



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 1 March 2022

by M Savage BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 June 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/R0660/C/21/3282460

Land at Meadow Lodge, Clamhunger Lane, Mere, Knutsford, Cheshire WA16 6QG

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. The appeal is made by Mr David Robert Harlow against an enforcement notice issued by Cheshire East Council.
 - The notice was issued on 10 August 2021.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the unauthorised construction of a detached garage.
 - The requirements of the notice are to:
 - a) Demolish the detached garage shown in the approximate position shaded in orange on the attached plan marked 'Plan B'.
 - b) Grub out all foundations.
 - c) Reinstate the area of land shown in the approximate position shaded in orange on the attached plan marked 'Plan B' in topsoil and reseed with grass seed
 - d) Remove all resultant debris from the land.
 - The periods for compliance with the requirements are:
 - a) 6 months after this Notice takes effect
 - b) 6 months after this Notice takes effect
 - c) 6 months after this Notice takes effect.
 - d) 7 months after this Notice takes effect.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/R0660/W/21/3280204

Meadow Lodge Clamhunger Lane, Mere, Knutsford, Cheshire WA16 6QG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Harlow against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 20/3852M, dated 2 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of one infill dwelling with detached garage and access.
-

Appeal C Ref: APP/R0660/W/21/3286710

Meadow Lodge, Clamhunger Lane, Mere WA16 6QG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Harlow against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 21/4846M, dated 10 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is Construction of single-storey detached garage (part retrospective).
-

Decision: Appeal A Ref: APP/R0660/C/21/3282460

1. The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Decision: Appeal B Ref: APP/R0660/W/21/3280204

2. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for the construction of one infill dwelling with detached garage and access at Meadow Lodge, Clamhunger Lane, Mere, Knutsford, Cheshire WA16 6QG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/3852M, dated 2 September 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Decision: Appeal C Ref: APP/R0660/W/21/3286710

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single-storey detached garage (part retrospective) at Meadow Lodge, Clamhunger Lane, Knutsford, Cheshire WA16 6QG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/4846M, dated 10 September 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

4. With respect to Appeal B, the planning application is in outline with all matters reserved for future consideration apart from access. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis. Plans are indicative with respect to the reserved matters.
5. With respect to Appeal B, notwithstanding the description of development provided on the application form, the appellant has since agreed, in writing, to change the description of the proposed development, to 'construction of one infill dwelling with detached garage and access'. I have therefore used the amended description in the banner heading above and shall consider the appeal on that basis.
6. With respect to Appeal B, the appeal form identifies the appellant's name as 'Marlow'. The appellant has confirmed this is an error and so I have used the name 'Harlow' in the banner heading above.
7. With respect to Appeal C, the appeal has been made against non-determination. The Council agree that planning permission should be granted. Objection has been made by the Mere Parish Council on the basis that there are no special circumstances regarding the green belt and from an interested party due to the effect on the countryside and the green belt. I shall therefore address these matters in my decision letter below.

Appeal A: Ground (a) and Appeals B and C: S78 Appeals

8. An appeal under ground (a) is made on the basis that planning permission ought to be granted for the matters stated in the notice. Since there is a commonality between the issues in the different appeals, I shall deal with them together.

Main Issues

9. The main issues of the appeals are:

- Whether the appeal schemes are inappropriate development in the green belt having regard to the revised framework and relevant development plan policies;
- The effect of the appeal schemes on the openness of the Green Belt;
- The effect of appeal schemes A, the unauthorised detached garage and C, the proposed single-storey detached garage, on the character and appearance of the area;
- 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 required to justify the appeal scheme.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate Development in the Green Belt

10. Clamhunger Lane is generally characterised by substantial dwellings set in generous plots. Appeal A concerns a detached double garage which is located within the grounds of Meadow Lodge, set well back from the highway, with mature vegetation bounding the site. Appeal B concerns a substantial lawned area which abuts Meadow Lodge, between the properties Meadow Vale and Greco.
11. The main parties do not dispute that the appeal site lies within the Green Belt. Policy PG3 of the Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (adopted 2017)(LPS) seeks to protect Green Belt from inappropriate development and Policy GC1 states that within the Green Belt approval will not be given except in very special circumstances, for the construction of new buildings unless it is for specified types of development, including limited infilling within identified settlements.
12. The National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework')(2021) identifies that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It goes on to state that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt subject to a number of exceptions as set out in paragraph 149.

