



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2024

**by A Hickey MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 2 May 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/W/23/3332713**

**Langlands, Chivery, Aston Clinton, Buckinghamshire HP23 6LD**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Liam Bond against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
  - The application Ref is 23/00439/APP.
  - The development proposed is demolition of existing dwelling and site buildings, erection of replacement dwelling house with associated infrastructure, landscaping and ecological enhancement works.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing dwelling and site buildings, erection of replacement dwelling house with associated infrastructure, landscaping and ecological enhancement works at Langlands, Chivery, Aston Clinton, Buckinghamshire HP23 6LD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref is 23/00439/APP, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

## Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the appeal site address from the decision notice as it most accurately reflects the site location.
3. Since the lodging of the appeal, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) has been published. This has not raised any new matters which are determinative in this appeal.
4. On 22 November 2023, all designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) in England and Wales became 'National Landscapes'. The legal designation and policy status of AONBs are unchanged. I have accordingly referred to the Chilterns AONB as the Chilterns National Landscape (CNL) in my decision.
5. As part of the appellant's appeal submissions, additional information was provided in relation to biodiversity<sup>1</sup>. While not before the Council at the time of their decision, they were provided at the outset of the appeal. As such, the Council and other parties have had opportunity to comment on them and would not be prejudiced by my taking them into account in my reasoning.

---

<sup>1</sup> Biodiversity Net Gain Report: dated September 2023, prepared by ecology by design. Biodiversity Metric. Ecological Impact Assessment (non-EIA): dated October 2023, Prepared by ecology by design. Existing & Proposed Hard Surface (Stage 3) Rev 3 plan: dated 03 September 2023. Ancient Woodland letter: dated November 2023, prepared by Ecology by Design and Landscape & Ecology Management summary: 15 dated September 2023, prepared by SEED landscape design ltd.

6. A completed and signed Unilateral Undertaking (UU) was also submitted following the Authority's decision notice being issued. I return to this later.

### **Main Issues**

7. The main issues are:
- whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the development plan and the Framework;
  - the effects of the proposal upon biodiversity, including bats and trees; and
  - whether the proposal would provide a biodiversity net gain.

### **Reasons**

8. The appeal site is situated in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The proposed development would remove the existing dwelling, nearby outbuildings, and areas of hardstanding. A replacement part single part two-storey dwelling set partially below ground would then be erected. The scheme would also see a realigned driveway with a parking area and landscaping.
9. Policy S4 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) states, amongst other things, that within the Green Belt, land will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with national policy. Policy S4 allows for some small-scale development subject to a closed number of exceptions and providing that it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Of relevance to the appeal scheme are exceptions d. and f.
10. The Framework identifies that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Development within the Green Belt is inappropriate, with certain exceptions that are set out in Framework paragraphs 154 and 155. It goes on to state that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The main parties draw my attention to exceptions listed in Paragraph 154 at d) and g), and I find these to be the most relevant for the purposes of this appeal.
11. Exception d) of the Framework relates to the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces. The Framework does not provide a definition of what constitutes a materially larger replacement building.
12. VALP Policy S4 at exception d. supports the replacement of existing buildings in the Green Belt by new buildings that are not significantly larger in volume, normally by no more than 25-30% as measured externally of the original building (as it was first built or stood on 1 July 1948). There is no substantive evidence before me that the host dwelling has been extended, and I have considered it to be as it was first built for the purposes of Policy S4.
13. The supporting text to VALP Policy S4 excludes sheds and outbuildings being taken into account. While noting the wording of the Framework, the word building should not be read as excluding more than one building, providing as a matter of planning judgment, the buildings on site can sensibly be considered together in comparison with what is proposed to replace them.

