



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 8 November 2022

Site visit made on 9 November 2022

by S D Castle BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K1128/W/22/3303162 **Homefield Farm, Sherford TQ7 2AT**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Causer against the decision of South Hams District Council.
 - The application Ref 4751/21/FUL, dated 17 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 08 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is change of use of commercial buildings and dwelling house to 3 no. holiday lets. Demolition of existing retail unit. Replacement of commercial building with 1 no. self-build dwelling house. Associated works to include comprehensive landscape and ecology enhancement works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use of commercial buildings and dwelling house to 3 no. holiday lets, demolition of existing retail unit, replacement of commercial building with 1 no. self-build dwelling house, and associated works to include comprehensive landscape and ecology enhancement works at Homefield Farm, Sherford TQ7 2AT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 4751/21/FUL, dated 17 December 2021, subject to the conditions in the attached Schedule.
2. Since the date of the Council's decision notice, the Frogmore and Sherford Neighbourhood Plan (FSNP) has been made (May 2022) and now forms part of the development plan. The parties have had the opportunity to comment on any relevant policies within the made version of the FSNP during the course of the appeal.
3. During the appeal process, the appellants submitted revised plans. These removed a pergola feature as part of the proposed landscaping. I have had regard to the 'Wheatcroft' principles, including whether these amendments would materially alter the nature of the application, and whether anyone who should have been consulted on the changed development would be deprived of that opportunity. The appellants consulted on the revisions. I have come to the conclusion that no parties' interests would be prejudiced if I base my decision on the revised plans and I have proceeded on that basis.
4. The Council has confirmed that in the event the revised plans were to be accepted and the pergola omitted from the proposal, there would be no policy conflict identified with the rest of the scheme in regards to heritage. I have

therefore dealt with the appeal on the basis that reason for refusal 5 has been addressed.

5. Prior to the hearing, the Council also confirmed that it would not be defending its fourth reason for refusal relating to the development's impact on protected species. Nevertheless, given protected species would be affected by the development, in accordance with Circular 06/2005, it is necessary to consider whether an offence would be likely under the Habitats Regulations¹, and if there is any reason in principle why a licence would not be granted by Natural England. I have, therefore, addressed this matter as a main issue.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- The effect of the proposal on identified housing need (housing mix);
- Whether the proposal would be in a suitable location with particular regard to accessibility of services;
- Whether the need for tourist accommodation has been demonstrated; and
- The effect of the proposal on protected species, with particular regard to bats.

Reasons

Background

7. The appeal site is subject to an extensive planning history. There is no dispute between the main parties that much of that planning history is materially relevant to the determination of this appeal. Indeed, the agreed statement of common ground (SoCG) sets out that the planning history of the site establishes 3 fallback positions. The Council accepts that there is a realistic prospect of any the 3 alternative fallback positions set out within the SoCG occurring if this appeal is dismissed.
8. 'Fallback Position 1' relates to the occupation of the site for light industrial workshops (1,421 sq m), a retail unit (19 sq m) and an open-market dwelling (3-bed). This fallback position represents the existing lawful planning uses of the site.
9. 'Fallback Position 2' involves completion of a planning permission granted in 1999² for change of use of redundant agricultural buildings to 4 dwellings. A lawful material start was made on the implementation of this planning permission and it remains extant. This permission did not approve detailed proposed floor plans and it is therefore unclear as to what the completed housing mix would be.
10. 'Fallback Position 3' involves completion of a planning permission granted in 2004³ for conversion of barns to 4 dwellings. The Council issued a certificate of

¹ Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017

² 43/0367/99/CU

³ 43/0171/04/F

lawfulness in 2009⁴ confirming the lawfulness of existing drainage works given their accordance with the approved details of the 2004 permission. This permission remains extant and would result in 3 four-bed dwellings and a single three-bed dwelling.

11. The completion of either the 1999 permission or the 2004 permission would result in 4 open-market dwellings that are not restricted by any occupancy conditions.

