



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2024

by J Dowling BA (Hons), MPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/W/23/3332649

Polsden Farm, Polsden Road, Dorking, Surrey RH5 6BE

- 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 National Trust against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
- The application Ref MO/2022/0907, dated 20 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2023.
- The development proposed is demolition of four barns. Construction of biomass plant building, 1 x 4 bedroom dwelling. Conversion of tithe barn to 1 x 5 bedroom dwelling and conversion of former stables/ workshop buildings to 2 x 3 bedroom dwellings. Retention of original farmhouse. Creation of new hard and soft landscaping, car parking, turning and driveway areas

Decision

1. This appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of four barns. Construction of biomass plant building, 1 x 4 bedroom dwelling. Conversion of tithe barn to 1 x 5 bedroom dwelling and conversion of former stables/ workshop buildings to 2 x 3 bedroom dwellings. Retention of original farmhouse. Creation of new hard and soft landscaping, car parking, turning and driveway areas at Polsden Farm, Polsden Road, Dorking, Surrey RH5 6BE in accordance with the terms of the application ref MO/2022/0907 dated 20 May 2022 subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Procedural matters

2. The address and description of development differ from the details provided on the original application form. The Council corrected the address details and also amended the description of development to reflect amendments and changes made to the application whilst they were considering it. I am satisfied that the address is accurate and have considered the appeal on the basis of the final amended scheme that was considered by the Council.
3. In December 2023 the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF) was revised. Having regard to the matters that are most relevant to this appeal, there have been few substantive changes albeit the numbering of the paragraphs has changed. I am satisfied that no one would be prejudiced by the changes and therefore it is this revised version that I have used when determining this appeal. As a result, the paragraph numbers referred to in this decision letter differ from those referred to in the appeal documentation.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

- whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the NPPF and any relevant development plan policies;
- the effect on the openness of the Green Belt;
- the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and
- would any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, be clearly outweighed by other considerations. If so, would this amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Is the proposal inappropriate development in the Green Belt?

5. Paragraph 154 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate development in the Green Belt but then details six exceptions to this rule. The first exception (a) is buildings for agriculture or forestry and the final exception (g) is the limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings) which would:
- not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.
6. The NPPF (paragraph 155) also states that certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate development in the Green Belt provided that they preserve openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it. This includes (d) the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent construction.
7. The site is currently occupied by a number of buildings and an area of hardstanding. These include a farmhouse, tithe barn, former stable buildings and workshops and further barns/ agricultural buildings. The proposal would result in the conversion of the tithe barn (building 1) and the former stable buildings and workshop (buildings 2 and 3) to residential uses; the demolition of two single storey barns and replacement with a new one and half storey dwelling (building 4). The two open sided barns at the rear of the site would be demolished and replaced with a biomass plant building (building 6) and barn (building 7). A further barn to the rear of the existing farmhouse would be demolished and not replaced, and the farmhouse itself would remain unaltered.
8. I observed on site that the 17th Century tithe barn (building 1) is in a poor state of repair and currently requires scaffolding to support it. However, a structural report submitted with the application confirms that, except for the east end gable, the building is capable of being converted. Furthermore, it is clear from the documentation that the Appellant considers that the conversion of this building would provide the long-term solution to enable this historic building to be repaired and retained.

9. The former stable buildings and workshops are built of brick and flint and structurally appear to be capable of re-use. This is confirmed by the structural survey submitted with the application.
10. I am therefore satisfied that the conversion of buildings 1, 2 and 3 subject to having no greater impact on openness or conflicting with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, would not be inappropriate development and would comply with paragraph 155(d) of the NPPF.
11. Proposed building 7 (barn) would be for agricultural purposes which is one of the exceptions to development in the Green Belt as set out in paragraph 154(a) of the NPPF. As a result, I am satisfied that building 7 would not be inappropriate development.
12. Buildings 4 (new dwelling) and 6 (biomass plant building) would be located where there are existing barns and therefore, subject to not having a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the buildings that they are replacing, could meet the exceptions provided by paragraph 154(g) of the NPPF.