14. In this regard, given the outbuildings are close by and used in connection with the host dwelling, I see no reason why they should not be considered for the purposes of exception d. Given the more restrictive nature of Policy S4, its supporting text, and in these particular circumstances, it is not wholly consistent with the Framework, only moderate weight can be applied to it and the approach of the Framework is to be preferred.
15. I also note the appeal decisions referred to by the main parties involving the incorporation of basements and the consideration of being materially larger. As a matter of planning judgment, the incorporation of a basement is likely to be a material consideration and for the avoidance of doubt I have taken it into account in reaching my decision.
16. The Council's statement of case acknowledges that, as a whole the scheme would result in an overall reduction in footprint and volume when taking into account all ancillary buildings on site. Nonetheless, the Council consider the replacement dwelling would be materially larger than the dwelling it replaces.
17. While mathematical calculations are not definitive in determining whether a replacement building would be materially larger, they do provide an indication of the overall scale of development. In this instance, the replacement dwelling would consolidate built development across the site, reducing the footprint of buildings on site. The proposed dwelling despite being set over two-floors would be of a modest scale and would not be close to any boundary of the appeal site and would be partially built into the ground on the slope. While increasing the height of development onsite it would not result in a significantly more prominent building on the land, and the replacement dwelling would not be disproportionate in size having regard to the size of the appeal site. The replacement dwelling would consequently not be materially larger than the one it replaces.
18. No definition of small-scale development for the purposes of VALP Policy S4 is before me. I see no reason why it should not be considered small-scale. Additionally, the exclusion of sheds and outbuildings for volume increases is part of the supporting text acting as interpretative guidance to Policy S4, but is not a part of the policy itself, and it therefore carries less weight. In any event, VALP Policy S4 supports development, in the Green Belt, in accordance with national policy. The compliance with Policy S4 as a whole outweighs what I consider to be a minor conflict in terms of including sheds and outbuildings, contrary to the guidance contained within paragraph 3.35 of the VALP.
19. In reaching the above conclusion, I have had regard to the Council's comments on VALP Policy S4 containing no 'or' at the end of each criterion. However, it also does not include an 'and' at the end of each criterion. As the Council have identified, Policy S4 criteria are a more succinct version of very similar criteria in the Framework, which have not fundamentally changed through subsequent revisions. The Framework only requires development to comply with one listed exception to not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Given the thrust of Policy S4 is to protect the Green Belt in accordance with national policy, I see no reason, in this instance, why compliance must also be achieved with an additional criterion. Albeit, I accept there may be other instances where compliance with additional criteria could be required.
20. For the reasons above, the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework and would therefore not cause

harm to it. It would also comply with the overall aims of VALP Policy S4 in so far as it relates to allowing small scale development whilst protecting the Green Belt in accordance with national policy. Moreover, since the proposal would not result in inappropriate development in the Green Belt there is no need for me to consider the impact on openness or whether very special circumstances exist.

### *Biodiversity*

21. During my site visit, I noted that the appeal site had been cleared of some areas of vegetation and trees but was largely reflective of the plans before me. I also observed what appeared to be more recent footings that, from the evidence presented, relate to an extant permission<sup>2</sup> (extant consent) on the site for a replacement dwelling. The appeal site and buildings are also within close proximity to an area of ancient woodland.
22. VALP Policy NE8 seeks development to enhance and expand Aylesbury Vale's tree and woodland resource. It goes on to note development that would lead to an individual or cumulative significant adverse impact on ancient woodland or ancient trees will be refused unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated that the impacts to the site are clearly outweighed by the benefits of the development. Given the proximity of the site to the ancient woodland a minimum of 50m between the ancient woodland and any built development should be retained.
23. Policies EN1 and EN2 of the Aston Clinton Neighbourhood Plan (ACNP), amongst other things, seek to safeguard and avoid adverse impacts on protected natural habitats and species. The Framework emphasises the importance of natural habitats and biodiversity and lays special emphasis on protecting irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)<sup>3</sup> also provides advice on appropriate buffer zones.
24. While acknowledging the Council's comments in relation to the term 'wholly exceptional' footnote 67 of the Framework states 'for example' such that it is not a closed list. In my view, it is there to assist the decision maker, who must have regard to a number of considerations. Moreover, whilst accepting that both local and national policy have been updated since the extant consent was granted permission, it nevertheless results in a fallback position that must be given due consideration.
25. The proposed dwelling would be set back further from the ancient woodland than the extant consent for a dwelling on site. It would include a substantial reduction in hard standing and allow for the incorporation of more native plant species. Based on the evidence before me and my observations on site it is highly likely should the appeal fail, the extant consent will be progressed to completion. As such, the adverse effects would be substantially more harmful to the nearby ancient woodland than the proposed scheme. I therefore find that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated as required in Policy N8 of the VALP.
26. In reaching the above conclusion, I have had regard to the recent Tree Protection Order (ref: 23/00026/TPO). However, there is no substantive

---

<sup>2</sup> Ref: 19/00842/APP

<sup>3</sup> Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions: January 2022

evidence to demonstrate that harm to these TPO's would arise from the scheme. Moreover, any works not covered by an exception would require permission that must be sought from the local planning authority, as would any boundary alterations or changes.

