



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 4 March 2025

Site visit made on 4 March 2025

by E Dade BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/W/24/3354630

Redeham Hall Industrial Yard, Redehall Road, Smallfield, Surrey RH6 9RJ

- 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 Mike Hickey on behalf of Coinford Ltd against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is TA/2024/203.
 - The development proposed is demolition of workshop and storage buildings, erection of replacement buildings comprising 1no two-storey office building and 2no workshop buildings, extension of surface level car parking area, alterations to existing accesses hard landscaping and soft landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of workshop and storage buildings, erection of replacement buildings comprising 1no two-storey office building and 2no workshop buildings, extension of surface level car parking area, alterations to existing accesses hard landscaping and soft landscaping at Redeham Hall Industrial Yard, Redehall Road, Smallfield, Surrey RH6 9RJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref TA/2024/203, and subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The car park has been extended through the laying of an area of hardstanding enclosed by a hedgerow and was in use for staff parking at time of my site visit. The proposal has therefore been partly implemented and the proposed development is deemed to have commenced. This weighs neither for nor against the proposal, which I have assessed on the basis of the submitted plans.
3. The appellant has submitted an amended Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy. The Lead Local Flood Authority were consulted on the submitted details and raise no objection subject to the imposition of recommended conditions. The Council now consider the third reason for refusal, as stated on its decision notice, has been suitably addressed. Therefore, I do not consider flood risk and drainage matters to form a main issue in the appeal
4. On 12 December 2024, Government published the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). During the appeal, the parties were invited to comment on the relevance of the revised Framework to the proposal and in my decision, I have had regard to the parties' written responses.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in this appeal are:
- Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to the Framework and relevant development plan policies.
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt

6. The appeal site comprises the yard, office, workshop buildings, and areas of open storage and car parking associated with an established groundworks and construction business. To the north of the site is Redeham Hall, an office which serves as the business' headquarters. The site is within the Green Belt.
7. Policy DP10 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014 (TLP) supports the fundamental aim of keeping land permanently open and restricts inappropriate development which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except where very special circumstances exist. Policy DP10 reflects the provisions of paragraph 153 of the Framework which resists inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
8. TLP Policy DP13 identifies certain forms of development that are not inappropriate within the Green Belt. Of particular relevance to the proposal is criterion (G) of Policy DP13 which supports the limited infilling or partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt, where the development would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.
9. The exception provided by Policy DP13(G) is similar to that provided by paragraph 154(g) of the Framework. However, paragraph 154(g) requires proposals for infilling or redevelopment of previously developed land "not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt". The Council accepts that paragraph 154(g) sets a higher threshold for Green Belt harm than Policy DP13(G).
10. Paragraph 232 of the Framework requires due weight be given to existing development policies according to their degree of consistency with the Framework. Policy DP13(G) is not consistent with the Framework as it imposes a more stringent test for development of previously developed land in the Green Belt than Framework paragraph 154(g). Therefore, the weight to be afforded to Policy DP13 is diminished.
11. Criterion (I) of Policy DP13 also supports other forms of development identified as exceptions by the Framework. Paragraph 154(h) of the Framework considers engineering operations to not be inappropriate development, provided they preserve Green Belt openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.