The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt

13. Openness in the context of the Green Belt essentially means freedom from development and is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects.
14. Spatially the Appellant has demonstrated that the proposed development would result in a reduction in both floor area and volume when compared with the existing buildings on the site.
15. In visual terms the tithe barn currently has two single storey timber front extensions which would be demolished as part of the conversion of the building. In addition to reinstating the original form of the barn and opening views of the historic building this would improve the openness of the Green Belt. Both the tithe barn and former stables/ workshop would be refurbished with materials appropriate to the age and design of the buildings and consequently there would be limited visual change.
16. Building 4 would result in the demolition of two single storey modern barns and replacement with a one and a half storey dwelling. The new dwelling would have a similar height to the existing barns but due to the L shaped layout would have less bulk and mass. Furthermore, the design and materials of the new building would reflect the existing tithe barn. As a result, I consider that the proposed replacement dwelling would, both visually and spatially, have no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the buildings it would be replacing.
17. Building 6 would be sited on part of the site where there are existing barns and its bulk, mass, design and materials would be similar to the barns it would be replacing. As such I am satisfied that it would not affect openness of the Green Belt.
18. It was apparent from my site visit that the site has not been operating fully for some time. However, it was clear it has been a working farm which forms part of the wider National Trust landholding. As a result, I am satisfied that that there would have been both agricultural and domestic vehicle movements associated with the use. I therefore agree with the findings of the traffic survey

and the Council's committee report that the additional vehicle movements that would be generated by the proposal would not cause significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

19. Parking for the proposed residential units would be provided within the existing area of hardstanding which is enclosed on three sides by the existing buildings providing limited views of this space. This area would have provided parking in relation to the agricultural use and still provides parking for the farmhouse. Whilst the area would be replaced, I consider that there would be no adverse impact upon the openness of the Green Belt from the parking of vehicles in this area.
20. I agree with the Council that a condition removing permitted development rights under Classes A, B, C and E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2005 (the GPDO) would restrict future occupants from extending and altering the properties and installing sheds and outbuildings. However, I also accept that the residential use of the site would result in changes to the way that the external space could be used with the potential to introduce domestic paraphernalia such as washing lines, play equipment, tables and chairs etc. I note from the information submitted that the Appellant proposes to control this through the lease agreements however, I accept that this would not be enforceable by the Local Planning Authority. Consequently, I consider that this would have a very limited impact on the visual aspect of openness of the Green Belt.
21. Paragraph 142 of the NPPF indicates that the fundamental aim of Green Belts is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Given the location of the site in open countryside and the very limited effect on openness I have outlined above I conclude that the proposal would not result in the spread of the urban area or erode the overall openness of the Green Belt.

Other considerations

The effect on the character and appearance of the area

22. The site lies within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and is a valued landscape due to its historic and landscape setting. The proposal would retain the existing traditional farmstead layout and scale and would reflect the materials, glazing and detailing of the existing buildings. The new dwelling and barn would be sited within the footprint of the existing farmstead and would also reflect the existing form and proportions of other buildings at the site.
23. As a result, I consider that the proposal would be sympathetic to its rural setting and would not result in overdevelopment or adversely affect the character and appearance of the AONB or the valued landscape. The proposal would comply with policies ENV22 and ENV23 of the Mole Valley Local Plan (2000) (the MVLP) and policies CS13 and CS14 of the Mole Valley Core Strategy (2009) (the MVCS) which seek to ensure that new development must respect and enhance the character and appearance of the area in which it is located.

The effect on heritage assets

24. Polsden Lacey is an Edwardian manor house set in extensive landscaped grounds. The house itself is a Grade II* listed building and the garden and park is a Grade II* registered park and garden. Whilst neither of these

designations apply to the Polsden Farm the appeal site forms part of the wider Polsden Lacey estate.

