



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2023

by K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W3520/W/22/3292871

Land to the East of Hockey Hill, Wetheringsett-Cum-Brockford, Suffolk IP14 5PN

- 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 Dialston Will Trust Ltd against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/04921, dated 30 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is 14 no. dwellings including 4 no. affordable dwellings, construction of access and associated parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for development of 14 no. dwellings including 4 no. affordable dwellings, construction of access and associated parking, at Land to the East of Hockey Hill, Wetheringsett-Cum-Brockford, Suffolk IP14 5PN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/20/04921, dated 30 October 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was made in outline with the matters of access, scale and layout to be considered. I have approached the appeal on the same basis, with details relation to the reserved matters of appearance and landscaping being treated as solely illustrative at this stage.
3. I am considering this appeal at the same time as a proposal for 11 dwellings¹ on a site a short distance to the north along Hockey Hill. I have considered the appeals separately, but in doing so have been mindful of the potential cumulative effects of the two developments were both to be allowed.

Background and Main Issue

4. The appeal relates to a roughly square parcel of undeveloped land to the rear of dwellings on Hockey Hill and to the south of a small cul-de-sac containing Nos 18 to 33. The development would be accessed via the cul-de-sac, facilitated by the removal of existing blocks of garages between Nos 29 and 30. A roughly U-shaped layout of 8 bungalows and 6 two storey dwellings is proposed.
5. The application was recommended for approval by Council officers, but refused by its planning committee, on the basis that it would not enhance or maintain

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/W3520/W/22/3291190

the vitality of the rural community and would generate unsustainable traffic movements from future residents which would not support local services. No development plan policy conflict is cited in the reason for refusal, only conflict with Paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

6. The main issue, therefore, is whether the proposal represents a suitable location for housing, having regard to the relevant local and national policy context and other material considerations.

Reasons

Location for housing

7. The development plan for the area comprises the Mid Suffolk District Core Strategy (September 2008) (the CS), the Core Strategy Focused Review (December 2012) (the FR) and saved policies of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (September 1998) (the MSLP).
8. Policy CS1 of the CS designates Wetheringsett as a 'Secondary Village' at the bottom of the settlement hierarchy for the district. Secondary Villages are defined as villages unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs only. This may include employment, amenity and community facilities as well as small-scale infill housing and "rural exception" sites for affordable housing.
9. The site lies within the settlement boundary for Wetheringsett as established under the MSLP and was previously allocated for housing. The settlement boundaries of the MSLP have not subsequently been updated, despite intentions to do so within the CS. The Council points to new settlement boundaries having been advanced as part of its submitted Joint Local Plan² (JLP). However, the JLP has not yet been adopted, and in the evidence before me there is a letter from the examining Inspectors in December 2021 raising concerns and requiring further work on the housing policies of the JLP. Consequently, I place limited weight on the proposed boundaries and have considered the proposal on the basis of the 1998 boundaries still in place, in line with the suggested course of action of the examining Inspectors.
10. Being within the settlement boundary, the proposed 14 dwellings, including 4 affordable units, would be supported under Policies CS1 and CS2 which allow for provision for meeting local housing needs within designated settlement boundaries, in particular affordable housing.
11. However, notwithstanding this, the Council argues that the location of the housing would be unsuitable due to Wetheringsett lacking services and facilities for day-to-day living, which would significantly increase reliance on the private car and vehicle movements in and out of the village. It argues that any use of the few services within the village would not be sufficient to sustain or enhance the vitality of the community. The Council also points out that, under its draft JLP, Wetheringsett is not proposed to be elevated in the settlement hierarchy but is proposed to be designated as 'hinterland,' an area not proposed for major market development.
12. The Framework at Paragraph 79 sets out that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, and identify

² In conjunction with Babergh District Council

opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. The Framework adds that significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes, whilst recognising that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas.