Appeal B: Proposed dwelling

13. Paragraph 149 of the Framework states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are: e) limited infilling in villages. The main thrust of the appellant's case is that the proposed development would represent the infilling of a relatively small gap and would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
14. Although Mere is not an identified settlement within policy GC1, and so there would be conflict with the policy in this regard, the policy is inconsistent with the Framework, which does not limit infilling in this way. It is not disputed that the appeal site is within a village and I have no reason to disagree with this

conclusion, given the extent of housing which is grouped together. The Council state that the proposed development does not constitute limited infilling within a village, as it is not considered a relatively small gap between buildings.

15. Policy PG3 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (adopted 2017)(CELPS) states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate. Exceptions to this include limited infilling in villages. The Council advise that infilling is defined within the glossary of the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy as 'The development of a relatively small gap between existing buildings'.
16. The term 'small' is relative and so it is not particularly helpful in determining whether the appeal site comprises an infill site. The glossary of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan defines infilling as 'The filling of a small gaps in an otherwise built-up frontage. (A small gap is one which could be filled by one or two houses)'.
17. The gap between the dwellings Meadow Lodge and Greco, excluding the dismissed garage, is stated to be approximately 65m. It is proposed to erect a single dwelling and garage within the plot. The proposal is in outline and so the precise location of the dwelling could change. Nevertheless, the indicative plans show a substantial dwelling, positioned between Greco and Meadow Lodge, set well back from the main road.
18. Although the gap between the buildings would be generous, it would not be out of keeping with the pattern of development along Clamhunger Lane. Since the appeal scheme is for a single dwelling, I consider it would constitute limited infilling within a village and would therefore not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Consequently, there is no need for me to go on to consider the effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt, or whether very special circumstances exist.

Appeal C: Proposed garage

19. Paragraph 149 of the Framework states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are: c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Policy PG3 of the CELPS seeks to protect the Green Belt and largely repeats the wording of the Framework with respect to extensions to buildings.
20. Policy GC1 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (MBLP)(2004) supports the limited extension or alteration of existing dwellings in the Green Belt, subject to policy GC12. Policy GC12 of the MBLP states that alterations and extensions to existing houses in the countryside may be granted for up to 30% of the original floor space. Exceptions to the policy may be permitted where (1) The proposal lies in a group of houses or ribbon of development and the extension would not be prominent...(3) The extension is to provide a conservatory or domestic building in the curtilage and the proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the countryside.
21. The main thrust of the appellant's case in relation to Appeal C, is that the proposed garage would not be a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling. The appellant proposes to erect a single storey, double garage which

is detached from the main dwelling. Given the close relationship between the proposed garage and the main dwelling, I consider it can be regarded as part of the dwelling and therefore, an extension to the house for the purposes of applying paragraph 149 of the Framework.

22. The proposed garage is similar to the existing garage which is the subject of an enforcement notice, though it would have a reduced height and no accommodation at first floor. The appellant advises that the footprint of the garage is approximately 54sqm (square metres), which represents an increase in floor space of around 34.8% above the original building. This is not disputed by the Council.
23. Although the floor space would exceed the 30% set out in policy GC12, the difference is limited. Policy GC12 permits exceptions to the 30% rule in certain circumstances. The building would be set well back from the road and would be largely screened by well-established vegetation. Given the limited floor space and height of the building, it would not appear a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling.
24. While I accept that existing vegetation could be removed, I see no reason why the appellant would choose to remove it given the application for an outline dwelling above. Furthermore, the dwelling would be viewed from the public domain as a subordinate outbuilding adjacent to the main dwelling. Thus, I consider the building would not be a disproportionate extension over and above the size of the original building. Consequently, there would be no conflict with policy PG3 of the CELPTS, policies GC1 or GC12 of the MBLP or the Framework in this regard.
25. Since I have found the appeal scheme would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, there is no need for me to go on to consider the effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt, or whether very special circumstances exist.

