



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2025

by J Moore BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/W/24/3354846

Deer Park House, Hill Close, Wonersh, Guildford, Surrey GU5 0QP

- 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 N Rowe against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
- The application Ref is WA/2024/00143.
- The development proposed is Erection of two detached dwellings.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Erection of two detached dwellings at Deer Park House, Hill Close, Wonersh, Guildford, Surrey GU5 0QP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WA/2024/00143, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary and Procedural Matters

2. The description of development on the appeal form and decision notice is different to that used on the planning application form. The evidence indicates the change was agreed, and I have therefore used this description in my banner heading and formal decision above. During my visit I saw the appeal site from the neighbouring property of High Oaks, located on Bracken Close.
3. There was some confusion as to whether an earlier tree survey or report had been duly submitted to the appeal as part of the planning application. Following clarification, I am satisfied that this document was erroneously uploaded to the Council's website by the appellant during the determination phase and forms no part of the planning application.
4. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. The appeal timetable was such that all parties were able to make comments on this matter, and indeed some interested parties did so. However, I was not satisfied that the Council's statement had considered the revised Framework, and therefore, in the interests of natural justice and fairness, the Council was given an opportunity to make further comments on this matter. In the interests of efficiency, the deadline for the appellant's final comments was extended accordingly. The further amendment made on 7 February 2025 to the Framework does not constitute a change to policy, and therefore no party is prejudiced by a lack of consultation on this amendment.

Background and Main Issues

5. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. The evidence indicates that the committee resolved to refuse the application with reference to Policy RE2 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2003 (LPP1), and Policy DM14 of the of the Waverley Local

Plan – Part 2 (LPP2) which concern Green Belt. However, the decision notice refers to LPP2 Policy DM4, which concerns character and appearance. The evidence before me indicates that this was based on further officer advice. Although the main parties agree that the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, as the proposal would meet the requirements of paragraph 155 of the Framework, interested parties consider otherwise.

6. Therefore, having regard to all the evidence before me, the main issues are:
- the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt, having regard to the Framework, and any relevant development plan policies.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The Council draws my attention to the history of the area, such that it was once part of a wider property of Wonersh House, which included a pleasure garden of some 15 acres, a walled garden and a deer park. However, the evidence indicates that this property has long been demolished with some land given to public recreation, and much of the remaining land now forms the residential estate of Wonersh Park. There is nothing before me to indicate the presence or significance of any designated heritage asset within proximity, such that it might have a bearing on my findings. There is no compelling evidence before me to demonstrate that the site forms part of any area intended to remain undeveloped; nor to demonstrate that the appeal site forms any designated public open space or parkland.
8. Although the appeal site is within a proposed area of extension to the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (now referred to as National Landscape), the evidence indicates that following the second round of consultation which ended in December 2024, there will be a period of analysis and other stages before any final decision is made. The appeal site does not therefore benefit from any local or national landscape designation or any other designation (other than Green Belt) which might protect it from development.
9. The predominant character of Wonersh Park is of a residential estate of individually designed homes with variances in style, roof forms and building lines. During my visit, I saw that dwellings are predominantly, but not exclusively two storeys, including some with accommodation in their roof spaces. Boundaries are generally lined with trees and/or hedging with direct access to the street. The mature trees in the area, including those within gardens and along the roads make a positive contribution to its wooded character.
10. The evidence before me includes extensive detailed analysis of plots within the estate by the appellant and interested parties. Taking this data and my own observations into account, the estate has a spinal/central road called The Drive, which has two intersecting points with Mellerish Hill Road, one near the entrance to the estate and another farther south. Overall, it seems to me that in plan form, properties to the north of the second intersection appear to have more consistency and regularity in terms of plot shape/size and grain, compared to those to the south, where properties are generally in more spacious plots, with a looser grain of built form, more irregular building lines and/or plot shapes. Consequently, the area

to the south feels relatively more open and spacious than its northern counterpart, although the outward appearance of dwelling forms is largely similar. It seems to me that a mathematical approach to plot size, footprint, plot ratio and density that is based on an estate wide average does not take account for this distinction, even if the estate has developed organically over time.

