



Appeal Decision

Site visits made on 28 March & 5 April 2023

by JP Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G1630/W/22/3297682

Former Poultry Farm, Evesham Road, Littleworth, Greet, Winchcombe

- 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 Coolglas Developments Limited against the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00693/OUT, dated 26 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is an outline application for the redevelopment of the land and buildings at the 'Former Poultry Houses' for office use, a solar farm and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an outline application for the redevelopment of the land and buildings at the 'Former Poultry Houses' for office use, a solar farm and associated works at the former Poultry Farm, Evesham Road, Littleworth, Greet, Winchcombe, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00693/OUT, dated 26 May 2021, subject to the conditions in the Conditions Schedule below.

Preliminary Matters

2. This is an outline application with only appearance being reserved for later consideration. I have therefore treated any details relating to that matter as being illustrative only, but nonetheless informative.
3. The description above is taken from the decision notice, as I consider it describes what is before me more fully.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this case are
 - a) whether the presence of office units here is in accordance with the Council's strategy for employment uses (the principle of the development);
 - b) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - c) whether there would be an undue reliance on private motorised transport;
 - d) its effect on highway safety and
 - e) its effect on drainage.

Reasons

The principle of the development

5. This appeal concerns a site that is outside any defined settlement boundary in the development plan. Policy SD1 in the *Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy* (JCS)(adopted in 2017) supports employment development in the wider countryside where it is '*located ... adjacent to a settlement ... and of an appropriate scale and character*'.
6. An appeal was dismissed in 2019 for outline planning permission for 24 houses here (the 2019 decision), and in that it was stated that, although outside of Littleworth, the site could be accurately described as on the edge of that hamlet. I have no reason to find differently. As a result, it is adjacent to a settlement, thereby according in this regard with Policy SD1 in the JCS.
7. I understand that the *Tewkesbury Borough Plan* (the Local Plan) (adopted in 2022) gives a framework of policies to address the location of new employment uses. Local Plan Policy EMP4 concerns schemes outside settlement boundaries in the wider rural area, and says proposals for new employment development here will be supported in principle if one of 4 circumstances apply. I have been made aware of compliance with none of these, and no specific accommodation is in the policy for schemes outside of but adjacent to settlements. Similarly, I see no support for new-build employment uses in such a location in Policy 2.1 of the *Winchcombe and Sudeley Neighbourhood Development Plan 2011- 2031* (the Neighbourhood Plan).
8. There therefore appears to be a tension between Local Plan Policy EMP4 and JCS Policy SD1, as the latter expressly supports employment development adjacent to a settlement, while no support (other than under the specified circumstances) is provided in the former for any employment development outside of such boundaries. In this situation, section 38(5) of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* says the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy that is in the last document to be adopted, which, in this case, is the Local Plan.
9. I consider the proposal therefore does not accord with Local Plan Policy EMP4. The appellant similarly accepts there is not strict accordance with this policy. Whilst the appellant goes on to say it nonetheless accords with Local Plan Policy EMP5 (which I shall discuss further below), that policy only applies to proposals '*for new employment development that are acceptable in principle in accordance with [Local Plan] policies EMP1-EMP4*'. As I have found the scheme is not acceptable in principle under Local Plan Policy EMP4, then Local Plan Policy EMP5 cannot be a basis for it to be supported.
10. Accordingly, I conclude that, in principle, locating the development here would not be in accordance with the Council's strategy concerning the siting of employment development in the wider countryside, and would not accord with Policy EMP4 in the Local Plan or Policy 2.1 in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Character and appearance

11. Being outside any settlement boundary, the site can be considered as within the wider rural area. It also falls in a designated Special Landscape Area

(SLA). This is characterised by pastoral, undulating fields, with small woodlands dotted throughout. Across the SLA are villages and hamlets, as well as a scatter of farmsteads and agricultural buildings.

