet the required Dwelling Emission Rate have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.
- 9) No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until a SAP (Standard Assessment Procedure) assessment, or other alternative proof of compliance (which has been previously agreed in writing by the local planning authority) such as an Energy Performance Certificate, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to demonstrate that the dwelling has achieved the required Dwelling Emission Rate.
- 10) No machinery shall be operated, no process carried out and no deliveries taken at or dispatched from the site during construction, demolition or clearance of the site outside the following times:
0800 to 1800 hours on Monday to Friday; and

0800 to 1400 hours on Saturday.

No activities shall take place on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

- 11) No tree or hedgerow felling, vegetation clearance works, demolition work or other works that may affect nesting birds shall take place between March and August inclusive unless the absence of nesting birds has been confirmed by surveys or inspections and written approval has been given by the local planning authority.
- 12) If the development hereby approved has not commenced within 2 years of the date of this permission, a re-survey shall be carried out to establish whether bats or barn owls are present at the site. The survey shall be undertaken by a suitably qualified person. If the presence of bats or barn owls is confirmed, details of measures including timing for the protection or relocation of the species shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the approved measures shall be implemented.
- 13) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a scheme for the protection of the retained trees (the tree protection plan) and the appropriate working methods (the arboricultural method statement) in accordance with paragraphs 5.5 and 6.1 of British Standard BS 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations (or in an equivalent British Standard if replaced) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme for the protection of the retained trees shall be carried out as approved.
- 14) Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed method statement detailing measures that shall be implemented for the removal or long-term management or eradication of invasive plants listed under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, including Variegated Yellow Archangel and Hollyberry Cotoneaster, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The method statement shall include proposed measures to prevent the spread of invasive plants during any operations such as mowing, strimming or soil movement. It shall also contain measures to ensure that any soils brought to the site are free of the seeds, roots or stems of any invasive plant covered by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. The development shall proceed in accordance with the approved method statement.
- 15) The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented in the first planting season following completion of the development or first occupation/ use, whichever is the sooner, and shall be maintained thereafter for a period of not less than 5 years to the satisfaction of the local planning authority in compliance with BS 5837 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations. The maintenance shall include the watering, weeding, mulching and adjustment and removal of stakes and support systems, and shall include the replacement of any tree or shrub which is removed, becomes seriously damaged or diseased or dies, by the same species. Replacement trees as identified on plan ref 3038/LPC shall be 10-12 standards.
- 16) Prior to first occupation of each dwelling hereby approved, one Electric Vehicle Recharge point shall be provided to that dwelling. This shall be retained and maintained thereafter.

- 17) Prior to first occupation of each dwelling hereby approved, waste storage facilities to the rear of that dwelling shall be provided in accordance with drawing ref 3038/BS (Dorbcrest). The approved facilities shall be retained thereafter.
- 18) No development shall commence until final details of the design, based on sustainable drainage principles, and implementation of an appropriate surface water sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and LLFA. Those details shall include:
- a) Evidence that demonstrates that the surface water discharge complies with the drainage hierarchy.
 - b) Topographical plan of the development site with contours at 1m intervals.
 - c) Final sustainable drainage layout plan appropriately labelled to include all pipe/structure references, dimensions, design levels, discharge rates, finished floor levels in AOD with adjacent ground levels. Final sustainable longitudinal sections plan appropriately labelled to include all pipe/structure references, dimensions, design levels, discharge rates, with adjacent ground levels. Cross section drawings of flow control manholes and attenuation tank.
 - d) The drainage scheme should demonstrate that the surface water run-off shall not exceed the greenfield run off rate. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.
 - e) Sustainable drainage flow calculations (1 in 1, 1 in 2, 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 + climate change).
 - f) Plan identifying areas contributing to the drainage network.
 - g) Measures taken to prevent flooding and pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters, including watercourses.
 - h) A plan to show overland flow routes and flood water exceedance routes and flood extents.
 - i) Evidence of an assessment of the site conditions to include site investigation and test results to confirm infiltrations rates.
 - j) Breakdown of attenuation in pipes, manholes and attenuation tank.
 - k) Details of an appropriate management and maintenance plan for the sustainable drainage system for the lifetime of the development. This shall include arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker or management and maintenance by a Management Company and any means of access for maintenance and easements, where applicable.

The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of any of the dwellings, or completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Thereafter the drainage system shall be retained, managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

- 19) Prior to first occupation of each dwelling, the screen fencing/ boundary treatments shown on the approved plans shall be erected and retained thereafter.
- 20) Prior to first occupation of each dwelling, the approved parking spaces for that dwelling as identified on drawing ref 3003-P2-CP shall be drained and surfaced with a material to be approved in writing by the local planning authority. The parking spaces shall be retained at all times thereafter and they shall not be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles.
- 21) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), all garages shown on the approved plan shall be retained solely for the housing of private motor vehicles or domestic storage associated with the dwellings. In particular, no garage shall be used for any other domestic, trade or business purpose and they shall not be converted to or used as habitable living accommodation.
- 22) No development shall take place except for remediation and enabling works until a scheme for the construction of the site access has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied or brought into use and it shall be retained thereafter.