12. The Planning Practice Guidance identifies that openness can have both spatial and visual aspects. In addition, openness may be affected by the duration of development and the degree of activity generated¹.
13. The site's existing buildings are located toward the front of the site. Most of the site comprises areas of hardstanding used permanently for extensive storage, which at the time of my site visit included construction materials, machinery, vehicles, racking, and stacked portacabins. Whilst the type of materials and intensity of use of the open storage areas would change depending on the needs of the business, aerial photography from 2018 and 2021 each show the open storage areas extensively in use. In addition, there are 60 people employed in the yard, and therefore there would be frequent activity during working hours.
14. Due to the extent of its built form and intensity of activity and use, the site's existing contribution to Green Belt openness is limited. The appeal site does not strongly contribute to any Green Belt purpose at Framework paragraph 143.
15. The proposed development would comprise an office building and two workshops. The proposed office building would be capable of accommodating an increased number of personnel and would provide new facilities to meet the needs of the growing business such as new meeting spaces, canteen, training room, and lounge. The workshops would be used for the repair and maintenance of machinery and would be of a size and scale to accommodate large construction vehicles. Whilst the parties dispute how the volume of the proposed buildings should be calculated, the buildings would be larger in floorspace and volume than the existing buildings to be demolished. Therefore, the proposal would result in an increase in built form on the site.
16. The Council considers proposed Workshop A would be comparable to the industrial unit it replaces, and the proposed office building would consolidate built form thus providing a suitable trade-off in terms of built volume. The Council's concerns in respect of the proposal's effects on Green Belt openness relate principally to proposed Workshop B and the car park extension.
17. Proposed Workshop B would be sited within an area currently used for open air storage. As set out above, this area is normally occupied by materials and machinery and is in active use. Nonetheless, proposed workshop B would permanently increase built form in this location and would thus have an adverse spatial impact on Green Belt openness.
18. Proposed Workshop B would be set back in the site behind proposed Workshop A and existing built form that is to be retained. The Landscape and Visual Appraisal 2023 (LVIA) indicates the increased height of buildings would be barely perceptible beyond the site itself, and the proposed vegetation along the edges of the site would assist in containing the development.
19. The Council formerly granted a lawful development certificate (LDC) for use of the site as a groundworks and contractors' yard². It is my understanding that the car park extension projects beyond the boundary of the LDC into undeveloped land to the front of Redeham Hall. The appellant asserts that this land was previously a bund at the edge of the yard. However, the Council considers the area should be

¹ Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 64-013-20250225

² LPA ref: 2019/858

treated as agricultural land, and I have no evidence to confirm the area occupied by the extended car park has been lawfully developed.

20. The car park extension is an engineering operation for the purposes of paragraph 154(h) of the Framework. The car park extension occupies a relatively narrow strip of land within the hall's grounds that is relatively isolated from the wider countryside due to its relationship to the built form, including the appeal site, Redeham Hall, dwellings, and highway.
21. The extended car park has introduced an area of aggregate hardstanding and increased activity on the land through the movement of people and vehicles. Therefore, the spatial impacts of the extended car park are the loss of openness proportionate in size to the area of hardstanding.
22. However, the car park extension contains no built structures and is enclosed by a hedgerow which forms a defensible boundary. The hedgerow screens the hardstanding and permits only filtered views of parked vehicles.
23. The car park extension is not visually prominent from public vantage points. It is set back from the highway by an existing access route. Mature vegetation and buildings along the highway frontage are effective in obscuring the car park from view from road users. From the public right of way to the north and Downlands Road to the east, the car park is screened by existing hedgerows and trees which surround the grounds of Redeham Hall. Any glimpses between vegetation would be distant and viewed against a backdrop of the existing commercial buildings on the appeal site. Therefore, any visual impact on openness from the car park extension would be negligible.
24. The car park extension is small within the context of the Green Belt and would not amount to countryside encroachment. The car park is visually contained by its boundary treatment and existing landscape features. The car park extension therefore preserves Green Belt openness.
25. As set out above, the site would increase built form within a predominantly previously developed site within the Green Belt. The spatial impacts of the development would be a loss of openness commensurate with the scale and mass of the proposed built form. In addition, there would be increased activity associated with the growing business. However, the LVIA concludes the proposal would have a neutral effect on visual openness.
26. The proposed development would not result in unrestricted sprawl of built-up areas, merging of towns, encroachment into the countryside, and would not affect the setting of historic towns nor undermine urban regeneration. The proposal would not therefore conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt.
27. For these reasons, the proposed buildings would have only a modest adverse impact on Green Belt openness. Therefore, the proposed infilling and partial redevelopment of the previously developed land would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Consequently, for the purposes of paragraph 154(g), the proposal would not be inappropriate development.
28. The proposed buildings would have a greater spatial impact on Green Belt openness than the site's existing built form, and in this regard would conflict with Policy DP13(G). However, the Framework is a material consideration and, having

regard to the procedures for implementation at Framework paragraph 232, I consider the proposal's compliance with Framework 154(g) outweighs the conflict with Policy DP13(G).

29. Furthermore, the proposed car park extension would preserve Green Belt openness and therefore would not be inappropriate development within the context of paragraph 154(h) of the Framework and TLP Policy DP13(I).
30. Taken as a whole, the proposal would not be inappropriate development. The proposal would therefore comply with TLP Policy DP10 which restricts inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
31. Since I have concluded the proposal would not be inappropriate development, it is not necessary to apply the grey belt tests at Framework paragraph 155 nor have regard to considerations relevant to the application of very special circumstances.