Appeal A: Retention of existing garage

26. The erection of the garage has previously been considered by an Inspector on appeal, reference APP/R0660/W/20/3262923. The Inspector found the garage to be a disproportionate addition to the main dwellinghouse and therefore, inappropriate development in the Green Belt. I have no reason to disagree with the Inspector's conclusion in this regard.
27. The main thrust of the appellant's case under the ground (a) appeal, Appeal A, is that, Should the appeal be allowed for the construction of an infill dwelling (Appeal B), the garage would then comprise infilling within a village and would therefore not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, the garage does not currently constitute limited infilling, since it does not fill a gap between two buildings.
28. Whether or not I grant planning permission for the proposed dwelling, there is no guarantee that the appellant would choose to implement the permission. Consequently, it is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and conflicts with policy PG3 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS)(2017) and saved policies GC1 and GC12 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (MBLP)(2004), the requirements of which are set out above.

The effect on openness: Appeal A only

29. As set out above, since I have found the proposed dwelling (Appeal B) and the proposed garage (Appeal C) would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, my consideration of openness is limited to the retention of the existing garage.
30. I am mindful of the previous Inspector's conclusion with respect to the garage. However, I must reach my conclusion based upon the evidence before me and on what I have seen on site. Although the size of the building reduces the openness of the building in a spatial sense, it is located within the settlement of Mere and appears closely related to the original dwelling. Vegetation limits the visual impact of the building from Clamhunger Lane and whilst it can be seen from the public domain, I consider the effect on the openness of the Green Belt is modest.

Character and appearance

Appeal A: Retention of existing garage

31. Clamhunger Lane is characterised by substantial dwellings set in generous plots. Although outbuildings are a common feature of the area, they are generally designed so as to be clearly subordinate to the main dwelling. The garage which has been constructed, by contrast, is similar in height to the original dwelling and fails to demonstrate such a relationship when viewed from Clamhunger Lane. This diminishes the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policies SE1 of the CELPS which seeks design which is appropriate to the local context and policies SE4 and SD2 of the CELPS, which seek design which preserve local distinctiveness.

Appeal C: Proposed garage

32. As set out above, I have found that the proposed garage would be viewed from the public domain as a subordinate outbuilding adjacent to the main dwelling, which is characteristic of the area. Given the set back of the building from the road, and its position relative to other buildings along Clamhunger Lane, the proposed garage would not appear prominent or adversely affect the character and appearance of the countryside and there would be no conflict with policies SE1, SE4 and SD2 of the CELPS, the requirements of which are set out above.

Other considerations: Appeal A only

33. The appellant proposes to reduce the height of the garage and remove the first floor. There is currently a window in the side elevation, which faces towards the host dwelling. No window is shown on the proposed scheme and the external design differs, with no cladding on the gable end which faces towards the main house.
34. Whilst the proposed garage would sit on the same footprint as the existing garage, the proposed scheme is a smaller, single storey building. It would not be possible to grant a split decision, allowing the deemed application in part, but refusing the other part, since the top floor and roof are not physically severable from the rest of the building. It does not therefore form part of the matters specified in the notice and does not weigh in support of the appeal scheme.

35. While the garage provides secure off-road parking, the existing garage is not the only means of securing the appellant's vehicles and so I afford this matter very limited weight.

Conclusion: Appeal A

36. The Framework sets out the general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt. It states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development 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.
37. I find that the other considerations in this case do not clearly outweigh the harm that I have identified. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist and the appeal scheme would conflict with the Framework and with policies PG3, SE1, SE4 and SD2 of the CELPS and GC1 and GC12 of the MBLP, the requirements of which are set out above.

Other Matters

38. The enforcement regime is not intended to be punitive. Although works have been carried out without the benefit of planning permission, this does not weigh against the appeal schemes.