11. Deer Park House is located within Hill Close, which is a cul-de-sac off The Drive, in the southern part of the estate. The plot has an irregular shape, and due to the curve of the road, it is much larger than its frontage suggests. The existing plot is about 10,456m², and the evidence indicates that this is the largest plot within the street. Deer Park House is a two-storey detached property of an 'Arts and Crafts' style and is located deep within the plot towards its northern boundary.
12. The existing plot includes heavily wooded areas towards its boundaries. The appellant's evidence indicates that tree works, including some tree felling and thinning has taken place in recent times, following a period of neglect and/or vacancy. The evidence of interested parties (which includes a previous tree survey) also indicates that a tree of high quality has been felled. However, there is no evidence to indicate that the site is the subject of any tree preservation order, nor that any felling and tree works have been unlawfully undertaken. In any event, as an Inspector considering a s78 appeal, it is not my role to determine such matters. I am bound to consider the application before me as submitted. Nonetheless, regardless of any recent tree works/felling, the plot has a heavily wooded appearance, such that its tree cover makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would require the removal of a small number of low-quality trees within the site, and this would not significantly alter the wooded nature of the site or the wider wooded character of the area.
13. The proposed dwellings would be located towards the western and southern parts of the existing plot. The evidence indicates that plot sizes along Hill Close range from 1,680m² to 3,888m². The proposal would result in two new plots of 2,980m² and 3,031m², and the residual plot for Deer Park House would be 4,445m². Dwelling footprints range from about 158m² to 276m². The proposed dwellings would be 225m² and 257m², with Deer Park House being 204m². These figures do not indicate an unacceptable degree of discordance in plot size, footprint, plot ratio or density compared to other properties along Hill Close.
14. Each dwelling would be two storeys with further roof accommodation, such that they would be 2.5 storeys. The design is described as a 'cottage' style, each with a detached garage and with some degree of variance such that they would not be identical. External materials would include red clay roof tiles, red hanging tiles and red brick with architectural detailing in accordance with the requirements of the design guidance within the Blackheath, Shamley Green and Womersley Village Design Statement (2007). Due to their scale, height, width and depth, together with their design and architectural detailing, each proposed dwelling would accord with the prevailing scale, design and massing of properties within the wider area, even though they would be taller than the host property of Deer Park House.
15. The separation distances would be reasonable between each proposed dwelling, particularly in comparison to the minimum separation distances found in Hill Close. While the intervening detached garage forms between the proposed dwellings would be sited close to the shared boundary of each plot, and well forward of their principal elevations, there are other properties in the wider area, including within

the southern part of the estate which also have garaging or outbuildings forward of their principal elevations or forward of the elevations which face the street.

16. There is no policy or guidance before me by which the number of rooms or bedrooms within a property is limited, nor to prevent accommodation within any roof space. I note that there are other properties in the immediate and wider area which appear as 2.5 or 3 storey properties and/or with roof accommodation, such that these features are not uncommon. The proposed dwellings would occupy a relatively higher position than neighbouring properties towards the south/southwest, due to the lie of the land. However, the difference is such that the proposed dwellings would not appear at a significantly taller height with such bulk and mass to their roof storey to the extent that they would be unacceptable within the streetscape or wider landscaped setting.
17. Access for the proposed dwellings would be taken from the existing drive serving Deer Park House, and the submitted plans indicate that each plot would have some form of gated entrance along their own driveways, which is commonplace within the area. The access drive from the existing driveway would appear across the frontage, but it would be largely screened by existing tree cover. In this regard the proposed dwellings would not follow the predominant character of direct access to the street, and interested parties draw my attention to the fact that no other properties within the estate have a shared access arrangement. It seems to me that other properties within the southern part of the estate also have limited visual presence within the street, being well set back from the road, and/or with their principal elevations not facing the street, such that the proposed arrangement would not be significantly discordant.
18. Plot 2 would have a strong wooded character due to the presence of trees in proximity. Nonetheless, there would be sufficient areas of more open/useable garden space to serve the dwelling. The evidence indicates that existing trees within the appeal site would be suitably protected during any construction phase, and this can be secured by condition. Although the Council's Tree Officer considers that there may be future pressure to prune or fell trees within Plot 2, no objection is made. Of itself, and in the absence of any tree preservation order, this is not sufficient reason to refuse the development. The protection of retained trees could be secured by condition, in accordance with the Tree Officer's recommendations.
19. A woodland management plan (in accordance with the recommendations of the report by Wychwood Environmental Ltd) would secure the proper management and maintenance of the northeast woodland habitat, such that it would revert to native lowland deciduous woodland. This would be a positive benefit of the proposal in terms of the wooded character of the estate and the wider area.
20. LPP2 Policy DM4 seeks to ensure high quality design and sets out that the principles of good design should be incorporated by having regard to a number of factors. This includes making the most efficient use of land, while being sympathetic and responsive to the prevailing pattern of development, and by taking account of various factors including (but not limited to) the spaces between buildings, established street patterns and existing features of the site, including trees. Overall, the proposal would be sympathetic and responsive to the prevailing pattern of development. While the estate has no example of a property without direct access to the street, it seems to me that the proposal strikes a reasonable