Character and appearance

32. The site is located on the eastern side of Redehall Road and includes former farm buildings now in use as offices and workshops. The existing buildings have a large footprint and a functional appearance, but are varied in height, form, and materials.
33. Areas of hardstanding are expansive and contain tall stacks of materials and extensive open storage of large construction vehicles. The site and its features are large in scale and possess a utilitarian and industrial character.
34. To the south of the site's main access is a dwelling, and there is an additional dwelling within the northwest corner of the site fronting the highway. Opposite the site are a scout hut and large, detached dwellings. To the north, Redeham Hall is set back from the highway by its grounds and a tree-lined avenue and is enclosed by trees and hedgerows. Beyond the site to the east lies agricultural fields. The site is within a rural location and comprises a mix of uses. The LVIA concludes the site and immediate landscape are of medium / low landscape value.
35. Existing buildings are sited prominently at the front boundary, and generally obstruct views of other built form and open storage within the site from Redehall Road. A pedestrian footway exists on one side of Redehall Road only and ends opposite the site's main access. There is no street lighting or cycle infrastructure, and views of the site would normally be experienced as fleeting glimpses from motor vehicles passing the site's frontage.
36. The site is contained and generally well-screened from view by its boundary treatments, including mature trees and hedgerows. The LVIA identifies that due to the overlapping effects of trees and hedges in the landscape, the visual envelope of the site is limited to the site and a few locations within the immediate context. The LVIA establishes the approximate visibility of the site from surrounding locations and receptors, namely views into the site along the vehicular accesses from Redehall Road, and distant glimpses from the east and north from public right of way UK002/460/10 (PROW), and Dowlands Lane, a narrow, rural road. Therefore, the site is not visually prominent within the landscape.
37. The proposed office would be located at the front of the site where it would be visible from Redehall Road, and the proposed workshops would be set back in the site. The Council's assessment in its delegated report considers that, whilst the replacement buildings would be greater in mass and bulk than the existing

buildings, the proposed buildings would be viewed in the context of the commercial site and would not appear out of place. However, the Council consider the proposed workshops could have been designed to appear less bulky and encourage visual interest.

38. The scale of the proposed workshops would provide sufficient floorspace, access, and headroom to enable the repair and maintenance of construction vehicles and machinery. The design is therefore informed principally by the intended function of the buildings, which would have a simple form typical of industrial buildings. The workshops would not appear out of keeping with the site's existing character.
39. The submitted evidence does not identify any prevailing architectural features that are formative of the area's character so as to warrant a design of greater visual interest. Rather, through choices of external materials, the design of the proposed workshops seeks to be more visually recessive, relative to the light-coloured materials of existing buildings within the site.
40. The proposed workshops would be sited behind the existing office building that would be retained for storage and ancillary purposes. The bulk of the proposed workshops would therefore be generally concealed from view from the site's highway frontage by existing built form, with parts of the proposed workshops visible only as glimpses along the main access through the gap between the existing and proposed office buildings.
41. As discussed above, the car park extension is a relatively narrow and is enclosed by a hedgerow. It is set back in the site and is well screened from views from Redehall Road and wider landscape by mature trees and hedgerows that enclose the grounds of Redeham Hall. Views of the car park are highly localised and experienced from within the site or from adjoining land in the appellant's ownership where the car park would be viewed within the context of the existing commercial use of the site. The car park extension would not therefore appear incongruous and would not have a harmful urbanising effect upon its rural location.
42. The landscaping proposals would retain existing vegetation and provide new planting, including native trees, scrub, hedgerows, pleached trees, and amenity shrubs to help soften the appearance of the built development, integrate the development into its surroundings, mitigate views of the development, and provide biodiversity benefit.
43. The LVIA concludes that as hedgerow planting matures, it will provide increased enclosure to the development and soften the built form within the development in the long term. The overall effect on visual amenity of users of Redehall Road would be minor beneficial.
44. Any views of the proposed buildings from the north and east, such as from Dowlands Lane and PROW would be distant and experienced within the context of existing buildings and open storage on the site. The LVIA concludes that the visual impacts of the development would be negligible from Dowlands Lane and minor adverse from the PROW.
45. However, the landscape proposals include a wedge of tree and scrub planting along the rear boundary of the site. The LVIA concludes that the effect on PROW users would be negligible in the long term due to the enhanced filtering of views provided by the proposed planting. Therefore, the LVIA demonstrates the

landscape proposals would successfully assimilate the proposed development into its landscape setting, and any adverse visual impacts upon the character and appearance of the area would be adequately mitigated.