Housing Mix

12. The Council statement advises that, based on Office for National Statistics data, the parish of Frogmore & Sherford has a high proportion of under-occupied dwellings, with 54% of properties with two or more spare bedrooms. Across South Hams, the Strategic Housing Market Needs Assessment 2017 (SHMNA) demonstrates that 2-bedroom dwellings are in greatest need across all tenures of housing. The SHMNA also indicates that dwellings of four bedrooms or more are the size of dwelling least required across the district.
13. The Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014 – 2034 Supplementary Planning Document (JLP SPD) advises that, in order to ensure that homes are not built with a surplus of rooms that can be used as bedrooms, floor plans need to be carefully examined. Assessed against the JLP SPD guidance, the proposed gym and the office which has an ensuite bathroom and is a similar size to the adjacent bedroom, are the rooms most likely to have the potential to be used as an additional bedroom.
14. The proposed floorplan, in combination with the overall floor area of the dwelling significantly exceeding the minimum gross internal floor area for a 3-bed single storey dwelling⁵, is therefore tantamount to a 4-bed or larger dwelling. As such, the proposal would exacerbate the existing imbalance in the area's housing mix by replacing the existing 3-bed dwelling with a far larger dwelling.
15. The proposal would not, therefore, accord with the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014 – 2034 (adopted 2019) (JLP) Policy DEV8 which seeks opportunities for home ownership to be widened through the provision of a mix of house sizes, types and tenures, that meets the needs of existing and future residents, redressing any imbalance within the existing housing stock.

Location and sustainable transport

16. Sherford falls within the lowest tier of the settlement hierarchy (Smaller villages, Hamlets and the Countryside) as set out in the Council's spatial strategy and provides only very limited services and facilities, including a church and village hall. Access to most services, facilities and tourist attractions, such as shops, schools, leisure and health provision, would require travel to other settlements.
17. The SoCG identifies actual walking/cycling distances to the nearest settlements providing additional facilities and services, including 1.6 km to Frogmore, 3 km to Chillington, 3.5 km to Stokenham, 3.75 km to West Charleton, and 5 km to the nearest main town at Kingsbridge. The routes from the site to these

⁴ 43/1260/09/CLE

⁵ As set out in the Governments nationally described space standard.

settlements would include stretches of narrow country lanes, much of which are unlit and without footways or any specific facilities for cyclists. The closest bus stops to the site are located approximately 1.5km south of the site, on both sides of the A379 in Frogmore. These road conditions, combined with the distances involved, would make trips from the site by sustainable transport modes unattractive and potentially unsafe.

18. It is therefore likely that prospective residents and visitors would be heavily reliant on private motorised transport for trips to serve their everyday needs, and to tourist sites and leisure activities. The proposal would, however, represent a decrease in the expected vehicular trip rate in comparison to the 3 fallback positions. These comparative trip generation rates, as outlined in the appellants' Highway Technical Note (HTN) are agreed by the Council.
19. I acknowledge that the HTN provides only notional trip rate figures rather than actual rates for the existing lawful planning uses of the site. Commercial occupancy rates of a site can, however, be reasonably expected to vary over time. As such, the expected traffic generation from the site that would result if all the available floor space was used for its existing lawful planning use is an appropriate baseline to compare against the current proposals.
20. There is no substantive evidence before me to suggest that the daily journeys generated by the existing lawful uses scenario would result in significantly shorter journeys than those of the proposed use. Furthermore, the 4 open-market dwellings resulting from fallback positions 2 and 3 could, without planning permission, be used as self-contained holiday units. As such, it is not reasonable to suggest that the proposal would generate a greater number of, or longer, journeys than the fallback positions.
21. The HTN includes details of a range of sustainable travel measures to be included in a Sustainable Travel Plan (STP). The appellants propose to provide secure bike storage, E-bikes, electric charging points, and welcome packs for guests including details of public transport routes and a walk/cycle route map. Whilst the effect of the STP on the number of car journeys generated is unlikely to be significant, it would have a beneficial effect and the details of the STP can be reasonably secured by condition.
22. I have had regard to a dismissed appeal⁶ drawn to my attention by the Council relating to the siting of a shepherd hut for holiday use at Milton Abbot. In that case, the Inspector concluded the development would result in additional private car journeys given the limited alternative transport options available. The case before me is different, however, as it would involve the reuse of existing buildings and would reduce the expected number of trips by private car generated in comparison to the site's existing lawful planning uses. It would also generate a smaller number of trips than the other fallback positions.
23. Overall, by reducing the expected number of trips generated by the site requiring the private car, the proposal would be in accordance with JLP Policies TTV1, TTV2, SPT1, SPT2 and DEV15. The proposal would also comply with Policies FSNP5(2) and FSNP10. Taken together, these policies support, amongst other things, sustainable development, including through tourist accommodation that reuses existing buildings and avoids a significant increase in the number of trips requiring the private car. In light of this compliance with