balance between making an efficient use of land whilst respecting the development pattern and wooded character of the wider estate.

21. The Council's submissions suggest that as a result of the proposal there would be increased domestic paraphernalia within the site. However, the fact that the appeal site forms part of the residential garden serving Deer Park House is a significant material consideration in this regard, whereby there is no impediment to the presence of any domestic paraphernalia within the site as it presently exists. While further built form within a very large plot would inevitably give it a more suburban character than at present, this would not be of such an effect as to be visually intrusive, such that it would be out of keeping within the estate.
22. Further concerns are raised that the appeal scheme would set a precedent for further development within the estate. However, no specific examples have been put before me of sites where similar development could be brought forward and any future proposal would need to be considered on its own merits. Therefore, the appeal scheme would not set a precedent.
23. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area, and it would accord with LPP1 Policy DM4.

Whether inappropriate development

24. LPP1 Policy RE2 and LPP2 Policy DM14 are in general conformity with the Framework, setting out that development is inappropriate in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances are demonstrated, and that proposals will be permitted where they do not conflict with the exceptions listed in national planning policy. However, the approach does not take account of paragraph 155 of the Framework, which identifies that the development of homes in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate, subject to certain criteria.
25. The Framework defines grey belt as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land (PDL) and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. The appeal site is within the defined settlement boundary of the village of Womersley. As land within a residential garden that is not within a large built-up area, it would meet the definition of previously developed land (PDL) within the Framework. The appeal site is not located near any large built-up area, nor is it close to a neighbouring town, historic or otherwise, and it would therefore not serve to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another or to preserve the setting and special character of a historic town. For these reasons, it would not strongly contribute to any of the three Green Belt purposes (a), (b) or (d) in paragraph 143 of the Framework, and it can therefore be classified as grey belt land.
26. While the plan area comprises a large amount of Green Belt land, the appeal site represents a very small proportion of this land. There is no compelling evidence before me to demonstrate that the proposal would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan, and I find no reason to consider otherwise. Furthermore, there are no relevant policies relating to the assets in footnote 7 of the Framework (other than Green Belt) which would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development. The proposal would therefore comply with criterion a) of paragraph 155 of the Framework.

27. The application would provide two homes. The evidence before me indicates that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the supply stated to be 2.8 years according to the Council. This is a considerable shortfall and represents a demonstrable unmet need for housing development in accordance with footnote 56 of the Framework. The proposal would therefore comply with criterion b) of paragraph 155 of the Framework.
28. Paragraph 110 of the Framework sets out that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of sustainable transport objectives. Given the limited extent of facilities and services within the village, it is likely that future occupiers would need to travel further afield to meet some of their day-to-day and other needs, likely by private vehicles. However, paragraph 110 of the Framework also indicates that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas.
29. I note that LPP1 Policy SP2 allows limited levels of development in and around certain villages including Wonersh, in order to maintain Waverley's character whilst ensuring needs are met in a sustainable manner. While the effect upon character is considered in the previous main issue, the location of the proposal would not be unsuitable in terms of the Council's spatial strategy. There is no objection from the local highway authority to the proposal, and I find no reason to consider otherwise. Turning space would be provided within the appeal site for vehicles to leave the site in forward gear with sufficient visibility and there is no compelling evidence to indicate a significant impact upon the transport network or any harm to highway safety. Measures to promote sustainable transport can be secured by condition. Given the above, the proposal would comply with criterion c) of paragraph 155 of the Framework.
30. As the proposal would not be a major development, it would not require compliance with criterion d) of paragraph 155. Drawing all of the above together, all relevant criteria of paragraph 155 of the Framework would be satisfied.
31. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposed development would therefore accord with LPP1 Policy RE2 and LPP2 Policy DM14, whose objectives I have set out above. Even if the proposal were to conflict with any of the exceptions within LPP2 Policy DM14, as some interested parties contend, the material considerations of the Framework are such that this would not alter my conclusion on this main issue.