46. For these reasons, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
47. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies CSP18 and CSP21 of the Tandridge Core Strategy 2008 (CS) which together require development be of a high standard of design that reflects and respects the character, setting and local context, and protects the character and distinctiveness of landscapes and the countryside for its own sake. In addition, the proposal would satisfy TLP Policy DP7 which requires proposals have a complementary building design and not result in overdevelopment or unacceptable intensification by reason of scale, form, bulk, height, spacing, density and design.

Other Matters

48. The appellant has articulated a range of economic benefits associated with the proposal. However, the Council assert the appellant has failed to provide a needs assessment to evidence the need for the proposed increase in floorspace. Since the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and I have identified no harms arising from the proposed development, I am satisfied the submitted evidence is proportionate and a needs assessment is not required to justify the proposal.
49. A local resident raised concerns regarding the effects of the proposal on highway safety and the site's accessibility to pedestrians and public transport. As set out in the Transport Statement (TS), the required visibility splays would be achieved in both directions and the geometry of the existing access junctions would be improved. All HGV traffic would utilise the improved southwestern access thereby reducing risk of conflict between cars and HGVs. A dropped kerb and tactile paving crossing would be constructed to improve connectivity between the site access and existing pedestrian footway, which provides a route to bus stops within a modest walking distance. The TS demonstrates there would be improvements to highway safety associated with use of the junction accesses, and there would be improved provision for pedestrians.

Conditions

50. The parties have provided a list of suggested conditions within the Statement of Common Ground which I have considered against the Framework's tests. In the interests of certainty, I have included a condition specifying the approved plans. Since the proposal is deemed to be partly implemented, the suggested condition to specify the time limit for commencement of development is not necessary.
51. To protect human health and the environment, I have included conditions requiring submission of a scheme of assessment, decontamination and validation of contaminated land.
52. For the purpose of maintaining the character and appearance of the area, I have attached conditions requiring submission of details of external materials, soft landscaping, a Tree Protection Plan, and Arboricultural Method Statement.

53. To ensure the satisfactory completion of the development, I have included a condition requiring removal of those buildings shown to be demolished on the approved plans. However, to enable the continued operation of the business during construction, I have specified that a timetable for demolition be agreed by the Council.
54. To ensure the development contributes to a reduction of carbon dioxide emissions, as required by CS Policy CSP14, I have included a condition requiring submission of details of on-site renewable energy provision.
55. To avoid endangering aircraft and the operation of London Gatwick Airport, I have included a condition requiring submission of a bird hazard management plan.
56. To ensure any necessary sewerage improvement works are provided, I have included a condition requiring the appellant provide either confirmation that foul water capacity exists or details an infrastructure phasing plan.
57. I have attached a condition requiring the surface water drainage system be constructed to the National Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and not increase flood risk on or off site. In addition, to ensure the surface water drainage system is constructed in accordance with the approved details, I have included a condition requiring submission of a verification report.
58. In the interests of highway safety, I have included conditions to secure the provision of visibility zones, parking and turning areas, and requiring submission of a Construction Transport Management Plan. To promote sustainable transport and provide appropriate facilities in accordance with TLP Policy DP7, I have attached a condition requiring provision of secure cycle storage and e-bike charging.
59. To conserve and enhance the biodiversity value of the site and avoiding harm to protected species, I have attached conditions requiring submission of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, Construction and Ecological Management Plan, and requiring the development be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the Ecological Impact Assessment, Biodiversity Net Gain Report, and Landscape Strategy Plan.
60. I have not included the suggested condition requiring submission of a pedestrian crossing facility scheme. The local highway authority was consulted during the appeal and details of the proposed pedestrian crossing are set out at plan no F22115/02C, and therefore the condition would result in unnecessary duplication of the plans condition. Furthermore, the works to the highway would be subject to a s278 agreement with the local highway authority.

Conclusion

61. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan taken as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

E Dade

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: *Site Location Plan (10th Nov 2023)*; MGS45897-E-01 - *External Elevations 01-05*; MGS45897-E-02 - *External Elevations 06-12*; MGS45897-E-03 - *External Elevations 13-19*; MGS45897-SY-FPG *Service Yard Floor Plan - Ground*; MGS45897-SY-FPM *Service Yard Floor Plan - Mezzanine*; MGS47757-T *Topographic Survey*; PL00118.22.50A - *Site Layout Plan*; PL00118.22.51A - *Proposed Ground Floor Plan*; PL00118.22.52 - *Proposed First Floor Plan*; PL00118.22.53A - *Proposed West Facing Elevation (office building)*; PL00118.22.54A - *Proposed North Facing Elevation (office building)*; PL00118.22.55A - *Proposed South Facing Elevation (office building)*; PL00118.22.56 - *Proposed East Facing Elevation (office building)*; PL00118.22.57 - *Proposed North Facing Elevation (workshop A)*; PL00118.22.58 - *Proposed North Facing Elevations (workshops A & B)*; PL00118.22.59 - *Proposed South Facing Elevation (workshop A)*; PL00118.22.60 - *Proposed South Facing Elevations (workshop A & B)*; PL00118.22.61 - *Proposed East Facing Elevation (workshop A)*; PL00118.22.62 - *Proposed West Facing Elevation (workshop A)*; PL00118.22.63 - *Proposed West Facing Elevation (workshop B)*; PL00118.22.64 - *Proposed East Facing Elevation (workshop B)*; PL00126.22.20D - *Strategic Consolidated Development*; F22115/02C - *Proposed Commercial Access Layout and Visibility Assessment*.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved drawings. There shall be no variations from these approved drawings.

- 2) No further development shall take place until a detailed written scheme of 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. Before commencement of development above ground the scheme of assessment shall be carried out at such points and to such depth as the Local Planning Authority may reasonably stipulate, including suitable consideration of asbestos and chlorinated solvents. All laboratory results shall be provided as numeric values in an electronic formatted spreadsheet in accordance with the standards of the Government Guidance for Land affected by Contamination A scheme for decontamination and validation shall then be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the scheme as approved shall be implemented before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied.
- 3) No further development shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the buildings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.
- 4) No further development shall take place until a timetable for removal of buildings shown to be demolished as part of the development hereby approved has been submitted to and agreed with the Local Planning Authority. The demolition of buildings shall be implemented thereafter in accordance with the approved timetable.

- 5) No further development shall take place until details demonstrating how the development would satisfy the 10% reduction of carbon emissions through renewable resources have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The renewable energy provision shall thereafter be implemented and retained in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) No further development shall take place until full details of soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved.

Details of soft landscape works shall include retained trees and full specifications for all proposed trees, hedges and shrubs; ground preparation, planting specifications and ongoing maintenance, together with details of areas to be grass seeded or turfed. Planting schedules shall include details of species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities.

All new planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the completion or use of the buildings hereby approved (whichever is the sooner) or otherwise in accordance with a programme to be agreed. Any trees or plants (including those retained as part of the development) which either during development or within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed, or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

- 7) No further development shall take place until a Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement relating to all stages of development, for the protection of all trees and hedges to be retained on site or trees located offsite within 12 metres of the site boundary, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall observe the principles of BS 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations), shall be implemented prior to any works commencing on site, shall be retained during the course of development.

In any event, the following restrictions shall be strictly observed unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority:

- a) No bonfires shall take place within the root protection area (RPA) or within a position where heat could affect foliage or branches.
 - b) No further trenches, drains or service runs shall be sited within the RPA of any retained trees.
 - c) No further changes in ground levels or excavations shall take place within the RPA of any retained trees.
- 8) No further development shall take place until a Bird Hazard Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted plan shall include details of management of any flat/shallow pitched/green roofs on buildings within the site which may be attractive to nesting, roosting and “loafing” birds.

The Bird Hazard Management Plan shall be implemented as approved upon completion of the buildings shall remain in force for the life of the buildings.