⁶ APP/Q1153/W/20/3244500

the relevant policies of the development plan, with regards to this main issue, there is no conflict with the overarching purpose of the planning system to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development as set out in paragraphs 7, 11, and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)

Need for tourist accommodation

24. Policy DEV15 of the JLP is concerned with supporting the rural economy. Point 7 of that policy relates to tourist development. It sets out camping, caravan, chalet or similar facilities that respond to an identified local need will be supported, provided the proposal is compatible with the rural road network, has no adverse environmental impact and is not located within the Undeveloped Coast policy area.
25. In terms of Policy DEV15, what represents 'local' and 'need' is not defined within the JLP or the JLP SPD. The appellants have provided evidence in the form of a detailed market demand and supply assessment (MDSA)⁷. The MDSA provides information regarding the availability of holiday accommodation with particular facilities on popular holiday lettings sites.
26. Whilst the data within the MDSA does not specifically demonstrate full occupancy rates within the Frogmore and Sherford Parish area, it does provide evidence of demand and high occupancy rates of comparable properties within Devon, particularly during the peak months. During July and August, the MDSA shows an occupancy rate of 88% in the market area of Kingsbridge and its surroundings⁸. Sherford is not an independent or isolated market for holiday accommodation. As such, I find including search data from across Devon does provide relevant evidence of local need in Sherford, insofar as it captures relevant market signals regarding the supply and demand of holiday accommodation in an interdependent market area.
27. I acknowledge that the MDSA indicates that increased occupancy rates have recently occurred compared to before the Covid-19 pandemic. In future, it may be that increased accommodation availability will occur as the influence of the pandemic on consumers' holiday choices lessens. This would, however, provide relevant market signals to holiday accommodation owners/operators and represents normal market functioning. Occupancy rates are largely dependent on individual business decisions (including pricing) within a market area. Those business decisions will not, at all times, ensure full occupancy. I am not persuaded, therefore, that full occupancy is required to demonstrate a 'local need'.
28. The appellants have also submitted a letter from the Chair of the PASC UK (Professional Association of Self-Caterers UK) that advises that there is a huge shortage of holiday accommodation of the proposed quality in South Hams, particularly in inland locations. This letter is, therefore, indicative of continuing future needs for holiday accommodation within inland areas of South Hams such as Sherford. The letter is not, however, supported by any robust background data or quantitative evidence. As such, it is afforded only limited weight.

⁷ Homefield Farm Sherford Market Demand & Supply Assessment by Hotel Solutions & Natural Land (July 2022)

⁸ Derived from an AirDNA search focussed on Kingsbridge and then filtered to the capacity and high-level property specifications proposed at Homefield Farm to produce 360 listings.

29. I have had regard to the appeal decision⁹ referred to me by the Council where the Inspector found evidence regarding general UK holiday trends falls short of demonstrating an identified local need. In relation to the current development, however, the appellants have provided more geographically focussed evidence in the form of the MDSA. The MDSA has been produced by a tourism consultant with demonstrable professional expertise in this area of business and the multi-faceted approach of the MDSA is sensible and robust. As such, the findings of the MDSA are given significant weight.
30. On balance, the evidence provided by the appellants, is of sufficient weight to demonstrate a local need for the proposed holiday accommodation. The proposal, therefore, accords with JLP Policy DEV15.7 as referred to above.

Ecology

31. A protected species survey (PSS) submitted with the planning application reported the historic ranges have moderate suitability to support crevice roosting bats due to the condition of the walls, with deep cracks and crevices throughout. Emergence surveys confirmed that the site is used by common pipistrelle, long-eared and lesser horseshoe bats for day roosting. The PSS advises that the development could result in the potential killing/injuring of bats should they be present during construction works; the loss of summer day roosts for low numbers of long-eared bats and lesser horseshoe bats; and the loss of summer day roosts for moderate numbers of common pipistrelle bats.
32. Developments that would result in a breach of the protection afforded to European Protected Species (EPS) require a derogation licence, to avoid an offence under the Habitats Regulations. There is no requirement for an EPS derogation licence to be provided prior to grant of planning permission, but the decision taker must be assured that there would be a reasonable prospect of the licence being granted by Natural England.
33. The 3 tests that are used when EPS licences are being determined by NE are (in summary): that the development is necessary for reasons of overriding public interest; that there is no satisfactory alternative; and that it will not be detrimental to maintaining the population of the species at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.
34. The appellants' submitted structural report indicates that the historic ranges will require significant works to ensure their ongoing use. Those works include the overhaul or replacement of the slate roofs, crack repairs and re-bedding of loose stonework. Ensuring the historic ranges do not fall into disrepair could be achieved as a result of all 3 fallback positions, as well as by undertaking the current proposal. Only the current proposal, however, would secure the significant range of mitigation and landscaping measures that will result in a significant biodiversity net gain. Subject to securing these measures, including enhancements to the site from additional roosting opportunities installed post-development, the Council's ecologist does not object to the development. As such, overall, the development would provide environmental benefits outweighing the limited impacts on the local populations of the identified bat species and would meet the imperative overriding public interest (IROPI) test within a licensing context.