Other Matters

Biodiversity Net Gain

32. Interested parties raise concerns that the proposal does not demonstrate 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG) or demonstrate net gain by use of a biodiversity metric, and my attention is drawn to the consultation responses of Surrey Wildlife Trust in this regard. Interested parties also suggest that account should be taken of tree works and/or felling before the application was made, with reference to Schedule 14, clause 6 of the Environment Act 2021 (the Act).
33. I have carefully considered the wording of LPP2 Policy DM1, which states that (with the appellant's emphasis underlined), "Development should ... g) Follow the mitigation hierarchy as set out in DM1a) to: i) avoid negative impacts upon biodiversity deliver the minimum biodiversity net gain of 10% as required by the

Environment Act 2021. The biodiversity net gain should be compared to the baseline and calculated using the most up to date national biodiversity metric.”

34. I have also considered the Planning Practice Guidance¹. Although this makes reference to a paragraph within a previous version of the Framework, it sets out that “Planning authorities and neighbourhood planning bodies when preparing new policies in line with paragraph 185 will want to take account of the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain. Plan-makers should be aware of the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, but they do not need to include policies which duplicate the detailed provisions of this statutory framework. It will also be inappropriate for plans or supplementary planning documents to include policies or guidance which are incompatible with this framework, for instance by applying biodiversity net gain to exempt categories of development or encouraging the use of a different biodiversity metric or biodiversity gain hierarchy.” (my emphasis underlined).
35. Schedule 14, clause 6 of the Act seeks to ensure that account is taken in the calculation of pre-development biodiversity value of “any activities on land on or after 30 January 2020 that are not in accordance with planning permission or any other permission specified by the Secretary of State by regulations”. This part of the Act clearly applies to the biodiversity gain objective (i.e. mandatory 10% BNG).
36. Drawing all of the above together, I am satisfied that the wording of LPP2 DM1 refers to the mandatory 10% BNG as required by statute. The proposal is exempt from this by virtue of the temporary exemption for small development and by the fact that the application was made before 12 February 2024. By the same token, the provisions of Schedule 14, clause 6 of the Act regarding pre-development biodiversity value do not apply in the circumstances of this case.
37. The various reports submitted with the application demonstrate that the appeal site has been assessed in terms of habitat, and with due regard to protected, invasive and other species, with further surveys undertaken accordingly. These reports collectively include recommendations to protect and improve biodiversity. Consequently, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in significant harm to biodiversity such that it should be refused; and that a measurable net gain in biodiversity can be secured by a suitable pre-commencement condition. In such circumstances, the proposal would satisfy the requirements of LPP2 Policy DM1 and the requirements of the Framework at paragraph 187 that decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by (among other things) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity.

Other

38. Neighbouring occupiers raise privacy concerns due to the presence, siting and height of the proposed dwellings, differences in land levels, the presence of a rear dormer to the dwelling at Plot 1 and the relationship to private amenity space serving neighbouring properties. During my visit, I was able to walk the perimeter of the appeal site along the shared boundaries with neighbouring properties at High Oaks, Heron’s Brook and Hambledon House. At High Oaks, I was able to view the appeal site from all vantage points within their grounds, including from points at a relatively high level within the contours of their plot, and along the full length of the shared boundary to the appeal site. I was also able to view the relationship

¹ Planning Practice Guidance: Biodiversity Net Gain, May 2024 - Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 74-006-20240214

between the appeal site and the rear part of the grounds of Hambledon House from within the grounds of High Oaks.