25. When I visited Polsden Lacey I observed that around the main house the levels drop steeply from the South Lawn providing views out across the valley. However, due to the location of the site in the valley below and the intervening woodland, views of the site from this location are exceptionally limited.
26. I also visited the Admiral's Walk, Bagden Drive, Nun's Walk and Long Walk. I acknowledge that at the time of my visit that optimal screening was provided by the trees. However, the only location where I observed the potential for some very limited inter-visibility was from the terrace/ Ha-Ha where in the winter months there may be the potential for glimpsed views of the roofs of the farmstead. As these roofs pre-exist or will be replaced by buildings with a similar roof form, I am satisfied that the proposal would not adversely affect the setting or significance of either of the designated heritage assets.
27. The tithe barn and stables are not listed but given the barns 17th Century origins and the historic nature of the farmstead could be considered to be non-designated heritage assets. Whilst it is preferable that buildings should retain their original use, it was clear from my site visit that the tithe barn is in an extremely poor state of repair and therefore it would probably not be financially viable to repair it for use as a barn. The proposed conversion of the workshop and stables would be sympathetic and would ensure their retention. Furthermore, from the evidence submitted it is clear that the proposal would ensure the long-term future of the buildings and also contribute to the on-going maintenance of the wider Polsden Lacey estate including the designated house and gardens.
28. I therefore consider that the proposal would accord with policy CS14 of the MVCS, policy ENV43 of the MVLP and section 16 of the NPPF which seek to protect designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings.

Other matters

29. I note that there is significant third-party concern regarding the access road including the safety of other users and the potential pressure to upgrade and widen it. As set out above I am satisfied that the increase in traffic compared to the current use, if it was fully operational, would be marginal. Furthermore, I observed on site that due to its width, winding nature and gradient that vehicle speeds along the road are currently very low and as a result I am satisfied that the safety of other users of the road including pedestrians and riders would not be compromised. I am satisfied that given the access road is currently used by agricultural and estate vehicles that it could satisfactorily accommodate construction traffic and deliveries for the proposed bio-mass plant. Whilst I note that the road is in a poor condition it currently provides a serviceable form of access to a number of other properties including Yew Tree Barn a holiday let operated by the Appellant. I therefore do not consider that the proposal would lead to additional pressure to alter or improve the road and in any event if such works required the benefit of planning permission these concerns could be considered by the Council when determining that proposal.
30. I note the concerns regarding the relatively remote location of the site and the fact that future occupiers would need to be reliant on the car. However, whilst the NPPF supports development where the opportunity to travel sustainably is

maximised it also recognises that transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas. I note that the NPPF sets out that there are three dimensions to sustainable development and that sustainability is not just limited to environmental matters. Whilst I note the Council's comments regarding housing land supply, the proposal would contribute to the need for new homes and would therefore be consistent with the social and economic roles of sustainable development.

31. Concerns were raised with regards to potential for flooding. However I note that, subject to the imposition of a condition the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) are satisfied.
32. I am satisfied that due to the proposed layout and subject to an obscure glazing condition, that the living conditions for the occupiers of the existing farmhouse and the proposed new units would not be adversely affected.
33. The Council's first reason for refusal refers to the impact of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt and then refers to policies CS1 and CS2 of the MVCS. The Appellant contends that these do not relate to the Green Belt. However, whilst these policies do not specifically refer to development in the Green Belt being inappropriate, they do refer to focusing development into pre-existing towns and villages (policy CS1) and that the development needs of the Council can be met without the need to use land in the Green Belt (policy CS2). Furthermore, whilst not explicitly referred to in the reason for refusal Section 13 of the NPPF sets out the relevant tests for development in the Green Belt. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Would the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, be clearly outweighed by other considerations? If so, would this amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal?

34. In conclusion for the reasons set out above I consider that building 7 would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt as it is an agricultural building and therefore would be covered by the exceptions listed in paragraph 154 of the NPPF.
35. As set out above I have concluded that the scheme would have no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt or conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. As a result, I consider that buildings 1, 2 and 3 would not be inappropriate development and would comply with the requirements of paragraph 155 of the NPPF. Buildings 4 and 6 would result in the redevelopment of previously developed land and would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. Therefore, they would not be inappropriate development as they would meet the requirements of paragraph 154(g) of the NPPF.
36. Furthermore, as set out above I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area including the AONB and would not affect the setting of the designated heritage assets at Polsden Lacy and would ensure the retention of the non-designated heritage assets on the appeal site. As a result, I am satisfied that no other harm would arise as a result of the proposal.
37. The proposal would therefore comply with policies CS1, CS2, CS13 and CS14 if the MVCS, policies ENV22, ENV23 and ENV43 of the MVLP and sections 13 and

16 of the NPPF. As a result, I consider that the need to demonstrate Very Special Circumstances does not apply.