12. To the west of the site, on the opposite side of Evesham Road, are the houses that comprise the hamlet of Littleworth. To the east, separated by a small area of land in the appellants' control but outside of the site, are the northernmost houses in Greet.
13. Currently on the site are 2 large, low poultry sheds, 2 taller feed hoppers and, standing a little apart, a bungalow, all of which can be described as unused, dilapidated and poorly maintained. Whilst their condition means they are unsightly, the visual impact of the buildings within the landscape is reduced by the intensely overgrown nature of the site, with self-seeded trees and banks of brambles concealing them to a great extent. Furthermore, because the site has been unused for a long time there are no external storage or vehicle manoeuvring areas apparent, and if these had been present, they would not only have had a visual impact of themselves, but would also have allowed the buildings to be more noticeable.
14. However, despite this, there are places on the footpath to the south from where the buildings can be viewed, the roof of the northern-most poultry shed is apparent from the footpath crossing the elevated land to the north, and the hoppers can be seen from the east as they rise above much of the vegetation that has grown up. From these points, the despoiled nature of the site can be appreciated and so, although so overgrown, to my mind it nonetheless has a negative effect on the immediate locality. Furthermore, maintaining the site in an overgrown and unmanaged state so as to conceal the dereliction is not a beneficial use of land.
15. The proposal is to demolish all the structures now present, and erect some groups of commercial buildings just to the east of where the poultry sheds currently stand. These would have a smaller floor area than the existing buildings, but, although still single storey, they would be slightly taller than the poultry sheds.
16. The scheme could be seen from the footpaths to the north (on rising land) and immediately to the south, as well as from Evesham Road and some nearby houses. In considering its visual impact, I recognise that appearance is a reserved matter. However, I have had regard to the illustrative plans as well as the commitments given in the appellant's submissions, and these can be secured to a great extent through the imposition of suitable conditions.
17. The proposed buildings would not be appreciably larger than what is now on site and, whilst they would no doubt be taller, they would still be relatively low, single storey structures. Consequently, even accounting for their greater height, if sensitive external materials and detailing were to be agreed at reserved matters stage in line with the appellant's intentions, their scale, design and form would be similar to those now present, albeit when they were in a maintained state. Moreover, as they would broadly display the character and appearance of agricultural buildings, they would accord with the presence of farmsteads that are found across the SLA. Therefore, mindful of the additional landscaping proposed, the development would sit with comfort in the

landscape, whilst the housing a little to either side would mean it would not be a stark, isolated feature. I also find that, as it would be comparable in size to what is there now, the proposal would not be disproportionate in relation to either Littleworth or Greet, and any effect it would have on merging these settlements would not be materially greater than when the existing buildings were operational.

18. Inevitably undergrowth around the site would be cleared, and that would mean the buildings would be more exposed, but given the potential for them being of a suitable, agricultural design, that would not be harmful. There would also be some areas of associated parking and servicing, but these would be confined to the western side of the commercial units, and their extent would not be unduly large around buildings of an agricultural appearance. Any external lighting could be controlled by condition to protect the countryside, while I have no basis to consider the use proposed would generate a level of noise that would detract from the character of the area or the enjoyment of the footpaths.
19. As an ancillary part of the scheme, and not intended to operate in an independent manner, up to 75 solar panels would be on the site, each measuring no more than 1m by 1.6m. This would not be a large solar scheme, and I am not aware that the land on which it would stand is of high agricultural value. I was also told of no other similar developments in the vicinity. The panels could be visible from the surrounding footpath network. However, the scale of the solar scheme could be controlled by condition, as indeed could the overall height of each panel and any associated apparatus. If it ceased to be operational for a period, a condition could also be imposed to require its removal or maintenance. The solar panels would be development beyond what is there now, but their light-weight nature would ensure separation and distinction remained between Littleworth and Greet. Mindful that houses would be nearby to the east and west, I consider this aspect of the scheme would not detract unacceptably from the character and appearance of the surroundings, and so would not conflict with JCS Policy INF5 or Local Plan Policy ENV3 concerning renewable energy development.
20. An Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is to the east and west, through which run long-distance footpaths. When looking from these, the surrounding landscaping and the distances mean the development would scarcely be apparent in the overall vista. However, if it could be seen, because of its size, scale and design it would not be incongruous or inappropriate.
21. The site does not fall under the definition of previously developed land given in the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) as, amongst other things, that definition excludes land last occupied by agricultural buildings. Having said that, I consider that building on a site where similar derelict structures are found at present reduces the effect on the landscape. Indeed, overall, by replacing derelict buildings with ones of a similar scale and agricultural character that would sit in a suitably landscaped and managed context, I consider there would in fact be a benefit to the appearance of the locality.
22. I recognise that the 2019 decision was dismissed partly because of harm to the character and appearance of the area. However, a residential scheme of that

nature would undoubtedly be more urban in character than the buildings now proposed, and less sympathetic to the rural locality. There would also be more paraphernalia around the scheme in the form of gardens and access roads, whilst it would be reasonable to assume the intended houses would be taller. In the 2019 decision it was stated the proposed landscaping would take time to be established. I agree. Unlike that previous scheme though, I consider that the proposed buildings, with their agricultural form, have the potential to sit comfortably in the landscape, and the panels would not be unduly dominant. Therefore, while the planting would integrate the scheme into the surroundings, the delay in its establishment is not a concern. Consequently, the material differences between the 2 schemes mean those matters raised in the 2019 decision do not offer a basis for me to find differently on this issue.