39. I appreciate that the proposed dwellings would impact upon the level of privacy presently enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers. However, taking account of the combination of various factors, including the nature of separation distances, the degree of intervisibility between the rear dormer proposed for the dwelling at Plot 1 and neighbouring properties, intervening tree cover and other vegetation (whether or not in leaf), the differences in level, siting and height of the proposed dwellings, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact upon the privacy of neighbouring occupiers, nor an unacceptably overbearing relationship.
40. Interested parties consider that the proposal would encourage car dependency. However, measures to encourage the uptake of more sustainable modes of transport can be secured by condition. Furthermore, trips for day-to-day needs including schooling would not be materially different to those made by residents within the wider estate.
41. Concerns are raised regarding the impact of the construction phase of the development, including the effects upon wildlife and biodiversity. These matters can be controlled by conditions requiring protective measures, mitigations and precautionary approaches in the interests of protected species, and by other regulatory frameworks. Effects upon residential amenity and highway/pedestrian safety can be controlled by a condition requiring a construction method statement, and I would consider it reasonable and necessary to do so in the context of the site if I were to allow the appeal.
42. Further concerns are raised that information was not fully or properly presented to the Council's committee and the resolution made was not properly reflected in the reasons for refusal. However, it is not uncommon for resolutions to be made and subsequently altered in light of further officer advice prior to the issue of a decision notice. Such matters are the responsibility of the determining local planning authority. For the avoidance of doubt, these matters, together with the conduct of any person or party including (but not limited to) landowners, applicants, officers, interested parties, and agents/representatives do not affect my consideration of the appeal. I have considered the application as submitted on its planning merits.
43. The proposal would deliver two dwellings, which would assist in meeting housing needs even if it does not include affordable housing. This would assist in meeting the government's objective to significantly increase the supply of land for homes. As set out earlier in my decision, the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, and the proposal would contribute to this shortfall. Even if two dwellings would be a small contribution, these matters would attract positive weight in favour of the proposal. The proposal would provide temporary economic benefits during the construction phase, with further permanent benefits arising thereafter from household expenditure.
44. The proposal would meet the definition of PDL within the Framework, and paragraph 124 sets out that planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. There is no compelling evidence before me to demonstrate that the proposal would fail to meet this objective. Paragraph 125 c) of the Framework sets

out that planning decisions should (among other things) give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, proposals for which should be approved unless substantial harm would be caused. This matter is a positive consideration in favour of the proposal.

Conditions

45. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council, comments from the appellant including pre-commencement, and in light of the PPG. For clarity, precision and to ensure compliance with the PPG, I have undertaken some amendments, editing and rationalisation. Where conditions require compliance prior to the commencement of development, the appellant has provided their written agreement to their terms as per s100ZA of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
46. Conditions 1 and 2 respectively impose a time limit for commencement and require the development to be completed in accordance with the approved plans. These conditions are necessary in the interests of clarity, precision and enforceability.
47. Conditions 3-9 inclusive are reasonably and necessarily imposed as pre-commencement conditions so that controls and measures are in place prior to any works undertaken and in order to ensure that mitigations and enhancements for biodiversity are suitably secured prior to development taking place.
48. Condition 3 is necessary to ensure that retained trees are protected from harm during the construction phase of the development in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and biodiversity. Conditions 4-6 inclusive are necessary to prevent harm to protected species and in the interests of biodiversity. Condition 6 is also necessary to ensure that a strategy is in place to secure suitable mitigations and enhancements for reptiles and amphibians. Condition 7 is necessary to ensure that a plan is in place to protect woodland habitat during the construction phase of the development, and to ensure that arrangements are in place for its proper management and maintenance, in the interests of biodiversity and the character and appearance of the area. Condition 8 is necessary to ensure that a plan is in place to ensure that impacts upon biodiversity are minimised and/or mitigated, and that the enhancements proposed are suitably secured and demonstrate a net gain for biodiversity.
49. I have imposed condition 9 to ensure that a Construction Method Statement is in place to control noise, disturbance and pollution arising from construction activity; to ensure public safety and the safe operation of the highway network; and to protect the reasonable amenity of neighbours.
50. Conditions 10 and 11 are respectively imposed to control the external appearance of the dwellings, and to ensure suitable hard and soft landscaping works. Such conditions are reasonable and necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the development and the wider area. Conditions 12 and 13 are reasonable and necessary in the interests of highway safety. As no cycle store is indicated within the scheme, condition 14 seeks to ensure that cycle parking is agreed and implemented prior to occupation, in the interests of sustainable transport. As no refuse and recycling facilities are indicated, a condition to secure these is necessary in the interests of residential amenity.