27. My attention has been drawn to two appeals<sup>4</sup> that relate to development and ancient woodland. Whilst I do not have full details of these schemes they appear to be for a development of a greater scale and not for a replacement dwelling such that I can draw no comparisons that lead me to reach a different conclusion on this issue.
28. Circular 06/2005 (the Circular), referred to in paragraph 185 of the Framework, states that it is essential the presence or otherwise of protected species and the extent that they may be affected is established before planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed. The need to ensure ecological surveys are carried out should therefore only be left to coverage under planning conditions in exceptional circumstances. The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (the NERC Act) also places a duty on all public authorities to have regard, in the exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.
29. I have had regard to the Council's comments regarding bats following the submission of an updated Ecological Impact Assessment<sup>5</sup>. The updated assessment detailed two additional surveys, which show building3 was used for foraging and lacked suitable roosting potential. There is no disagreement that building2 contains roosting bats and the surrounding area, including the appeal site is utilised for commuting and foraging. Subject to appropriate mitigation and enhancement features as detailed within the updated Ecological Impact Assessment the proposed development would not result in harm to protected species namely bats.
30. For the reasons set out above the proposal would have an acceptable effect upon biodiversity and protected species. This would be compliant with Policies NE1 of the VALP and Policies EN1 and EN2 of the ACNP. The proposal would also accord with chapter 15 of the Framework, the NERC Act and the Circular.

#### *Biodiversity net gain*

31. Policy NE1 of the VALP and Policies EN1 and EN2 of the ACNP, requires a biodiversity net gain (BNG). This will be sought by protecting, managing, enhancing and extending existing biodiversity resources and by creating new biodiversity resources. These policies are broadly consistent with the Framework and Planning Practice guidance in so far as they relate to conserving and enhancing the natural environment.
32. As noted above, the appellant has provided a BNG Report and Biodiversity Metric as part of the appeal scheme. The main parties are in agreement regarding the findings of the documents, which show habitat gains through the creation of other neutral grassland and individual tree planting.
33. The Council's main concern is that biodiversity net gains must identify what is proposed within the application line and what is proposed outside the application line to secure the gains appropriately.

---

<sup>4</sup> Appeal refs: APP/C1435/W/23/3321978 and APP/C1435/W/22/3307820

<sup>5</sup> Ecological Impact Assessment (non-EIA) prepared by ecologybydesign dated October 2023.

34. When taking into account the revised site boundary, the appeal site still appears to have sufficient space in which to accommodate planting, hedgerows, and other methods that could be employed to secure BNG. Moreover, a completed and signed UU includes obligations related to BNG on the adjoining land that while outside of the application boundary forms part of the wider site. This site could provide adequate biodiversity offsetting as required by the Council BNG SPD<sup>6</sup>. Therefore, a net-gain can ultimately be achieved through on-site mitigation and/or off-site offsetting if required.
35. With the imposition of suitably worded conditions and the UU, the proposal would achieve BNG and this would be compliant with Policy NE1 of the VALP, Policies EN1 and EN2 of the ACNP and the BNG SPD. The proposal would also accord with the Framework, in so far as it seeks to increase biodiversity.

### **Other Matters**

36. The appeal site falls within the zone of influence of the Chilterns Beechwood Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The SAC is protected for its beech forests, semi-natural dry grasslands and scrub, and its population of stag beetles. As the competent authority in this case, I have a duty under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to consider, in the interests of the protection from harm, whether a given development would have likely significant effects on the integrity and/or special interest of the SAC either in isolation or in combination with other plans/projects.
37. New residential development within the zone of influence has the potential to adversely affect the integrity of the designated site through increased recreational pressure. As a replacement dwelling, the proposal would not result in a net increase of residential development and therefore would not lead to increased recreational pressure. As such, I am satisfied that the proposal alone and in combination with other plans and projects would not have a likely significant effect on the SAC.
38. The appeal site is located within the CNL, where, as set out in paragraph 182 of the Framework, great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty. The Council did not object to the design of the replacement dwelling and based on the submitted plans and my observations onsite, I find no reason to disagree. The overall scale, massing and form of the dwelling would be inconspicuous in the wider countryside and would remove some deteriorating outbuildings. These positive effects would, therefore conserve and, to a limited degree, enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the CNL.

### **Conditions**

39. The Council have suggested that 18 conditions be imposed, which I conclude on below. In imposing conditions, I have had regard to the approach in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. Where pre-commencement conditions have been imposed these have been agreed by the appellant.
40. In addition to the statutory time limit condition, a condition specifying the plans that are approved and that the development shall be undertaken in accordance with them is required in the interests of certainty.

---

<sup>6</sup> Buckinghamshire Council Biodiversity Net Gain - Supplementary Planning Document July 2022.

41. To protect the character and appearance of the area, it is also necessary to impose conditions requiring details of the external surfaces of the development finished floor/ground level and have these approved by the Council. For similar reasons condition on hard and soft landscaping is also required. A condition on boundary treatments is also necessary for the character and appearance of the area and the residential amenities of nearby occupiers.
42. A condition for a BNG Report and associated Biodiversity Metric was suggested by the Council. However, given that both have been submitted as part of the appeal process and details for BNG are also required as part of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, this condition would not be necessary or reasonable. In the interests of safeguarding protected species, ancient woodland and habitat conditions are also required.
43. Details of water consumption are necessary in the interest of reducing water consumption. Also, a condition is necessary for the submission of a surface water drainage scheme in the interests of sustainable drainage.
44. In the interests of parking and sustainable travel options, cycle storage is required. For highway safety reasons, car parking and manoeuvring conditions are also required.
45. With regards to the Council's request that a condition be imposed removing permitted development rights, it is possible for homeowners, in implementing these rights, to affect the character and appearance of the area. Due to the location of the site within the CNL, I consider this condition necessary.
46. Installing electric vehicle charge points in new homes now forms part of Building Control Regulations. It has not been explained why these regulations and controls do not satisfactorily deal with the request for a condition. As such, this suggested condition is considered unnecessary.
47. A condition on the residential curtilage has been requested. However, details are included in the plan's condition, and it is therefore not needed.

### **Conclusion**

48. For the reason set out above, the appeal is allowed.

*A Hickey*

INSPECTOR

### **Schedule of conditions (1-16)**

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:  
  
03-001 A Location Plan  
03-012 A Proposed site plan  
03-002 Existing and proposed curtilage plan (proposed reduced domestic curtilage)  
45-011-A1 Proposed site plan wide  
45-013-A1 Proposed roof plan  
45-020-A1 Proposed floor plan  
03-015 Site section diagrams  
45-030 A1 Proposed elevations: north and east  
45-031 A1 Proposed elevations: south and west  
LAC\_005 rev A Landscape section  
LAC\_004\_rev C Feb 2023 Landscape masterplan  
LAC\_003\_rev D Landscape Design  
03-004 Boundaries Plan
3. No development (other than the necessary testing to ascertain the ground condition) shall take place until a detailed sustainable surface water drainage scheme for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall be based on an assessment of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles as set out in the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework. It shall also include calculations and demonstrate that the surface water generated by this development can be accommodated and disposed of without discharging onto the highway and without increasing flood risk on or off-site. The drainage scheme shall also demonstrate that the silt and pollutants resulting from the site can be adequately managed to ensure there is no pollution risk to receiving waters.
4. No works shall be carried out on site (including site clearance and demolition) until an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) has been submitted in accordance with current British Standard 5837 and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Ground protection measures including protective fencing shall be erected or installed prior to the commencement of any works or development on the site including any works of demolition and shall conform to current British Standard 5837 specification guidance. The approved fencing and/or ground protection measures shall be retained and maintained until all building, engineering or other operations have been completed. No work shall be carried out or materials stored within the fenced or protected areas without prior written agreement from the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details.