13. The appeal site is adjacent to the main part of the village, Wetheringsett-Cum-Brockford – Church, which includes a church, village hall, primary school and play area. The addition of dwellings would have a positive effect in terms of support for these facilities, which could be reached on foot. The nearest shop, a convenience store forming part of a petrol station on the A140 some 1.8km away, is beyond reasonable walking distance, and is said to offer a limited range of goods. That said, the Framework recognises that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Mendelsham, around 3.5km away, has additional services including a health centre, local shop, chip shop, playing fields and a community centre which future residents could patronise.
14. The limited facilities in the village mean that residents are still likely to travel beyond the village to avail of most services and employment opportunities and would rely on the private car to do so as the distances involved would preclude walking or cycling, and with no conveniently located or regular public transport option, the nearest being the 113 service stopping on the A140 some 1.4km away. However, the dispersed layout of Wetheringsett means that any development is going to be closer to some facilities than others, and not all are going to be walkable given the distances and road conditions. The scale of the proposal also means the number of journeys is not likely to be significant and many trips, such as to the facilities in Mendelsham, would be short. Importantly, the proximity of the local primary school and church would encourage regular trips by walking or cycling which would help to reduce the overall reliance on the private car. In addition, I am told that the primary school is undersubscribed. The addition of development close to the school would potentially generate additional demand for pupil places which would support its ongoing viability.
15. Overall, the location of the proposal would not conflict with the spatial strategy of the development plan as expressed through Policies CS1 and CS2. I acknowledge that the level of service provision within the village is limited, and as such there would be a reliance on the private car for most journeys. However, the harm in this respect is mitigated by the proximity of the primary school, the support the development would provide to the school, and the potential for many car journeys to be relatively short. Consequently, in terms of accessibility to services and the vitality of the rural community, I conclude on balance that the proposal would represent a suitable location for housing.

Parking and Traffic Movements

16. The Council's criticism of increased traffic movements relates primarily to use of the private car as set out above, but further concerns are raised in respect of the parking layout proposed and potential safety issues with the operation of the local highway network.
17. The evidence before me indicates that the addition of 14 dwellings would lead to 11 additional trips in the peak period. This would not be a significant

increase bearing in mind it would be spread out over a period of an hour or more. Moreover, my observations on site were of the existing highway network being very lightly trafficked and capable of accommodating additional traffic without severe impact on its operation. I appreciate that during school pick-up and drop-off times there may be some congestion along Hockey Hill, but this is by its nature temporary and the scale of development proposed would not exacerbate this to a significant degree.

18. The Council at appeal stage criticises the tandem parking layout of some units, in that they may add unnecessarily to the number of vehicle movements within the estate should residents have to manoeuvre one car to allow another in or out. Such arrangements are not uncommon in housing estates, and whilst I accept that they may lead to some additional movements, I am not persuaded that they would be so frequent as to cause demonstrable harm to highway or pedestrian safety, or to neighbours' living conditions through noise or disturbance.
19. The Council has not opposed the loss of the existing garages but argues that the proposed parking spaces at the site entrance would be too distant from the existing dwellings in the Hockey Hill cul-de-sac and therefore not of use to existing residents. I have limited information regarding the existing use of the garages, though the appellant asserts they are rarely used for parking. I have no evidence that the proposal would lead to an unaddressed displacement of parking onto the cul-de-sac or the proposed development. Moreover, from what I saw on site, the proposed spaces would be close to a number of dwellings within the cul-de-sac and capable of providing convenient additional parking for residents and visitors. As such, I find no harm in these respects.
20. Concern has also been raised in respect of an existing agricultural access from Hockey Hill. This is to be retained but I am satisfied that it would not be used as a cut-through by residents given how close it would be to the actual entrance and that it would be unpaved, more difficult to navigate and certainly no quicker a route for drivers.
21. Some interested parties also question the suitability of the footpath between the site and the school. I walked this at my visit and although it is narrow in places, it is passable along its length, and there would not be such a level of pedestrian traffic that those using it would be routinely forced onto the road. I am satisfied that the existing footpath would provide a safe means of access to the school.
22. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its effect on highway safety. As indicated, the Council has not cited conflict with any development plan policy, but of those referred to me, I find no conflict with saved Policies H13, T9 and T10 of the MSLP which together require safe access and egress to be provided, regard to be had to the suitability and capacity of existing roads; and for road layouts and parking to be designed and provided in line with relevant standards. Nor would there be any conflict with the Framework, which directs that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Other Material Considerations