Conditions

38. Paragraph 56 of the NPPF sets out a number of tests that conditions need to meet. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against Paragraph 56 and adjusted their wording where necessary in the interests of clarity and consistency. In addition to the standard time limit, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
39. Given the presence of non-designated heritage assets and location of the site within an AONB and the Green Belt, I have attached conditions requiring the submission and approval of proposed external materials, hard surfacing, external joinery, guttering and rainwater goods to ensure that the new and converted buildings would respect their surroundings. For the same reasons I have included conditions requiring the submission and approval of a landscaping scheme, details of the proposed boundary treatment and an external lighting management plan.
40. I consider, given the concerns about the intensity of the use and the effect on the Green Belt and AONB that conditions removing permitted development rights for Classes A, B, C and E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, removing the right to insert windows, dormer windows, glazed openings or rooflights other than those shown on the approved plans, restricting external lighting and restricting the use of building 7 to agricultural purposes would be reasonable and necessary.
41. In assessing the effect that the proposal would have on living conditions of future occupiers I consider that the proposed first floor window in the side elevation of Building 1 could give views into the proposed rear gardens of Buildings 2 and 3. As a result I have included a condition requiring this window to be obscure glazed and fixed shut except, as it is required to provide a secondary means of escape, in an emergency thereby ensuring that the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring houses would not be harmed. As the room is dual aspect, I consider that the living conditions of the occupiers of this room would not be adversely affected.
42. I agree that the retention of the tithe barn is important and note the concerns of the Council regarding its condition. I therefore consider that a condition requiring the submission of a structural survey and repair schedule would be necessary.
43. I note the Council have suggested a condition that would require carbon emissions and energy use to be reduced by 10% through the use of on-site instillation and implementation of decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy sources. However, the scheme would deliver a biomass plant which will supply heat and hot water to the new and converted dwellings which the Council's sustainability consultant considers should far exceed this 10% requirement. As a result, I consider that the imposition of such a condition would be unnecessary. I consider that a condition requiring the provision of fast charging sockets for electric vehicles is reasonable.

44. Given the location of the site I agree with the Council that a condition requiring the submission and approval of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is necessary. In the interests of minimising the number of conditions, I have not included suggested condition 11 as I consider that to an extent this duplicates the landscaping condition and that any elements not captured could be captured by amending the drafting of the landscaping or CEMP conditions which I have done.
45. I note that the proposed flooding and drainage conditions were requested by the Lead Local Flood Authority and am satisfied that they are necessary to minimise the risk of flooding.
46. Given the age of the buildings on the site I agree with the Council that the presence of asbestos on the site is a possibility and given the previous agricultural uses of the building there is the possibility of some ground contamination. I therefore consider, on a precautionary basis, that the land contamination condition suggested by the Council is necessary.
47. Currently there are no details of how waste and recycling generated by the use would be managed, stored or collected. Given the sensitivities of the site I consider that a condition requiring details of how refuse and recycling would be stored and collected from the site is necessary.

Conclusion

48. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised and subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule this appeal should be allowed.

Jo Dowling

INSPECTOR

Schedule 1 – conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed in all respects strictly in accordance with the submitted documents and plan numbers, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority:

Location Plan	LP-01
Site Plan	SP-01 Rev E
Building 1	PL01-Rev B
Building 2	PL-02-Rev A
Building 3	PL-03-Rev A
Building 4	PL04-Rev C
Building 6	PL06-Rev C
Building 7	PL-07 Rev C
Geocellular Crate Soakaway Calculation (Soakaway 1), December 2022, awa	
Geocellular Crate Soakaway Calculation (Soakaway 2), December 2022, awa	
Geocellular Crate Soakaway Calculation (Soakaway 3), December 2022, awa	
Geocellular Crate Soakaway Calculation (Soakaway 4), December 2022, awa	
Geocellular Crate Soakaway Calculation (Soakaway 5), December 2022, awa	
Drainage Scheme General Layout, December 2022	1224/D2 Rev T2, awa
Drainage Layout Sheet 1	12204/D2 T2, December 2022 12224/D2 Rev T2, awa
Drainage Layout Sheet 2	12204/D3 Rev T1, August 2022, awa
Drainage Layout Sheet 3	12204/D4 Rev T1, August 2022, awa
Drainage Layout Sheet 4	12204/D5 Rev T1, August 2022, awa
Drainage Layout Sheet 5	12204/D6 Rev T1, August 2022, awa
Drainage details	12204/D7 Rev T1, August 2022, awa
Infiltration test report	December 2022, Id J15338, ST Consult