23. Accordingly, I conclude that the development would not detract unacceptably from the character and appearance of the area or the SLA, and so in this regard would not conflict with JCS Policies SD1, SD6 & INF5 or Local Plan Policies EMP5 & ENV3, which seek development of this nature to respond positively to its context and the distinctiveness of the landscape.

Reliance on the private motor car

24. Neither JCS Policy SD1 nor Local Plan Policy EMP4, when outlining the circumstances where employment uses will be accepted in the wider rural area, make any specific comment on the access to alternative transport modes. However, the development plan has to be read as a whole, and, under JCS Policy INF1 and Local Plan Policy EMP5, developers are required to provide safe and accessible connections to the transport network to allow travel choice. In assessing this matter though, I have taken into account the guidance in the Framework that says opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural locations.
25. Relatively few houses are near to the site so it is unlikely many workers would live very close to these premises. The nearest bus stops are about 105m away along Evesham Road and, as the main parties fairly accept, these have a reasonable service for a rural area. However, that road has limited pavements and lighting, and its verges tend not to be suitable for pedestrian use. Consequently, these deficiencies are likely to reduce the attractiveness of walking between the site and the bus stops, and so deter the use of buses. The appellant though is to provide a footpath within the appeal site to its south-western corner. This would create a safe route for a significant part of the distance to the bus stop, thereby reducing how far the bus users had to walk along Evesham Road and so meaning the nature of that road was less of a deterrent.
26. The appellant would also consider upgrading the footpath that runs to the south of the site between Littleworth and the northern part of Greet. I have no details of what that work would involve, much of that path is outside of its ownership and I have no confidence there is a likelihood such an upgrade would be undertaken. In any event, given its route, I am not satisfied it would materially increase pedestrian accessibility to the site to any material degree.

27. Cycling may well be an option, drawing employees from further afield. However, the character of the roads means it is unlikely this is going to constitute a significant mode of travel to and from the site.
28. Therefore, while I acknowledge that other locations in Winchcombe and Greet may have better access to transport choices, I consider that this site, nonetheless, has reasonable access for a rural area.
29. Irrespective of findings on alternative transport modes, the appellant has contended that the development could reduce reliance on the car in the wider area, as it would mean local residents did not have to travel so far to work. There is nothing of substance to quantify the scale of this benefit though, and there is no evidence to show local employment provision or whether there is a need for such commercial space in the area. Indeed, what is proposed could appeal to occupiers from further away who found the accommodation was better value or provided a more attractive working environment than their existing site, or it could encourage those to travel who currently work at home and so do not commute. It may also result in visitors to the site having to travel further. However, it is difficult for the planning system to control where users of the site would live, so even if evidence had been forthcoming to show a local demand, I have no mechanism to ensure only that demand was served. On balance, given its location and the nature of the road network, I consider it is reasonable to assume the scheme would primarily appeal to those living in Winchcombe and the surrounding settlements, and so some benefit may accrue from this contention.
30. In the 2019 decision, it is said the main parties considered that scheme's future residents would be dependent upon the car for their day-to-day needs. I assume the appellant to that appeal was one of those main parties, and I am mindful the appellant was the same as in this appeal before me. However, the needs, travel patterns and travel profiles of residents are not the same as those of employees. As such, whilst I do not disagree with those findings from 2019, I consider they are not applicable to this different case before me.
31. Overall, I recognise there may be other locations in the built-up area of Greet and Winchcombe that would be more accessible on foot or by public transport, and I have noted the Borough-wide level of identified employment land. However, I conclude that the presence of the footway within the site, when taken with the guidance in the Framework and the potential benefits the scheme could offer to reducing traffic movements in the wider area, mean the scheme's reliance on private motorised transport would not be unacceptable, and so in this regard would not be contrary to JCS Policy INF1 or Local Plan Policy EMP5.