Effect on Heritage Assets

23. The Council considered the implications of the proposal on the settings of two listed buildings to the south-west of the appeal site, Paxes House and Hill Farm House, and determined that the countryside setting of these listed buildings would be maintained to the rear and south-east of these assets with the loss of setting to the north-east resulting in a very low level of less than substantial harm to heritage significance. Having observed the location of these buildings, which form part of the linear development along Hockey Hill and are separated from the appeal site by other dwellings and a substantial tree line, I concur with the Council that any harm in this respect would be very limited in the case of Paxes House, being the nearer of the two, with no harmful effect to Hill Farm House given its greater distance and additional intervening buildings and landscape features.
24. Paragraph 202 of the Framework directs that less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
25. The proposal would deliver 11 dwellings which would contribute to the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, although in light of the Council's stated housing land supply of over 9.5 years, which is not directly challenged by the appellant, the proposal would not be essential for meeting housing targets and so this benefit, by itself, would attract limited weight in favour of the proposal.
26. There would be economic benefits arising from the construction of the dwellings, and subsequently from engagement by future residents in the local economy. Given the scale of the proposal, such benefits would attract limited weight.
27. The proposal would deliver a policy compliant four affordable housing units. This would help to meet a local need for such housing as set out under Policy H4 of the MSLP. Notwithstanding the Council's criticism of the site's location, their delivery would still be a benefit of the proposal attracting moderate weight.
28. I also afford moderate weight to the potential benefits to the viability of the local primary school through increased demand for places from new families who may occupy the development.
29. Overall, I find that the public benefits in this case would outweigh the low level of less than substantial harm to the setting of Paxes House.

Other Issues Raised

30. I have had regard to a number of matters raised by interested parties, beyond those already captured by the main issues above. Concerns regarding disruption during construction are noted. Although I accept this would be a source of noise and disturbance for nearby occupants, it would be temporary in nature and is a factor in every building operation. As such, it would not be a valid reason to withhold permission. However, the degree of disturbance can be

addressed through suitable planning conditions to control the hours of working and methods employed on site.

31. The Council has not opposed the proposal in terms of neighbours' living conditions. The dwellings to the western boundary of the site on Hockey Hill are bungalows with relatively tall rear fences and several with detached garages within their rear gardens. The nearest dwellings within the development would also be single storey in height. This would limit the degree of intervisibility between dwellings either side of the western boundary of the site, such that sufficient levels of privacy would be retained for both existing and new residents.
32. I accept that the existing vista over the undeveloped site and open countryside beyond would be lost for existing residents. However, this is not a protected view and whilst neighbours' outlook would include the massing of the proposed dwellings, their single storey scale and separation distance from existing dwellings would avoid creating an undue sense of enclosure or severe loss of outlook.
33. Reference is made to the use of the site as a local playing space and having a role as a wildlife corridor linking habitats. The appellant states that the site has not been used as a play space for over 50 years, and any activity in that time has not been with the consent of the landowner. The site was in a natural state at the time of my visit, with substantial grass growth which did not suggest any recent use as a play space. The Council has not opposed the application on the grounds of ecological impacts, and having regard to the evidence provided, I have no reasons to reach different conclusions.

Planning Obligation

34. The appellant has provided a signed and dated Section 106 Agreement. This would secure delivery of the four affordable housing units and payment of a secondary school transport contribution. I am satisfied that each sought obligation meets the tests set out in Paragraph 57 of the Framework for planning obligations. As a result, I have taken the completed agreement into account.

Conditions

35. The Council has provided a list of prospective conditions, upon which the appellant has had the chance to comment. Where necessary, I have amended the wording of conditions to ensure they meet the relevant tests set out in the Framework.
36. Conditions relating to the timing of reserved matters applications [1, 2], implementation of the development [3] and the relevant approved plans and documents [4] are all necessary to provide certainty.
37. Details of a surface water drainage scheme [5] are required to address site drainage and flood risk, to include a verification report [22] on completion of the development. A condition is required for the submission, approval and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan [6] to protect neighbours' living conditions. Details of water, energy and resource efficiency measures [7] are required in the interests of sustainability. Precise details of the site access [8] are required in the interest of highway safety. A scheme of archaeological investigation and written report [9, 10] are required

to ensure any archaeological remains are properly recorded and preserved. Each of these conditions is required to be pre-commencement as they relate specifically to the construction phase and would be ineffective or lead to harm or loss were they required to be addressed at a later stage.

38. Further conditions are required in respect of refuse/recycling facilities [11] to are required to maintain public health and the general amenity of the area; for a biodiversity enhancement strategy [12] and agreed mitigation measures [13] to be implemented in the interest of protecting species and promoting biodiversity.
39. It is necessary to require works to be undertaken in accordance with the submitted arboricultural details [14] and to set parameters for the planting and maintenance of site landscaping [15] to protect existing trees and ensure a satisfactory overall appearance.
40. Conditions in respect of the use of the existing field access [16], the provision of visibility splays [17], providing manoeuvring space for refuse vehicles [18] and implementing the proposed parking areas [19] are all necessary in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety. Details of cycle parking arrangements [20] and fire hydrants [21] are necessary in the interest of promoting sustainable modes of transport and fire safety, respectively.
41. Details of electric vehicle charging facilities are sought by the Council. However, since June 2022, the requirement to provide electric vehicle charging points has become part of the Building Regulations, and so it is not necessary to duplicate this requirement by condition.