The AMS & TPP shall include:

- 1.) Detailed plans showing location of the protective fencing including any additional ground protection whether temporary or permanent;
  - 2.) Details as to proposed access into and out of the site;
  - 3.) Details of any 'no-dig' or cellular confinement system required within the root protection areas of retained trees;
  - 4.) All phases and timing of the project, including phasing of demolition and construction operations, in relation to arboricultural matters and details of supervision by a qualified arboriculturist and details of site supervision; and
  - 5.) Siting of machinery, work huts and contractor parking; areas for the storage of materials and the siting of skips and working spaces.
5. No work shall be carried out on site (including site clearance and demolition) until a habitat management plan (HMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The content of the HMP shall include the following.
- a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
  - b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
  - c) Aims and objectives of management which will (without limitation) include the provision of biodiversity net gain within the Site as shown within the Biodiversity Gain Plan.
  - d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
  - e) Details of ecological buffer.
  - f) Details of wildlife sensitive lighting should external lightening be proposed during operational phase of the development.
  - g) Model specifications and locations of biodiversity enhancement features (a minimum of a bat box, bee hotel and bird box).
  - h) Prescriptions for management actions.
  - i) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a thirty-year period).
  - j) Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan.
  - k) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The HMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall be for no less than 30 years. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the HMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed, and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

6. No work shall be carried out on site (including site clearance and demolition) until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.
- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
  - b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones" and natural ecological buffer.

- c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
- d) Measures to avoid and mitigate impacts to the SSSI (Site of Specific Scientific Interest), priority habitat, local wildlife site and recognised nature reserve.
- e) Demonstrate how best practice will be used to minimise dust to ensure no pollution from demolition or construction adversely affect the SSSI
- f) Details of wildlife sensitive lighting should external lightening be proposed during construction phase of the development.
- g) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- h) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- i) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- j) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- k) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP must be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details.

7. No construction shall take place above slab level until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP shall include a woodland management plan and a biodiversity management and monitoring plan which shall follow the recommendations of the Ecological Impact Assessment (non-EIA) dated October 2023, the landscape and ecological management summary prepared by SEED dated 15/09/2023, and shall be prepared in accordance with the Habitat Management Plan approved pursuant to condition 5 of this permission. The LEMP shall demonstrate that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the details of the Landscape Masterplan dated May 2023 and the Landscape Developed Design LAC\_003\_Rev D and shall provide for native planting within the Ecological Buffer Zone indicated on 03-012 rev A. The LEMP shall also demonstrate that the development shall achieve a minimum net gain in biodiversity of 21% in accordance with the Biodiversity Net Gain report and metric dated September 2023. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
8. No development beyond site clearance shall take place until details of the proposed finished floor levels of all buildings and the finished ground levels of the site, in relation to existing site levels of surrounding property, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.
9. No development above slab level shall commence until a schedule of all the materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

10.No development shall take place above slab level until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall accord with the approved Landscape masterplan and include existing trees and/or hedgerows to be retained and/or removed accurately shown with root protection areas; schedules of plants noting species, plant supply sizes and proposed densities; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with tree, plant and grass establishment; and the implementation programme. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

If within a period of ten years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub, that tree or shrub, or any tree and shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed, dies, becomes severely damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees and shrubs of equivalent size, species and quantity. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner or in accordance with the agreed programme of works.

11.No development shall take place above slab level until details of all boundary treatments including walls, fences, gates or other means of enclosure to be erected in or around the residential curtilage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

12.Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved secure bicycle storage facilities for the dwelling shall be provided and fully installed. The storage facilities shall be retained thereafter.

13.Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted the car parking and manoeuvring area shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved drawings. The car parking area so provided shall be maintained and shall be used for no other purpose thereafter.

14. The development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with Appendix 7 of the bat activity survey (Elite Ecology, October 2023) identified within the agreed Ecological Impact Assessment (ecology by Design, October 2023) recommendation. Prior to occupation of the approved dwelling a written statement to confirm the recommendations have be carried out will first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

15.The dwelling hereby permitted shall be constructed and fitted out so as not to exceed the optional water consumption standard of 110 litres per person per day, as set out in Approved Document G of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended).

16. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, with or without modification), no development covered by Classes A, B and E of Part 1 and Class A of Part 2 of Schedule 2 to that Order shall be carried out without the specific grant of planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.