51. In the interests of biodiversity, a condition to control lighting is reasonable and necessary. Condition 17 is reasonable and necessary in the interests of residential amenity.
52. I have imposed a condition to secure the proposed energy efficiency measures in the development, and to ensure that the siting of air source heat pumps is suitably controlled in the interests of climate change and residential amenity. Condition 19 regarding tree protection is necessary in the interests of biodiversity and the character and appearance of the area, as recommended by the Council's Tree Officer.
53. Furthermore, in light of the wooded nature of the appeal site together with the evidence regarding the presence and/or likely presence of protected species and woodland habitat within the wider site, the Council suggests that a number of conditions go to the heart of the permission. I find no reason to disagree. In my judgement, it is clear that conditions Nos 3-8 inclusive and condition No 19, which collectively seek to secure precautionary working methods, protective measures, mitigations, enhancements and tree protection are reasonable and necessary in order to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Conclusion

54. I have found that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area, and it would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It therefore accords with the development plan, read as whole. There are no material considerations to indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission should be granted, subject to the conditions that I have set out.

J Moore

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions - Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/W/24/3354846

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing Nos: PL01-A; PL03-B; PL04-B; PL05-A; PL06-C; PL07-B; PL08; PL09; PL10; PL11.

Pre-commencement conditions

- 3) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until the scheme for the protection of the retained trees (the tree protection plan) has been installed and all required information has been provided to the local planning authority as set out in the Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) by David Archer Associates dated October 2023 (hereby approved), including the name and contact details of the suitably qualified supervising arboriculturist.

No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place unless and until the installation of the tree protection measures has been verified by the local planning authority, including any agreed modifications at any pre-site meetings. The developer/arboriculturist shall provide written notice to the local planning authority of the date of the installed tree protection measures and/or the date(s) of any modified installations.

The verification by the local planning authority shall be via an in-person inspection and/or by the submission of photographic evidence (provided this is agreed in writing with the local planning authority following any site meeting). The local planning authority shall provide written confirmation of verification of the installed/modified tree protection measures.

Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved AMS (including reporting procedures, supervision requirements and record keeping) and the installed/modified tree protection measures shall be maintained in-situ and not moved or removed until all construction activity has finished and all construction related equipment, materials and machinery are removed from site.

- 4) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a badger precautionary method of working has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The precautionary method of working shall demonstrate that works will be undertaken outside the badger breeding season (between 1st July and 30th November) and shall include details of notification procedures and actions in the event that any additional badger activity is detected during the clearance and construction phases of the development. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved precautionary method of working.
- 5) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a hazel dormouse precautionary method of working has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved precautionary method of working.

- 6) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a Reptile and Amphibian Mitigation Strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Strategy shall be based on the findings and recommendations of the submitted ecological reports accompanying the application and shall include, but not be limited to the following:
- a) Description of the aims and objectives of the Strategy;
 - b) Location and map of the proposed translocation site;
 - c) Assessment of the habitats present, including their ecological function to reptiles and amphibians;
 - d) Details of measures to protect reptiles and amphibians during the construction phase of the development;
 - e) Details of required management measures;
 - f) A work schedule, including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period;
 - g) A monitoring strategy, including details of how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development delivers the fully functioning objectives of the approved Strategy;
 - h) Details of the responsible body/bodies and/or organisation(s) responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the strategy and the legal and funding mechanisms by which the long-term implementation and monitoring of the strategy will be secured.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Reptile and Amphibian Mitigation Strategy.