Highway safety

32. It is proposed to widen the existing site access to allow it to be used by 2-way traffic and to provide improved sight lines. At this point Evesham Road is straight and of sufficient width for 2 vehicles to pass. It is also subject to a 30mph speed limit, with this limit increasing about 90m to the north.
33. I raise no objections to the width of the intended access, or the available visibility for drivers turning into the site.

34. Currently, vegetation restricts views to the south for emerging drivers. However, on the information before me it appears that lies either within the adopted highway or the appeal site, so could be suitably managed, thereby achieving improved visibility.
35. The only speed survey offered by the appellant dates from 2018. In my opinion, and subject to the management of vegetation identified above, the achievable sight lines are satisfactory given the 85th percentiles in that survey. That survey though is now somewhat old, and traffic patterns may well have changed over the intervening period. However, I am aware of no circumstances that would have meant any such change was appreciable or material. Although it has been said that, based on '*local knowledge*', drivers are exceeding the speed limit here, that is unsubstantiated. In any event, if that is happening now, I have no reason to consider it was not also occurring in 2018 and so would have been incorporated into the findings of the speed survey. Indeed, the 85th percentiles in the 2018 survey were in fact above 30mph. I am mindful too that this is not a new access but is one that may well be able to serve some form of agricultural operation on the land, albeit with a lesser traffic flow, but with no control over visibility. Taking all these factors together, I consider adequate sight splays can be achieved and there is no need for a roundabout here.
36. The scheme would result in some users of the site walking along Evesham Road, and highway safety concerns in this regard have been raised. However, this would not be for a long length of the road. Moreover, there is a general desire to encourage the use of rural public transport, and the use of those bus stops by anyone, whether connected with the development or not, will often involve pedestrians making use of the carriageway. It is also subject to a 30mph speed limit, while the road junctions and driveways will mean drivers display a certain caution. Therefore, I find that the site's bus users walking along this stretch of Evesham Road would not compromise highway safety unacceptably.
37. In the 2019 decision it was expressly stated that highway safety was not explored, and so it offers no findings that have a bearing on my reasoning.
38. Accordingly, I conclude that the development would not have an adverse effect on highway safety, and so in this regard would not conflict with Local Plan Policy EMP5.

Drainage

39. Currently the site drains directly into the ground, but the presence of clays means infiltration is an unacceptable solution for this development. Rather, the only option appears to be for drainage to go into the nearby highway drains. There is uncertainty though as to whether the drains are capable of accommodating the additional demands of the development without leading to surface water flooding.
40. In response, the appellant has said the matter can be addressed with further supporting engineering information and calculations, following jetting and maintenance to facilitate a full survey and confirmation of the state of the

highway drains. It was suggested such investigations could be secured through a negatively worded condition.

41. The appellant has not proved the viability of its drainage solution. However, the *Planning Practice Guidance* makes clear that is not the necessary test for the imposition of a negatively worded condition. Rather, it says such a condition should only not be imposed if there are no prospects at all of the action being performed within the time limits of the permission. On the evidence before me I find the likelihood of the drainage network being examined and found to be suitable, and the site therefore being capable of being drained satisfactorily, is greater than that. Consequently, I consider a negatively worded condition would be a satisfactory way forward. I accept there is a possibility that if the drains are not found to be adequate, such a condition would stand in the way of the development being implemented, but that is the reason why conditions are worded in that manner.
42. I have no decisive evidence to show the scheme would give rise to other drainage issues. Again, the 2019 decision stated that it did not explore that matter, and so it offers no findings that have a bearing on my reasoning.
43. Accordingly, I have insufficient evidence to conclude that the scheme could not be adequately drained, and so it would not conflict with JCS Policy INF2 that requires schemes to have suitable drainage.

Other matters

44. As the site is in the countryside and is unmanaged and overgrown, it is to be expected that wildlife might use it for foraging or even as habitat. I also understand that birds are attracted to solar panels for various reasons. However, I have nothing to show that the scheme would cause unacceptable ecological harm in these regards. Given the nature and scale of the use, I find that neither activity round the buildings nor the vehicle movements at the access would have an unreasonable effect on the living conditions of nearby residents. No justification for retaining the site in agricultural use has been offered.