Biodiversity: Appeal B

39. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 requires decision makers to undertake appropriate assessment where significant effects on a European site are likely and only to give consent if there are no adverse effects on the integrity of a European site unless other legal tests have been met.
40. Natural England has previously advised that the application could have potential significant effects on Midland Mere & Mosses Phase 1 Ramsar and The Mere, Mere Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). During the course of the appeal, Natural England provided updated advice regarding nutrient level pollution in a number of existing and new river basin catchments, including Rostherne Mere Ramsar.
41. The appeal site is located approximately 327m from the Midlands Meres and Mosses Phase 1 Ramsar and The Mere SSSI. It is also within the catchment of the Rostherne Mere Ramsar and Rostherne Mere SSSI. Factors which are known to adversely impact the ecological character of the sites include eutrophication. Given the location and scale of the development, waste-water pollution is the potential impact pathway which has been identified as a means for the proposed development to adversely impact protected sites.
42. The appellant has provided correspondence from United Utilities, which confirms that while it has wastewater assets in the area, there are no associated overflows or discharges into the Rostherne Mere catchment. Works which were completed circa 2019 saw cessation of storm overflows from Rostherne pumping Station and Mere Platts Pumping Station which discharged to Rostherne Brook, a tributary of Rostherne Mere.

43. Natural England advise that if there is no wastewater discharge from within the catchment, it would reduce the likelihood of the proposed development having adverse nutrient impacts on the designated Habitat sites. The Council advise that, given the nature of the development, the impacts from run-off would be very small and, so long as there is no waste-water impact, it can be considered out of scope for Nutrient Neutrality.
44. The appellant proposes to connect to the upgraded sewerage network, however, since the proposal is in outline, no details have been provided. Nevertheless, it would be possible to secure details of drainage via condition. Given the advice from United Utilities, I am satisfied that the inclusion of a condition would adequately overcome any adverse effects of the proposal on the above sites, including Rostherne Mere.

Conditions: Appeal B

45. Since the application is in outline, I shall include conditions relating to the submission and timing of reserved matters applications and the commencement of development. In the interests of certainty, I shall include a condition to secure details of existing and proposed ground levels.
46. To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, I shall include a condition to secure a scheme of hard and soft landscaping and a scheme for the protection of retained trees and implementation of the protection works, as well as protective fencing. Paragraph 180 of the Framework advises that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around development should be integrated as part of their design. As part of the landscaping scheme, I shall require the provision of features to enhance biodiversity value, including the provision of features for nesting birds and roosting bats.
47. In the interests of preventing off-site pollution and flooding, I shall include a condition to secure foul and surface water drainage.
48. Paragraph 112(e) of the Framework sets out that development should be designed to enable the charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations. I shall include a condition to secure electrical vehicle charging infrastructure.

Conditions: Appeal C

49. In the interests of certainty, I shall include a plans condition and a materials condition. The Council has requested that the development shall be completed 'within [sic] commence within six months of the date of this approval and retained for the lifetime of the development...' The condition requested is contradictory and, in my view, unreasonable and unnecessary.
50. The garage is part retrospective and so there is no need for a commencement condition. Requiring that the works are completed within 6 months is unreasonable, since there may be factors outside the appellant's control which delay the completion of the development. Requiring its retention for the lifetime of the development is not sufficiently precise and is unreasonable, given permitted development rights.
51. The Council has requested a condition restricting the use so that it can only be used as incidental to the dwellinghouse. The appellant has provided a unilateral undertaking (UU) to the appeal, within which the appellant covenants not to

sell the garage separately from the property and at all times to only use the garage ancillary to the use and enjoyment of the owner's home. However, I consider that the condition and UU are not necessary in this case. Planning permission would be required for a material change of use and uses which are ancillary or incidental would not be development and so would be allowed anyway.