- 7) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a Woodland Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan shall be based on the proposed impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures specified in the Woodland Assessment - Letter of Report, by Wychwood Environmental Ltd dated October 2024 and shall include, but not be limited to the following:
- a) Description of the aims and objectives of the Plan;
 - b) A plan to demarcate in detail, maintain and manage the northeast woodland Habitat of Principal Importance as a native Lowland Deciduous Woodland;
 - c) A plan for the sensitive removal of trees;
 - d) A plan to eradicate invasive and non-native species;
 - e) Details of native species planting and other proposed biodiversity enhancement features;
 - f) A work schedule, including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period;
 - g) A monitoring strategy, including details of how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the

development delivers the fully functioning objectives of the approved Plan;

- h) Details of the responsible body/bodies and/or organisation(s) responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the Plan and the legal and/or funding mechanisms by which the long-term implementation and monitoring of the Plan will be secured.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Woodland Management Plan.

- 8) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a Biodiversity Enhancement and Mitigation Plan (BEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The BEMP shall be based on impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures specified in the submitted ecological reports accompanying the application and shall include, but not be limited to the following:

- a) Description of the aims and objectives of the BEMP;
- b) Details of the measurable biodiversity net gain that will be achieved as a result of the BEMP with reference to a baseline;
- c) Evaluation of features to be provided;
- d) A location plan of all biodiversity enhancements to be provided;
- e) A timetable for the implementation of all biodiversity enhancements;
- f) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;
- g) Prescriptions for management actions;
- h) A monitoring strategy, including details of how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development delivers the fully functioning objectives of the approved BEMP;
- i) Details of the responsible body/bodies and/or organisation(s) responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the BEMP.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved BEMP.

- 9) No development shall take place, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:

- a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- c) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- d) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
- e) delivery, demolition and construction working hours.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

Early stage and pre-occupancy conditions

- 10) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials as specified on the approved drawings.
- 11) No dwelling shall be occupied until a scheme for landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include the following:
 - a) details of all hard and soft surfacing to include type, position, design, dimensions and materials and any sustainable drainage system used;
 - b) a schedule detailing sizes and numbers/densities of all proposed trees/plants including details of tree pit design, use of guards or other protective measures and the location, species, size, nursery stock type, supplier and defect period;
 - c) details of all boundary treatments to include type, position, design, dimensions and materials.

The landscaping shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme in the first planting season after completion or the first occupation of the development, whichever is the sooner.

Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

- 12) The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the existing vehicular access onto Hill Close has been provided with 2m x 25m visibility splays, in accordance with a scheme that shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the visibility splays shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction between 0.6m and 2.0m above ground level.
- 13) The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes.
- 14) The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until secure cycle parking for each dwelling has been laid out within the site in accordance with a scheme that shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the secure cycle parking shall be retained and maintained for its designated purpose.
- 15) The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until a scheme for the storage of refuse and recycling has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be carried out and provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development and the refuse and recycling storage facilities shall thereafter be retained for use at all times.
- 16) The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until a Lighting Design Strategy for Biodiversity has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall

demonstrate how and where external lighting will be installed and shall include lighting contour plans and technical specifications to demonstrate that that all areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent sensitive species using their territory or accessing their breeding sites and resting places.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved strategy and shall thereafter be maintained and operated in accordance with the approved strategy for the lifetime of the development.

- 17) The window on the first floor of the east-facing elevation of the dwelling at Plot 1 serving an ensuite shall be obscurely glazed to Pilkington Textured Glass Privacy Level 5 or standard equivalent and be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed, and shall be retained at such a privacy level for the lifetime of the development and shall not at any time be replaced with clear glazing.
- 18) The measures detailed in the Planning Energy Statement by Surrey Energy dated 16 October 2023 (hereby approved) shall be incorporated into the final design of the development. Prior to the installation of air source heat pumps (ASHPs), details of their siting, scale and appearance shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The ASHPs shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of each dwelling and shall be retained in operational working order for the lifetime of the development.

Tree Protection

- 19) In this condition 'retained tree' means an existing tree, which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars.
 - a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted, destroyed, pruned, cut or damaged in any manner within five years from the date of the first occupation of the development hereby permitted other than in accordance with the approved plans and details.
 - b) If any retained tree is cut down, uprooted or destroyed or dies within five years from the date of the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species and shall be planted, at such time as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

*** END OF SCHEDULE ***