⁹ Appeal Ref: APP/K1128/W/20/3260220

35. I have also considered the feasibility of alternative options to the appeal proposal. In all fallback scenarios, existing roosts could also be damaged in any refurbishment or conversion, with a similar impact on EPS. Proceeding with the development as proposed would provide the maximum environmental benefit. On balance, taking into account the mitigation measures proposed, including new roost provisions and significant biodiversity net gain, I am satisfied that there are no satisfactory alternatives to the appeal proposal.
36. Finally, with regard to the third derogation test, mitigation and compensation measures are proposed, and thus subject to appropriate conditions, the favourable status of the identified protected species would be maintained.
37. The Council's Appeal Statement confirms that the Council has withdrawn its fourth reason for refusal relating to harm to protected species. Overall, therefore, I conclude that the proposal should meet all three derogation tests and that there is a reasonable prospect of Natural England granting a licence. The proposal, therefore, complies with JLP Policy DEV26 which requires development should support the protection, conservation, enhancement and restoration of biodiversity and protected species wherever possible, subject to the legal tests afforded to them where applicable, and unless the need for, or benefits of the development clearly outweigh any loss. For similar reasons, the proposal also complies with paragraph 179(b) of the Framework, which seeks the protection and recovery of priority species and measurable net gains for biodiversity.

Other Matters

South Hams Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

38. The development site lies within the South Hams SAC Landscape Connectivity Zone for greater horseshoe bats. The Council's Habitats Regulations Assessment Guidance (HRAG) for the SAC includes a flow chart to clarify when an application may have a likely significant effect on the SAC's greater horseshoe bat population. By virtue of the development largely being within the footprint of existing buildings, it will not lead to the loss, damage, or disturbance, at a landscape scale, to a network of potential greater horseshoe bat commuting routes. Nor will it lead to the loss damage or disturbance to a pinch point or an existing mitigation feature. As such, in accordance with the HRAG, the proposal would not result in a likely significant effect on the South Hams SAC.

Planning Balance

39. I have found the proposal to conflict with the development plan by virtue of its impact on housing mix. Replacing an existing 3-bed dwelling with a larger dwelling would, however, have a limited effect on the overall housing mix of the area. As such, the resulting harm is of limited weight.
40. The fallback positions are, however, significant material considerations. The Council accepts that there is not a significant difference in the number of bedrooms in dwellings when comparing the proposal and fallback positions 2 and 3. Whilst the Council considers the dwellings resulting from the completion of either the 1999 or 2004 permissions would make a greater contribution to housing supply than the current proposal, further planning permission would

not be required to use the open market dwellings for self-contained holiday accommodation.

41. I have also found that the proposal would have a less harmful impact than the fallback positions in terms of trips by unsustainable transport modes. I give significant weight to the environmental benefit of reducing such trips, particularly in comparison to the existing lawful uses of the site. Furthermore, the proposal would secure an increase in net biodiversity and substantial new landscaping. These benefits are afforded moderate weight.
42. On the balance of all that is before me, the benefits of the scheme in comparison to the existing use, justifies a decision which is not in accordance with the development plan.