Ground (f)

52. An appeal under ground (f) is made on the basis that the steps required by the notice to be taken, or the activities required by the notice to cease, exceed what is necessary to remedy any breach of planning control which may be constituted by those matters or, as the case may be, to remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by any such breach.
53. I am obliged to consider whether there is an obvious alternative which would overcome the planning difficulties at less cost and disruption than total removal. The appellant has submitted plans for an alternative scheme, which have also been submitted in support of Appeal C.
54. As set out above, the reduction in the height of the garage would address concerns about harm to the green belt, as well as character and appearance of the area. However, I have found that the proposed scheme does not form part of the matters stated in the notice. Since the breach of planning control alleged is the erection of a detached garage, allowing it to remain would fail to remedy the breach.
55. The notice requires the foundations to be removed and the area reinstated as grass. The appellant suggests the 'footprint' of the garage could remain as hardstanding as part of the existing approved driveway. While the foundations may have a more limited effect on openness than the development as a whole, since it facilitates the breach, requiring its removal would not exceed what is necessary to remedy the breach. Furthermore, it would not be possible to word the requirements with the necessary precision that the appellant knew what they needed to do.
56. Consequently, the appeal under ground (f) must fail. Nevertheless, section 180 of the Act sets out that where, after the service of an enforcement notice, planning permission is granted for any development carried out before the grant of that permission, the notice shall cease to have effect so far as inconsistent with that permission. Since I am granting planning permission for the proposed garage under Appeal C, the appellant would be able to retain those parts of the building which are consistent with the permission.

Ground (g)

57. An appeal under ground (g) is made on the basis that any period specified in the notice...falls short of what should reasonably be allowed. The appellant asserts that the time is too short to comply with the notice and that a period of 12 months will be required to enable a sufficient period of dry weather for the work to be undertaken and if an alternative scheme is approved, for those alteration works to be undertaken.
58. Given the limited size of the building, I consider 6 months is sufficient to enable its removal, or alteration in line with the planning permission I have granted under Appeal C. The appeal under ground (g) therefore must fail.

Conclusion: Appeal A

59. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Conclusion: Appeal B

60. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed dwelling would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would accord with the development plan as a whole. Consequently, the appeal should be allowed.

Conclusion: Appeal C

61. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed garage would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, would not harm the character and appearance of the area and accords with the development plan as a whole. Consequently, the appeal should be allowed.

M Savage

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions: Appeal B

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Proposed Block Site Plan 3715 1000 D.
- 5) No development shall take place until the following information shall have 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; levels along all site boundaries; levels across the site at regular intervals and floor levels of adjoining buildings;
 - full details of the proposed finished floor levels of all buildings and hard landscaped surfaces.

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

- 6) No development shall commence until there shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a scheme of both hard and soft landscaping. These details shall include: the incorporation of features for nesting birds and roosting bats; indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, identify those to be retained and set out measures for their protection throughout the course of development.
- 7) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
- 8) All the trees and hedges shown on the landscaping plan as "to be retained" and/or any trees whose canopies overhang the site] shall be protected by strong fencing, the location and type to be previously approved in writing by the local planning authority. The fencing shall be erected in accordance with the approved details before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed within any fenced area, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

[In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars.]

- 9) No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until surface water drainage works shall have been implemented in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before any details are submitted to the local planning authority an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system, having regard to Defra's non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (or any subsequent version), and the results of the assessment shall have been provided to the local planning authority. Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall:
- provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
 - include a timetable for its implementation; and,
 - provide, a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.
- 10) None of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be occupied until works for the disposal of sewage shall have been provided on the site to serve the development hereby permitted, in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 11) Prior to the first occupation of the property, the developer shall provide Electric Vehicle Infrastructure to the following specification:
- A single Mode 3 compliant Electric Vehicle Charging Point with off road parking. The charging point shall be independently wired to a 30A spur to enable minimum 7kW Fast charging or the best available given the electrical infrastructure.
 - Should the infrastructure not be available, written confirmation of such from the electrical supplier shall be submitted to the local planning authority prior to discharge. Where there is insufficient infrastructure, Mode 2 compliant charging may be acceptable.
- The infrastructure shall be maintained in an operational condition in perpetuity.

Schedule of Conditions: Appeal C

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, drawing number 4909/01, Proposed Garage Ground Floor Plan, drawing number 200 Revision C, Proposed elevations, drawing number 300 Revision C, Site Section AA, drawing number 4001, Revision A, Existing Block Plan as-built, drawing number 500B Revision D.
- 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the garage hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

End of Schedules