Planning balance

45. Section 38(6) of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* says development should be in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise (the planning balance).
46. In this instance I have found the development does not fall under any of the stated criteria in Local Plan Policy EMP4, and so is not in accordance with up-to-date policies in the development plan regarding the location of employment uses.
47. Balanced against this, redeveloping this derelict site with a smaller scheme of a suitable design would be a benefit to the character and appearance of the area, which weighs in its favour. I also accept the scheme would be creating employment opportunities in a rural area in a location that offers some choice of alternative transport mode, and so would be supporting a prosperous rural economy, although this benefit is tempered by not knowing whether there is a need for such provision or who it would serve. There would be a further benefit from the generation of on-site solar power. The weight attributed to this has to take into account the fact that the long-term presence of the panels cannot be guaranteed. Whilst I have considered a condition concerning the removal of the

panels in the event of them not generating electricity, I have no reason to expect this scenario would occur.

48. The lack of an adverse effect on drainage and highway safety, and the acceptance that any reliance on private motorised transport would not be unacceptable, are matters reasonably expected in new development and so are afforded neutral weight.
49. The appellant has also said the existing buildings could be converted to employment use as '*permitted development*'. In this location I accept that Local Plan Policy EMP4 would be more supportive of the buildings' conversion. However, their condition is so poor that it is reasonable to assume there is little if any prospect of them being converted or reused, and I have no evidence to show otherwise. Furthermore, no prior approval submissions have been forthcoming. This is therefore not a fallback position to which I attach any appreciable weight.
50. Overall, weighing the benefits and the harms, I have treated the development plan as the starting point and acknowledge its primacy. However, on balance I conclude that the harm resulting from the location of the scheme outside of, albeit adjacent to, the settlement would be outweighed by the benefit of redeveloping this derelict site in this manner in a location where there was some choice of transport modes.

Conditions

51. The standard conditions concerning outline permissions [Conditions 1-3 in the Conditions Schedule below] should be imposed, and the elements of the development not held over as reserved matters should be in accordance with the approved plans [4].
52. Having regard to the appearance of the locality, the bungalow should be demolished [16], while the scale of the new buildings should be defined [5], and external lighting should be agreed [20]. The details of the landscaping, hardsurfacing, fencing and tree/hedge protection should be agreed and delivered [12-14]. Although I note substantial landscaping details have been submitted already, I nonetheless consider some information is still lacking and so such a condition is necessary. However, the levels and materials of the buildings should be addressed at reserved matters stage as they comprise part of the matter of appearance.
53. Again, to safeguard the character and appearance, the scale of the solar element of the scheme should be defined and outstanding details approved [9 & 10]. There should also be a condition to ensure repair or removal of the solar panels if they cease to be operational for a period [11]. As the solar farm is not intended to be an independent operation its provision should not operate before the office development commences, though in the interests of sustainability it should be in place by the time the offices are occupied [8].
54. Given the existing use a condition should be imposed requiring potential contamination to be explored and remediation completed [7]. As this could affect how the development is undertaken, it needs to be approved before development commences. However, there is no requirement to stipulate the areas the contamination report needs to address, as that could be a matter tailored by later discussion between the parties. Given the responsibilities of

the developer to comply with conditions, there is no need for a verification report or similar to be submitted, and, mindful of other legislation, it is not necessary for the condition to address contamination that is discovered once the works have begun.

55. A condition requiring the approval of drainage details is also necessary, and, for the reasons stated above, its implications for the drainage of the scheme mean this has to be approved before the development commences [6].
56. To encourage sustainable travel a condition requiring electric charging points is necessary [15], though the condition does not need to stipulate the BS standards to which they would comply, as that would be taken into account when approving the scheme. For this reason too the footpath link to the south-west corner of the site should be laid out [19]. A condition requiring showers and lockers to be provided has also been suggested, but I am unclear as to how many are needed and find there is not a robust justification for imposing such a requirement.
57. Mindful of highway safety, the access, parking and sight splays should be provided and retained [17 & 18].