Conclusion

42. For the reasons set out, I conclude that the proposal accords with the development plan, taken as a whole. Material considerations in this case, including the Framework, do not indicate that permission should nevertheless be withheld. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

K Savage

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

Procedural Matters

- 1) Details of appearance and landscaping (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 drawings/documents:
 - Block Plan - Proposed LTA 7374-001D - Site Plan
 - Red Line Plan LTA 7374-001D - Site Location Plan
 - Design and Access Statement – Hucklesby Architects
 - Heritage Statement – Hucklesby Architects
 - Enviro check flood report (3/11/20)
 - Land Contamination Report including Flood Risk Assessment 07.2020 – Oakley Soils Ltd. Part 1
 - Land Contamination Report including Flood Risk Assessment 07.2020 – Oakley Soils Ltd. Part 2
 - Land Contamination Report including Flood Risk Assessment 07.2020 – Oakley Soils Ltd. Part 3
 - Land Contamination Report including Flood Risk Assessment 07.2020 – Oakley Soils Ltd. Part 4
 - Norfolk Trees - Arboriculturist Report
 - GH Bullard - Flood Assessment and Drainage Report
 - Anglian Ecology Report - Great Crested Newt Survey
 - GH Bullard & Associates – Drainage
 - Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Anglian Ecology, March 2019)
 - Anglian Ecology - Updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (original dated 24.03.2019 submitted with Outline Planning Application on 30.10.20)

Pre-commencement

- 5) Concurrent with the first reserved matters application(s) a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority (LPA). The scheme shall be in accordance with the approved FRA and include:

- a. Dimensioned plans and drawings of the surface water drainage scheme;
- b. Further infiltration testing on the site in accordance with BRE 365 and the use of infiltration as the means of drainage if the infiltration rates and groundwater levels show it to be possible;
- c. If the use of infiltration is not possible then modelling shall be submitted to demonstrate that the surface water runoff will be restricted to Q_{bar} or 2l/s/ha for all events up to the critical 1 in 100 year rainfall events including climate change as specified in the FRA;
- d. Modelling of the surface water drainage scheme to show that the attenuation/infiltration features will contain the 1 in 100 year rainfall event including climate change;
- e. Modelling of the surface water conveyance network in the 1 in 30 year rainfall event to show no above ground flooding, and modelling of the volumes of any above ground flooding from the pipe network in a 1 in 100 year rainfall event including climate change, along with topographic plans showing where the water will flow and be stored to ensure no flooding of buildings or offsite flows;
- f. Topographical plans depicting all exceedance flow paths and demonstration that the flows would not flood buildings or flow offsite, and if they are to be directed to the surface water drainage system then the potential additional rates and volumes of surface water must be included within the modelling of the surface water system;
- g. Details of the maintenance and management of the surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority;
- h. Details of a Construction Surface Water Management Plan (CSWMP) detailing how surface water and storm water will be managed on the site during construction (including demolition and site clearance operations) is submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The CSWMP shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved plan for the duration of construction. The approved CSWMP shall include Method statements, scaled and dimensioned plans and drawings detailing surface water management proposals to include:-
 - i. Temporary drainage systems
 - ii. Measures for managing pollution / water quality and protecting controlled waters and watercourses
 - iii. Measures for managing any on or offsite flood risk associated with construction.

The scheme shall be fully implemented as approved.

- 6) Before the development hereby permitted is commenced a Construction Management Plan shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Construction of the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plan. The Construction Management Plan shall include the following matters:

- Hours of working during the site clearance, demolition, and construction phases of development - to be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority;
 - Means of access for construction traffic;
 - Haul routes for construction traffic on the highway network and monitoring and review mechanisms;
 - Provision of boundary hoarding and lighting;
 - Details of proposed means of dust suppression;
 - Details of measures to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction;
 - Details of deliveries times to the site during construction phase;
 - Details of provision to ensure pedestrian and cycle safety;
 - Programme of works (including measures for traffic management);
 - Parking and turning for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors;
 - Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - Storage of plant and materials;
 - Maintain a register of complaints and record of actions taken to deal with such complaints at the site office as specified in the Plan throughout the period of occupation of the site.
- 7) Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of water, energy and resource efficiency measures, during the construction and operational phases of the development shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include a clear timetable for the implementation of the measures in relation to the construction and occupancy of the development. The scheme shall be constructed and the measures provided and made available for use in accordance with such timetable as may be agreed.
- 8) Before the development is commenced, details of the access and associated works, (including layout, levels, gradients, surfacing and means of surface water drainage), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The access shall then be fully provided in accordance with the approved details and shall be made available to use prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved.
- 9) No development shall take place until a scheme of archaeological evaluation of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority (including any demolition needing to be carried out as necessary in order to carry out the evaluation). The evaluation shall be carried out in its entirety as may be agreed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority,
- 10) No development shall take place until a written report on the results of the archaeology evaluation of the site has been submitted to the local planning authority and that confirmation by the local planning authority has been provided that no further investigation work is required in writing.