Conditions

43. I have considered the conditions agreed between the Council and the appellants against the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. Where necessary, I have amended and added to the set of conditions for clarity, to ensure compliance with national policy and guidance, and in light of the discussions at the hearing. The numbers in brackets relate to the conditions in the schedule.
44. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant plans and documents as this provides certainty (2). In the interests of living conditions, ecology, highways safety and efficiency, a condition requiring a Construction Management Plan Statement is necessary (3).
45. In the interests of ecology and landscaping, conditions ensuring appropriate protection/enhancement of biodiversity and habitats are necessary (4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10). In order to prevent increased risks of flooding and pollution, and in the interests of the principles of sustainable drainage, a condition is necessary to ensure the appropriate surface and foul water drainage of the site (11). In the interests of sustainable transport, highway safety and accessibility, conditions are necessary to secure the provision of electric charging points (12), car parking (13), submission of a sustainable travel plan (14).
46. In the interests of heritage, character, and appearance, it is necessary to attach conditions in relation to: finished floor levels (15); materials to be used externally on the buildings (16, 17, 18, 19, 20); removal of permitted development rights (22). In order to define the permission and ensure the use of the holiday units in accordance with planning policies pertaining to the area, a condition restricting the holiday units to be used for holiday accommodation only is necessary (21). Conditions 3, 4, 5 and 6 are pre-commencement conditions as construction management, tree protection, and ecology measures will need to be agreed before works begin to prevent the development resulting in harm in these regards.

Conclusion

47. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Ian Ponter	Counsel for the Appellants, Kings Chambers
Gareth Salthouse	Associate Director, Emery Planning
Peter Todd	Technical Director, SCP
Adam Gough	Head of Property, Natural Land

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Charlotte Howrihane	Planning Officer, South Hams District Council
Steven Stroud	Planning Officer, South Hams District Council
Philip Baker	Strategic Planning Officer, South Hams District Council

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Cllr Peter Hadley	Frogmore and Sherford Parish Council
Cllr Richard Foss	South Hams District Council

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.
- 2) The development hereby approved shall in all respects accord strictly with the following approved drawings: Location Plan; Proposed Site Layout Plan (ref: 4532/101 Rev. B); Existing & Proposed Elevations – Unit A Sheet 1 of 2 (ref: 4532-120B); Existing & Proposed Elevations – Unit A Sheet 2 of 2 (ref: 4532-121B); Proposed Elevations - Unit B (ref: 4532-122B); Proposed Ground Floor Plan (ref: 4532-110B); Proposed First Floor Plan (ref: 4532-111B); Proposed Plans – Unit B (ref: 4532-125B); Proposed Landscape Layout Plan (ref: M3342-PA-01-V5); Wider Landscape Layout Plan (ref: M3342-PA-04-V2); and Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (ref: M3342-PA-05-V2).
- 3) No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved CMP shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and the approved measures shall be retained for the duration of construction works. The CMP shall include the following: (a) the timetable of the works; (b) daily hours of construction; (c) hours during which delivery and construction traffic will travel to and from the site, with such vehicular movements being restricted to between 08:00 and 18.00 Mondays to Fridays and 09.00 to 13.00 on Saturdays, and no such vehicular movements taking place on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays; (d) a site plan showing the location where all building materials, finished or unfinished products, parts, crates, packing materials and waste will be stored during the demolition and construction phases; (e) areas on-site where delivery vehicles and construction traffic will load or unload building materials, finished or unfinished products, parts, crates, packing materials and waste with confirmation that no construction traffic or delivery vehicles will park on the public highway for loading or unloading purposes; (f) the means of enclosure of the site during construction works; (g) details of proposals to promote car sharing amongst construction staff in order to limit construction staff vehicles parking off-site; (h) The proposed route of all construction traffic exceeding 7.5 tonnes; (i) Details of the amount and location of construction worker parking.
- 4) No works or development shall take place until a method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority for the protection of nesting birds during construction works. Construction works shall only take place in accordance with the approved scheme thereafter.
- 5) No development or works of site preparation shall take place until all trees that are to be retained within or adjacent to the site have been enclosed with temporary protective fencing in accordance with BS: 5837:2012 "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations". The fencing shall be retained throughout the period of construction and no activity prohibited by BS: 5837:2012 shall take place within such protective fencing during the construction period.