9) The buildings hereby approved shall not be brought into use until confirmation has been provided that either:-

- Foul water capacity exists off site to serve the development, or
- A development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with the Local Authority.

Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed, no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan, or 3. All Foul water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed.

10) The buildings hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the proposed amended accesses to Redehall Road have been constructed and provided with visibility zones in accordance with the approved plans (drawing references F22115/01 Rev B and F22115/02 Rev C) and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 0.6m high.

The buildings hereby approved shall not be brought into use until facilities for high quality, secure, lit and covered parking of bicycles and the provision of charging points with timers for e-bikes by said facilities have been provided within the development site in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the said approved facilities shall be provided, retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

11) The buildings hereby approved shall not be brought into use until space has been laid out within the car park to the north of the proposed workshops in accordance with the approved plans for vehicles to be parked, loaded and unloaded, and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking, loading and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes.

12) No further development shall take place until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of the following items has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development:

- a) Parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- b) Loading and unloading of plant and materials
- c) Storage of plant and materials
- d) Programme of works (including measures for traffic management)
- e) HGV deliveries and hours of operation
- f) Vehicle routing
- g) On-site turning for construction vehicles

13) No further development shall take place until details of the final design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the

planning authority. The final solution should follow the principles set out in the approved drainage strategy. 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 drainage details shall include:

- a) The results of ground conditions or infiltration testing completed in accordance with BRE Digest: 365 and confirmation of groundwater levels.
- b) Hydraulic calculations to demonstrate the proposed final solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 (+35% allowance for climate change) & 1 in 100 (+40% allowance for climate change) storm events. If infiltration is deemed unfeasible, associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate of 2.5l/s.
- c) Construction drawings for all drainage elements including cross sections and detailed drainage layout plan.
- d) An exceedance flow routing plan demonstrating no increase in surface water flood risk on or off site. The plan must include proposed levels and flow directions.
- e) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for all drainage elements.
- f) Details of how surface water will be managed during construction including measures to protect on site and downstream systems prior to the final drainage system being operational. Including details of how existing watercourse on and adjacent to the site will be protected.

14) The buildings hereby approved shall not be brought into use until a verification report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), confirming any defects have been rectified. Provide the details of any management company. Provide an 'As-Built' drainage layout and state the national grid reference of key drainage elements.

15) No further development shall take place until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP should be based on the proposed impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures specified in the Ecological Impact Assessment and Biodiversity Net Gain Report and should include, but not be limited to 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.
- d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
- e) Prescriptions for management actions, together with a plan of management compartments
- f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period
- g) Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan
- h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures

- i) Legal and funding mechanisms by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the applicant with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery.
- j) Monitoring strategy, including details of 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.
- k) Copper Coin Pond SNCI Mitigation Strategy.
- l) Bat Mitigation and Compensation Strategy.
- m) Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan.

Subsequently, the development shall only be undertaken in accordance with the approved Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, all measures set out within the approved Plan shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the dwelling and retained at all times thereafter.

- 16) No further development shall take place until a Construction and Ecological Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This document will need to be submitted to and approved by the LPA in writing, prior to the commencement of the development. The CEMP should include, but not be limited to:

- a) Map showing the location of all of the ecological features.
- b) Risk assessment of the potentially damaging construction activities
- c) Practical measures to avoid and reduce impacts during construction.
- d) Location and timing of works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- e) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- f) Ecological Constraints and Mitigation Plan.
- g) Use of protected fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.
- h) Copper Coin Pond SNCI Mitigation Strategy.

Subsequently, the development shall only be undertaken in accordance with the approved Construction and Ecological Management Plan, all measures set out within the approved Plan shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the dwelling and retained at all times thereafter.

- 17) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the recommendations and mitigation measures set out the Ecological Impact Assessment (prepared by FPCR dated January 2024), Biodiversity Net Gain Report (prepared by FPCR dated January 2024) and Landscape Strategy Plan received on 21st February 2024.

END OF SCHEDULE

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

- Vic Hester BA (Hons), DIP UPI, CMS, MRTPI – Partner, VLH Associates
- Leo Phillips BA (Hons) MLA, CMLI - Director, FPCR Landscape
- Mike Hickey - CEO, Coinford Ltd, Appellant

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

- Hannah Middleton, Principal Planning Officer
- Paul Batchelor, Planning and Development Manager