Should the local planning authority require further investigation and works, no development shall take place on site until the implementation of a full programme of archaeological work has been secured, in

accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

- a. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording.
- b. The programme for post investigation assessment.
- c. Details of the provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording.
- d. Details of the provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation.
- e. Details of the provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation; and
- f. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

The written scheme of investigation shall be carried out in its entirety prior to any other development taking place, or in such other phased arrangement including a phasing plan as may be previously approved in writing by the local planning authority.

No building shall be occupied until the archaeology evaluation, and if required the Written Scheme of Investigation, have been completed, submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. Furthermore, no building shall be occupied until analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition from the archaeology investigations as agreed under the Written Scheme of Investigation has taken place, unless an alternative agreed timetable or phasing for the provision of results is agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Before development above slab level

- 11) Prior to commencement of development above slab level, details of the areas to be provided for storage and presentation of refuse/recycling bins shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose(s).
- 12) Prior to commencement of development above slab level: a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy for protected and Priority species shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority following the recommendations made within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Anglian Ecology, March 2019). The content of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy shall include the following:
 - a) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed enhancement measures;
 - b) detailed designs to achieve stated objectives;
 - c) locations of proposed enhancement measures by appropriate maps and plans;
 - d) persons responsible for implementing the enhancement measures;

- e) details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant).

The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

During construction/Prior to occupation

- 13) All changes in ground levels, hard landscaping, planting, seeding or turfing shown on the approved landscaping details (as required by Condition 1 above) shall be carried out in full during the first planting and seeding season (October - March inclusive) following the commencement of the development or in such other phased arrangement as may be approved, in writing, by the local planning authority up to the first use or first occupation of the development. Any trees, hedges, shrubs or turf identified within the approved landscaping details (both proposed planting and existing) which die, are removed, seriously damaged or seriously diseased, within a period of 10 years of being planted or in the case of existing planting within a period of 10 years from the commencement of development, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
- 14) The existing field access, which crosses part of the site, shall be retained as a result if the development hereby approved and shall remain available for use during site clearance, demolition and construction phases.
- 15) All mitigation and enhancement measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Anglian Ecology, March 2019), the eDNA Survey (Anglian Ecology, April 2021), the eDNA Survey (Anglian Ecology, April 2021) as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination.
- 16) Before the access is first used visibility splays shall be provided as shown on approved drawings and shall thereafter retained and maintained in the approved form. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 2 Class A of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no obstruction over 0.6 metres high shall be erected, constructed, planted or permitted to grow within the areas of the visibility splays.
- 17) The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with the measures as outlined with the Norfolk Trees - Arboriculturist Report (November 2020), as submitted with the planning application.
- 18) The proposed estate road(s) shall be made suitable for a 32 tonne Refuse Collection Vehicle (RCV) to manoeuvre around, and the estate road surfaces and construction shall be suitable for an RCV to drive on.
- 19) The use shall not commence until the areas within the site shown on the approved drawings for the purposes of loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking (including garage spaces as applicable) of vehicles have been fully provided and made functionally available for use. Thereafter those areas shall be retained and remain free of obstruction except for the purpose of manoeuvring and parking of vehicles.

- 20) Notwithstanding the approved details, the use shall not commence until precise details of secure cycle storage areas have been provided and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The approved areas shall then be fully provided prior to first occupation and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose(s).
- 21) Prior to the first occupation of the site, details of the provision of fire hydrants shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The fire hydrants shall be carried out in accordance with these details in their entirety and in accordance with the timetable as may be agreed.

Post development

- 22) Within 28 days of practical completion of the last dwelling or unit, a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) verification report shall be submitted to the LPA, detailing that the SuDS have been inspected, have been built and function in accordance with the approved designs and drawings. The report shall include details of all SuDS components and piped networks have been submitted, in an approved form, to and approved in writing by the LPA for inclusion on the Lead Local Flood Authority's Flood Risk Asset Register.