Conclusion

58. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

JP Sargent

INSPECTOR

Conditions Schedule

- 1) Details of the appearance (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) Unless otherwise amended under the conditions listed below, the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the following approved drawings, insofar as those drawings relate to the matters of access, landscaping, scale and layout:
 - Location Plan - Drawing 21533/03
 - Proposed Site Masterplan – Drawing 22023/10(H)
 - Site Section as Proposed – Drawing 22023/11
 - Site Elevation as Proposed – Drawing 22023/12
 - Drainage Strategy – Drawing C001 Rev. A
- 5) The footprint of the buildings hereby permitted shall be no larger than as shown on Drawing 22023/10(H) and the heights of the buildings shall be no greater than is shown on Drawing 22023/12.
- 6) Prior to the commencement of development details of a surface water drainage scheme, together with a timetable for its implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage scheme shall be in general accordance with the drainage strategy shown on Drawing C001 Rev A (Drainage Strategy) and shall include a demonstration that the drains to be used are capable of accommodating the flows from the development, along with any works of maintenance or repair necessary to achieve that state. The approved drainage scheme shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details, works and timetable, and no part of the development shall be occupied until the approved drainage scheme has been implemented in full and the scheme is operational.
- 7) Prior to the commencement of development, a preliminary risk assessment report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to determine whether a site investigation is required. This report shall take the form of a phase 1 desk study and site walk over and shall include the identification of previous site uses, potential contaminants that might reasonably be expected given those uses and any other relevant information. Where an unacceptable risk is identified a scheme for detailed site investigation, including an appraisal of remedial option(s) and a timetable for the implementation of those options, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The scheme must be designed to assess the nature and extent of any contamination and must be led by the findings of the preliminary risk

assessment. The remediation option(s) shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and its timetable.

- 8) The proposed solar farm shall not be operational before work has commenced on the redevelopment of the buildings for office use, but shall be fully operational before the first occupation of the buildings hereby permitted.
- 9) Notwithstanding any details on the approved plans, the proposed solar farm shall not exceed 75 panels, and no panel shall have a size greater than 1.6m by 1m.
- 10) Prior to the commencement of the construction of the solar farm, details of the panels, along with any supporting apparatus (including the siting of such panels and apparatus), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the solar farm shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 11) If the solar farm does not generate any electricity to the national grid for more than 6 months in a continuous period of 12 months, then details of a scheme, to repair or remove the solar farm and all associated infrastructure, buildings, equipment and access points, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval within 3 months of the end of that 12-month period, together with a timetable for its repair or removal. If removal of the development is required, these details shall also include the landscaping of the site once the apparatus is removed, again with a timetable for its implementation. Once approved, the solar farm shall be repaired or removed (as necessary), and, if required, relandscaped, in accordance with the approved details and timetable.
- 12) Notwithstanding the information on the approved plans, with or before the submission of the reserved matters details shall be submitted for approval by the local planning authority of how any trees and hedgerows to be retained are to be protected during the course of development, together with a timetable for such protection works. Once approved in writing by the local planning authority, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved tree and hedgerow protection works and timetable.
- 13) Notwithstanding the information on the approved plans, with or before the submission of the reserved matters details shall be submitted for approval by the local planning authority of the species, sizes, densities and planting numbers of all planting and landscaping, together with details of the tree pit design. Once approved in writing by the local planning authority, all planting, seeding or turfing shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of the buildings or 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, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation. If any trees or hedgerows fail more than once they shall continue to be replaced on an annual basis until the end of the 5-year period.

- 14) Notwithstanding the information on the approved plans, with or before the submission of the reserved matters details shall be submitted for approval by the local planning authority of the materials to be used for hard landscaping, and details of the boundary treatments, along with a timetable for their implementation. Once approved in writing by the local planning authority, these elements shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetable.
- 15) With or before the submission of the reserved matters, details shall be submitted for approval by the local planning authority of an electric vehicle infrastructure strategy and implementation plan containing details of the number and location of all electric vehicle charging points. Buildings and parking spaces that are to be provided with charging points shall not be brought into use until associated charging points are installed in accordance with the approved details and are operational. The charging points installed shall be retained thereafter unless replaced or upgraded to an equal or higher specification.
- 16) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the existing dwelling on site shall be demolished to ground level.
- 17) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the access, drive and parking shall be provided in accordance with the submitted plans, and surfaced in a manner that has first been approved in writing by the local planning authority. These areas shall thereafter be retained for those uses.
- 18) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the visibility splays of 2.4m by 54m shall be provided in each direction from the proposed access, and those splays shall thereafter be kept clear of any obstruction greater than 0.6m in height above the adjacent carriageway.
- 19) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the proposed proscriptive footpath through the site shall be provided in accordance with Drawing 22023/10(H) and surfaced in a manner that has first been approved in writing by the local planning authority, and this footpath shall thereafter be retained for pedestrian access to and from the development.
- 20) No external lighting shall be installed unless its location and nature have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.