- 6) No development or works of site preparation shall take place until a detailed Biodiversity Enhancement Plan, based upon the principles set out within the Biodiversity Net Gain, Habitat Creation and Management Ecology Technical Note prepared by Orbis Ecology (Report Ref: 2044BG V2), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of the formation of any banks, construction details for the pond, terraces or other earthworks, planting plans, specifications and schedules (including planting size, species and numbers/densities), details of existing plants/trees to be retained and a timetable for the implementation of the works. The landscape works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme prior to the development hereby permitted being brought into use and retained thereafter.
- 7) The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a Landscape, Woodland and Ecological Management Plan, setting out details of future management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented thereafter and shall always remain operational.
- 8) No clearance of trees and shrubs in preparation for (or during the course of) development shall take place during the bird nesting season (March-August inclusive) unless an ecological survey has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to establish whether the site is utilised for bird nesting. Should the survey reveal the presence of any nesting species, then no development shall take place during the period specified above unless a mitigation strategy has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which provides for the protection of nesting birds during the period of works on site. The mitigation strategy shall be implemented as approved.
- 9) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the bat and bird boxes as set out at Section 8 and Appendix C of the Final Bat Report prepared by Orbis Ecology (Report ref: ORB0501BG) have been installed. The bat and bird boxes shall be always retained thereafter.
- 10) No above ground construction work shall take place unless and until the Lesser Horseshoe Bat Barn as shown on drawing numbers 4532/121 B (Existing and Proposed Elevations Unit A Sheet 2 of 2), M3146-PA-03-V5 (Landscape Layout Plan), M3342-PA-05-V2 (Ecological Mitigation & Enhancement Plan) and 4532/101 Rev. B (Proposed Site Layout Plan), has been constructed in its entirety and completed in accordance with the recommendations set out in Section 8 and Appendix C of the Final Bat Report prepared by Orbis Ecology (Report ref: ORB0501BG). The bat barn shall always be retained thereafter.
- 11) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the surface water and foul water drainage scheme set out through the Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy prepared by PCA Consulting Engineers (Report Ref: 16249). The scheme shall be implemented prior to the development hereby permitted being brought into use and retained thereafter.

- 12) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until a scheme for electric vehicle charging points has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to any part of the development being brought into use.
- 13) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the vehicular parking spaces identified on the approved drawings referenced as 4532/101 Rev. B (Proposed Site Layout Plan) and M3342-PA-01-V5 (Proposed Landscape Layout Plan) have been provided and made available. The spaces shall thereafter be maintained and retained for such purposes at all times.
- 14) The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a Sustainable Travel Plan has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the approved Sustainable Travel Plan measures shall be maintained thereafter for the life of the development.
- 15) No above ground development shall take place until full details of the finished levels, above ordnance datum, of the ground floor of the proposed dwellinghouse (Building B as shown on dwg ref: 4532/101 Rev. B) in relation to existing ground levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.
- 16) Details of all external facing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation. The development shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the details so approved.
- 17) No above ground construction works shall take place until details of proposed roofing in respect of the holiday let building hereby approved has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including the following:
 - The means by which natural slates will be fixed to the roof structure.
 - The type and size of natural slates to be used together with the type, colour and profile of the ridge tiles.
 - Constructional details at a scale of 1:20 of all eaves, verges and fascia boards.
 - Details of all ducts, flues, rainwater goods, vents and other external attachments.

The roofing works to the holiday let building hereby approved shall only take place in accordance with the approved scheme and the roof shall be retained in that form at all times thereafter.

- 18) The external walls to the holiday let building hereby approved shall be retained in their natural stone finish and shall not be rendered, colourwashed or otherwise treated in such a manner which would obscure the natural stone finish. Any alterations and repairs to the existing external walls shall be carried out to match the existing stonework and mortar in terms of size, appearance, colour and texture.

- 19) No above ground construction works shall take place unless a scheme for all replacement and new doors, windows and openings for the holiday let building hereby approved has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall set out the specification, materials and appearance for all new and replacement doors, windows and openings. The works to the holiday let building shall only take place in accordance with the approved scheme and the doors, windows and openings shall be retained in accordance with the approved scheme at all times thereafter.
- 20) Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved and any information shown in the application documents, no pergola shall be constructed attached to the south-western elevation of unit 1 (as shown on dwg ref: 4532/101 Rev. B).
- 21) Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting those Orders, with or without modification), the holiday accommodation hereby permitted (units 1, 2 and 3 as shown on dwg ref: 4532/101 Rev. B) shall be used for holiday accommodation only and for no other purpose.
- 22) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (and any Order revoking and re-enacting this Order), no development of the types described in the following Classes of Schedule 2 Part 1 shall be undertaken to the dwelling hereby approved without the express consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority other than those expressly authorised by this permission:- (a) Class A (extensions and alterations); Class AA (enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys); Classes B and C (roof additions or alterations to the roof); Class D (porch); Class E (buildings etc. incidental to the enjoyment of a dwellinghouse); Class F (hardsurfaces); Class G (chimney, flue or soil and vent pipe); and Class H (microwave antenna).

End of schedule