3. Before any above ground works take place, details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

4. Before any above ground works take place, details of the hard surfacing to be used within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall indicate either porous materials or the provision of a direct run-off from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area. All hard surfacing shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, completed prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and thereafter, permanently retained as such.
5. Before any above ground works take place, details of all external joinery shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority including materials, method of opening and large-scale drawings showing sections through mullions, transoms and glazing bars. Windows and door openings should have a reveal to be agreed. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
6. Before any above ground works take place details of how refuse and recycling will be stored at and collected from the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
7. Before any above ground works take place, details of the guttering and rainwater goods shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
8. Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted a structural survey and detailed repair schedule of Building 1 (The Tithe Barn) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
9. Before any above ground works take place, details of a landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping scheme shall include measures to deliver biodiversity net gains, such as bird or bat boxes and log piles including the enhancement action to the barn owl nest box set out in the ecological surveys. The landscaping scheme shall also incorporate the planting of native species of trees, shrubs, herbaceous plants and areas to be grassed including residential gardens. The landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting season after the development has commenced unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be maintained for a period of 5 years. Such maintenance shall include the replacement of any trees or shrubs that die with a tree or shrub of the same species and maturity unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
10. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected/ retained including those to curtilages of the new dwellings has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatment shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, completed prior to the first occupation of the development and thereafter permanently retained.

11. Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted a Construction Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include, but not be limited to a:

- a) Map showing the location of all ecological features.
- b) Risk assessment of the potentially damaging construction activities.
- c) Practical measures to avoid and reduce impacts during construction including details of the precautionary measures for mammals, great crested newts and reptiles based on the application's ecological surveys.
- d) Location and timing of works to avoid and reduce impacts during construction.
- e) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- f) Use of protective fencing, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

Construction shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

12. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until an external lighting management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, completed prior to first occupation of the development and thereafter permanently retained.

13. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national non-statutory technical standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDs. The required details shall include:

- a) The results of the infiltration testing completed in accordance with BRE Digest: 365 and confirmation of groundwater levels.
- b) Evidence that the proposed final solution will effectively manage 1 in 30 (+35% allowance for climate change) and 1 in 100 (+40% allowance for climate change) storm events and 10% allowance for urban creep, during all stages of the development. If infiltration is deemed unfeasible, associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate equivalent to the pre-development Greenfield run off.
- c) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance / risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc.). Confirmation is required of a 1m unsaturated zone from the base of any proposed soakaway to the seasonal high groundwater level and confirmation of half-drain times.

- d) A plan showing exceedance flows (ie during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected from increased flood risk.
 - e) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system.
 - f) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.
14. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report must demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/ areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls), and confirm any defects have been rectified.
15. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until each of the proposed dwellings are provided with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirements 7kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector – 230v AC 32 Amp single phase dedicated supply) in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
16. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no extensions within Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B or C to any dwelling hereby permitted shall be erected.
17. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no windows, dormer windows, glazed openings, roof lights or external lights other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed.
18. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no building or enclosure, swimming or other pool, within Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E shall be carried out to any dwelling hereby erected.
19. Building 7 hereby permitted shall only be used for agricultural purposes as defined in Section 336(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
20. Prior to the occupation of Building 1 the first floor side window in the western elevation shall be obscure glazed and fixed shut in all instances except for means of escape in an emergency and shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.
21. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a detailed contamination assessment consisting of site reconnaissance, conceptual

model, risk assessment and schedule of investigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme of investigation shall consist of site reconnaissance, conceptual model, risk assessment and schedule of investigation. Prior to commencement of development, other than demolition, the scheme of assessment including consideration of asbestos shall be carried out at such points and to such depths as the Local Planning Authority may stipulate and laboratory results shall be provided as numeric values in accordance with the standards of Government Guidance for Land affected by contamination. A scheme of decontamination and verification shall then be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and the scheme as approved, including provision of suitable soft landscaping where necessary, shall be implemented before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied.