



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2025

by **C Harding BA (Hons) PGCert PGDip MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4<sup>th</sup> April 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/W/24/3342039**

**Land Adjacent Orchard Way, Orchard Way, Easton On The Hill,  
Northamptonshire PE9 3LU**

- 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 Paul Gibbons against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
  - The application Ref is NE/23/00841/FUL.
  - The development proposed is construction of 2 new dwellinghouses (including 1 self-build unit), enhancement of orchard priority habitat, proposed parking, landscaping and boundary treatments; associated highway works to deliver turning head (approved under application ref: 17/01942/FUL and technical details approved under ref: 18/01028/CND).
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of 2 new dwellinghouses (including 1 self-build unit), enhancement of orchard priority habitat, proposed parking, landscaping and boundary treatments; associated highway works to deliver turning head at Land Adjacent Orchard Way, Orchard Way, Easton On The Hill, Northamptonshire PE9 3LU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref NE/23/00841/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

### Application for costs

2. An application for costs has been made by Mr Paul Gibbons against North Northamptonshire Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

### Preliminary Matters

3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') was published in December 2024, and I have afforded the main parties opportunity to comment upon the changes within it.
4. In the interests of clarity, in my formal decision I have omitted those parts of the description of the proposal which are not acts of development.

### Main Issues

5. The main issues are;
  - the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area, including its effect upon the significance of Easton on the Hill Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings, and;
  - whether the appeal site is a suitable location for residential development having regard to the spatial strategy.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

6. The appeal site lies close to the western boundary of the Easton on the Hill Conservation Area ('the CA'). The significance of the CA is derived, insofar as it relates to this appeal, from the historic street pattern of the settlement, which is tightly-knit, along with the age, architectural quality and distinctive yet consistent materials of buildings within the CA. I saw that the position of many buildings within the CA are located at the back of the footway which contributes to the formal and well-preserved character of the village core.
7. To the east of the appeal site is located 35 and 37 West Street, a Grade II listed building. The listing description identifies that it dates from the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Its significance is derived from its age, pleasing design and proportions, including stone mullioned windows, and its use of locally distinctive materials.
8. Glebe Cottage is a Grade II listed building located to the north of the appeal site, beyond modern residential properties on Orchard Way. This is also a 17<sup>th</sup> century building, and its significance is derived from its age, pleasing design and proportions and its use of locally distinctive materials.
9. Priest's House is a Grade II\* listed building located opposite to the entrance to Orchard Way. Its significance is derived from its considerable age and relatively high status, its architectural distinctiveness and its relationship with the village church which is located to the north.
10. The evidence indicates that the appeal site may have historic connections with 35 and 37 West Street and the wider CA as part of a larger area of orchards, or enclosed paddock or burgage plots extending to the rear of buildings on the western side of West Street. However, even if this was the case, much of any such character has been previously eroded by the construction of modern dwellings on Orchard Way and by development within, or the sub-division of, land associated with these properties and those on West Street.
11. I saw that the character of the CA is such that roads within it, including West Street are lined by buildings close to the rear of the footway. This provides a relatively self-contained character, with heavily framed views along thoroughfares. Views towards land behind built form are limited and restricted. 35 and 37 West Street is also self-contained, with substantial boundary treatments to the rear. Its visual relationship with the appeal site is minimal, and overall, the appeal site is largely imperceptible from within the CA.
12. However, the appeal site does contribute positively to the setting of the CA by forming a remnant of former uses of land around the settlement, and this can be appreciated from public vantage points on Orchard Way due to the open nature of the site. Both parties consider that the appeal site makes a positive contribution to the setting of the CA and 35 and 37 West Street, and I also find this is the case, although the level of contribution is minor.
13. The proposal would introduce into this space two dwellings of a traditional design, using materials reflective of the area. They would be positioned towards the southern boundary, with the north-western part of the site retained and enhanced as an area of orchard. The introduction of the dwellings would erode the existing

character of the site in terms of its contribution towards understanding the historic evolution of the settlement edge, including any relationship the appeal site may have had with 35 and 37 West Street.

14. Nevertheless, the proposed dwellings would be adequately spaced and although larger than some nearby buildings, would be generally respectful of their context in terms of layout, scale and design. Although they would be notably larger than properties on Orchard Way, there would be some visual separation, and there is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the dwellings would be harmfully prominent in local views. The retention and enhancement of the small area of remaining orchard would retain some echo of the past use of the site and the area around it. Given the level of erosion to the character of the edge of the CA in this location and to the setting of 35 and 37 West Street that has already taken place, the level of additional harm that would result to these heritage assets would be minor in nature.
15. With regard to Priest's House and Glebe Cottage, intervening modern development on Orchard Close has almost entirely severed any visual relationship that may have existed between the appeal site and these buildings. As a result, the appeal site makes little, if any, contribution to their setting. The effect of the proposal upon the significance of these heritage assets would be neutral, and I note that the Council has not raised any concerns in this respect.
16. For these reasons, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, including the significance of heritage assets. It would therefore fail to accord with JCS Policies JCS2 and JSC11 and LPP2 Policies EN2 and EN12. Together, and amongst other factors, these policies require that developments, including infill development, protect, and where possible, enhance the significance of heritage assets and preserve the character of settlements.

### **Heritage Balance**

17. Paragraph 215 of the Framework establishes that any harm to heritage assets should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case, the proposal would result in minor harm to the special interest of 35 and 37 West Street by eroding a characteristic of its setting that contributes to its significance. There would also be some harm to the setting of the CA. In terms of the Framework, the harms would be less than substantial, but would nevertheless be of considerable importance and weight.
18. The proposal is for two dwellings, one of which would be a self-build dwelling. The government's support for self-build and custom-build housing is clear. The Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 requires planning authorities to establish and publicise a register of those who are seeking to acquire serviced plots of land in the authority's area for their own self-build and custom housebuilding. The appellant is on the Council's relevant register. The Housing and Planning Act of 2016 provides that planning authorities must give suitable development permission in respect of enough serviced plots of land to meet the demand identified.
19. It is stated by the appellant, and it is not disputed by the Council, that demand for self-build housing plots in the area significantly exceeds supply, and that this has persisted for a number of years. This would indicate that the Council is failing to meet its duty in this regard. The delivery of a single self-build dwelling would go

some way to addressing this undersupply. Given the requirements of the Housing and Planning Act 2016, this is a public benefit to which I afford considerable weight.

20. Additionally, while the Council considers that it can demonstrate an overall adequate supply of deliverable housing land, the provision of two dwellings would still represent a boost to the supply and mix of housing more generally in line with the government's stated aim at Paragraph 61 of the Framework. I afford this factor moderate weight as an additional public benefit.
21. The proposal would lead to the consolidation and improvement of an existing small area of orchard, which would represent a level of biodiversity net gain ('BNG') of around 50%, and this would represent a further public benefit. However, I note that the area is not large, and although the BNG gain is significant in percentage terms, it is notable that the absolute gain would be expected to be around 0.7 units, which is a modest amount.
22. Furthermore, no biodiversity net gain plan has been provided, and although conditions have been suggested by the Council, uncertainty would remain in relation to the ongoing management, maintenance and retention of BNG features in the longer term. Therefore, taking a precautionary approach, I afford this factor only modest weight as a benefit of the scheme.
23. It is also stated, and not disputed by the Council, that the proposal would generate 7 full-time equivalent jobs and £380,000 of economic output during the construction of the scheme, that future occupants would generate an economic output of around £180,000 through employment, and that future residents would have a combined average spend of around £32,000 on retail, leisure and goods service. These are further public benefits of the proposal to which I afford modest weight.
24. Together the public benefits carry significant weight. I need to weigh this against the harm to heritage assets that would arise from the proposal, and take into account Paragraph 212 of the Framework, which states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset. The harm relates to the special interest of the listed building identified and the character and appearance of the CA. Whilst I afford great weight to the less than substantial harm that I have found, I am satisfied that the public benefits of the proposal would be sufficient to outweigh this harm.

#### *Suitable location*

25. The development strategy of the East Northamptonshire Local Plan Part 2 2023 ('LPP2') identifies Easton on the Hill as a large freestanding village. Policy 11 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011 – 2031 ('JCS') states that small scale infill development in rural areas will be permitted on suitable sites within villages where this would not materially harm the character of the settlement and residential amenity or exceed the capacity of local infrastructure or services.
26. LPP2 Policy EN1 provides support for small-scale infill development within existing built-up areas, as defined through LPP2 Policy EN2 and its supporting text, or within a Neighbourhood Plan, that help to maintain and strengthen local services in freestanding villages.

27. The supporting text to LPP2 Policy EN2 defines a built-up area as those settlements comprising a cluster of 20 or more residential buildings, including areas that have a closer relationship, in character and scale, to that cluster defining a settlement than that of the surrounding countryside.
28. In this respect the appeal site forms a defined area of grassland and orchard with a turning head to the rear of properties on West Street. I saw that the appeal site is currently accessible from Orchard Way. To the south of the appeal site lies the garden associated with a residential dwelling, and beyond, farm buildings. To the north are found residential properties along Orchard Way. As a result, although grazing land can be found to the west, the appeal site is bounded by residential properties, or land associated with them, on three sides.
29. The appeal site does not extend beyond an existing strong definition to the western edge of this part of the settlement. Therefore, its character is of open land within a built-up area, rather than forming a part of, or extension to the wider countryside. I therefore consider that it has a closer relationship to the settlement, and accordingly forms part of the built-up area.
30. The definition of 'small scale infill development' within the supporting text of JCS Policy 11 refers to 'the development of vacant or under-developed land within the main built up area of the village on land which is bounded by existing built curtilages on at least two sides, such as the filling in of a small gap in an otherwise substantially built up frontage'.
31. As set out above, the appeal site is bounded by residential development on three sides, however given that the level of built development on these boundaries varies and that the appeal site addresses the end of the cul-de-sac of Orchard Way rather than an established frontage, I accept that it would not comprise the infill of a small gap in an otherwise substantially built-up frontage.
32. However, on a fair reading of this definition, the reference to the filling in of a small gap in an otherwise substantially built up frontage is simply an example of one instance that may constitute infill development. It is not a singular test that all potential infill development must fulfil in order to be considered as such. It therefore follows that other forms of development may also be considered to be small-scale infill development for the purposes of this policy, depending on individual circumstances.
33. Given the nature of surrounding development, and the fact that the appeal proposal would not extend the built-form of the village into the countryside beyond an existing western extent established by neighbouring developments, I consider that it would, in this instance, nevertheless comprise infill development for the purposes of this policy.
34. LPP2 Policy EN2 (ii) provides support for infill development within a built-up area where (a) the site is well-related to the principal built-form of the settlement and not protected for any other use; (b) is clearly distinct from the surrounding countryside, both physically and visually; and (c) is bounded by existing or committed development on at least two sides, which should be adjoined by a highway and located such that developing it would not extend the built form away from a highway to create a backland form of development.

35. There is no evidence before me to indicate that the appeal site protected for other use. In terms of its visual and physical relationship with countryside, it is bordered by existing development on three sides. Beyond, to the west is wider countryside, however there is clear separation, with a substantial metal boundary treatment present. Furthermore, the character of the appeal site differs from the agricultural or grazing uses of the surrounding countryside due to the trees and orchard remnants that occupy the site, and the fact that it is open to access and views from Orchard Way.
36. The appeal site is accessible directly from Orchard Way by means of an existing turning head. Although located to the rear of West Street, it would be well related to Orchard Way in this respect and would effectively appear as a continuation of it. As a result, it would not comprise backland development.
37. Therefore, the appeal site would be a suitable location for residential development having regards to the spatial strategy and would accord with JCS Policy 11 and LPP2 Policies EN1 and EN2, the content of which I have set out above, and insofar as they relate to this main issue.
38. The Council has also cited conflict with LLP2 Policy EN3, however as this policy relates to development beyond the extent of the built-up area, and I have found that the appeal is within the built-up area, it is not relevant to this main issue.

### **Other Matters**

39. The proposal has received both objection and support from interested parties, and I have had full regard to all representations in reaching my decision.
40. In relation to the potential for public use of the proposed orchard area to affect the living conditions of occupiers of nearby properties, I note that the area in question is not large, and no seating or other means of congregation is proposed within it. There is no substantive evidence before me to indicate that the use of the area would be unacceptably harmful to nearby occupiers, subject to the imposition of a planning condition requiring the agreement of maintenance and management arrangements for this area.
41. Concern has also been raised in relation to noise and disturbance from construction work, and the use of Orchard Way for construction traffic. I am satisfied that these issues can be adequately controlled by means of planning condition.
42. A further comment notes that the proposal would lead to the loss of some trees and raises concern about the implications of this for wildlife. Having had regard to the evidence before me, including the ecological appraisal and biodiversity net gain calculation and landscaping plan, I consider that it is likely that in the longer term that the proposal would not harm biodiversity interests and would ultimately be likely to deliver an overall net gain.

### **Conditions**

43. I have had regard to the planning conditions suggested by the Council and the comments of the appellant. I have considered these against the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance ('PPG'). Where necessary, I have sought the agreement of the appellant in relation to pre-commencement conditions.

44. Conditions 1 and 2 are required in order to define the permission and a period for commencement in the interests of clarity. Condition 3 requires additional work in relation to land contamination and is required in the interests of the living conditions of future occupiers of the development. The condition is required to be pre-commencement in order to ensure that relevant risks are understood before groundworks start.
45. Condition 4 requires tree protection measures to be agreed and installed and is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. The condition is required to be pre-commencement so that adequate protection is in place prior to any works being undertaken.
46. Conditions 6 and 7 require further details in relation to site levels and the agreement of materials and are necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. Condition 8 relates to the management of construction practices and are required in the interests of the living conditions of nearby occupiers.
47. Conditions 9, 10 and 11 all relate to details of the proposed access and are necessary to ensure that the proposal does not harm highway safety. Condition 12 requires waste collection measures to be agreed and is necessary in the interests of the living conditions of existing and future occupiers, and sound environmental practices.
48. I have attached Condition 13 in order to ensure that adequate measures for the management of landscape areas are in place. This is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, to ensure that biodiversity net gain is secured, and in the interests of the living conditions of existing and future occupiers. Condition 14 relating to the provision of details of boundary treatments is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
49. Conditions 15 and 16 are required in order to mitigate the effects of the development upon biodiversity interests. Condition 17 relates to the occupation of one of the dwellings as a self-build dwelling and is required in order to ensure that the stated public benefits are delivered.
50. I have not attached the Council's suggested condition in relation to the removal of permitted development rights as the Framework and PPG indicate that such rights should only be removed in exceptional circumstances. Such circumstances have not been demonstrated in this instance, and I consider that the condition would be excessively onerous, making it both unnecessary and unreasonable. It would therefore fail the relevant tests set out in guidance.
51. The Council's suggested condition in relation to the provision of a Biodiversity Metric 4.0 assessment is not necessary as such information was provided with the planning application. This condition would therefore be unnecessary, and I have not imposed it in this instance as a result.
52. I have also not attached the suggested condition relation to the use of the field beyond the western extent of the site. This land falls outside of the appeal site and although in the control of the appellant, it has not been shown why such a condition would be necessary. The condition would therefore fail the relevant tests.

## Conclusion

53. The proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the setting of a listed building and the character and appearance of the CA. In doing so, it would conflict with JCS Policies 2 and 11, and LPP2 Policies EN2 and EN12 which require new development to preserve the significance of heritage assets, and the character of settlements. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to the development plan as a whole.
54. As outlined above, I have concluded that the benefits of the proposal would outweigh the harm to heritage assets. Accordingly, the Framework does not indicate that permission should be refused on this basis. Furthermore, as the relevant development plan policies make no provision for the balancing of harm to heritage assets against the public benefits of the proposal, the weight to which I afford the conflict with the development plan in this regard is reduced.
55. Residual harm would remain due to the conflict of the proposal with parts of JCS Policy 11 and LPP2 Policy EN2, however, as set out, the harm to the wider character of the statement is primarily related to the effect of the proposal upon heritage assets. Accordingly, on the basis of my reasoning set out above, I consider that the public benefits of the proposal would outweigh such harm and conflict with the development plan in this respect.
56. Therefore, I find that there are material considerations which would indicate that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan in this case.
57. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*C Harding*

INSPECTOR

### \*\*\*SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS\*\*\*

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the following plans and documents:

Part Block Plan – Proposed Turning Head Drawing No. (20)G02 Revision D  
Existing Site Location & Block Plans Drawing No.101  
Proposed House 2 Elevations & Sections Drawing No.106  
Proposed House 2 GA and Roof Plans Drawing No. 105  
Proposed House 1 GA Plans, Section & Elevations Drawing No. 104  
Heritage Impact Assessment (Marrons) dated August 2023  
Planning, Design and Access Statement (Marrons) dated August 2023  
Self-Build & Custom Housebuilding Assessment – East Northamptonshire (Marrons) dated July 2023  
Biodiversity Assessment – Final report (Archer Ecology) dated August 2023)

Summary of Economic Benefits Relating to the Proposed Residential Development of the Two Self Build Homes on Land Adjacent Orchard Way, Easton on the Hill (Marrons) dated July 2023  
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal – Final report (Archer Ecology) dated August 2023  
Biodiversity Metric 4.0 calculation tool  
LAND ADJACENT TO ORCHARD WAY ECOLOGY ADDENDUM NOTE (Archer Ecology)  
Arboricultural Report & Impact Assessment (AWA) dated October 2023  
Transport Note from Magna Transport Planning dated 16.10.2023  
BLOCK PLAN – PROPOSED Drawing No. 102 Revision A.  
Proposed Garage GA Plans, Section & Elevations Drawing No. 107 Revision A  
Site Plan – Proposed 23-1130-103 Rev B.  
ARTISTS IMPRESSION FROM EYE LEVEL 23-1130-112 Revision A.  
ARTISTS IMPRESSION FROM WEST FIELD – 22-01130-111 Revision A.  
LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS – Drawing No.06 Revision E

3. No development shall take place until an assessment of the risks posed by any contamination, carried out in accordance with British Standard BS 10175: Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of Practice and the Environment Agency, Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) (or equivalent British Standards and Model Procedures if replaced), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. If any contamination is found, no development shall take place until:
  - (i) a report specifying the measures to be taken, including the timescale, to remediate the site to render it suitable for the development hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
  - (ii) the site has been remediated in accordance with the approved measures and timescale, and;
  - (iii) a verification report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

If, during the course of development, any contamination is found which has not been previously identified, work shall be suspended until:

- (i) additional measures for the remediation of the site have been carried out in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and
  - (ii) a verification report for all of the remediation works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
4. No development or other operations shall commence on site until the existing trees and/or hedgerows to be retained have been protected in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree or hedge shall be carried out before any equipment, machinery, or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of development or other operations. The fencing shall be retained intact for the full duration of the development until all equipment, materials and surplus materials have been removed from the site. If

the fencing is damaged all operations shall cease until it is repaired in accordance with the approved details. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any fenced area in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered.

5. No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

This written scheme will include the following components, completion of each of which will trigger the phased discharging of the condition:

- (i) fieldwork in accordance with the agreed written scheme of investigation.
  - (ii) post-excavation assessment (to be submitted within six months of the completion of fieldwork, unless otherwise agreed in advance with the Planning Authority);
  - (iii) completion of post-excavation analysis, preparation of site archive ready for deposition at a store (Northamptonshire ARC) approved by the local planning authority, completion of an archive report, and submission of a publication report to be completed within two years of the completion of fieldwork, unless otherwise agreed in advance with the local planning authority.
6. No development above slab level shall take place until drawings showing the slab levels and finished floor levels of the dwellings in relation to the existing and proposed ground levels of the site (in relation to an existing datum point) the ground levels of the surrounding land and the slab and finished floor levels of the surrounding properties as well as identifying the proposed ridge height levels and the ridge heights of all neighbouring properties. The development shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the details so approved in writing by the local planning authority.
7. No development above slab level shall take place until sample details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposal hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained in the approved manner in perpetuity.
8. No demolition or construction work (including deliveries to or from the site and sub-contractors) shall take place on the site outside the hours of 0800 and 1800 Mondays to Fridays and 0800 and 1300 on Saturdays, and at no times on Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority. Vehicles must enter the site immediately and must leave the site in a safe and controlled manner. The public highway shall not be used as a holding area for deliveries. There shall be no contractor parking on the public highway at any time. There shall be no burning of any material during construction, demolition or site preparation works, and wheel washing facilities provided in order to prevent the deposit of mud and other debris on adjacent roads by vehicles travelling to and from the construction site.

9. The first 5m of the private driveway (access), measured from the back of the highway turning head shall be hard surfaced, as per the Adopted Northamptonshire Highway Standards (2016).
10. No gates, barriers or means of enclosure shall be erected across a vehicular access within 5.5 metres of the highway boundary. Any such feature erected beyond that distance should be hung to open inwards away from the highway.
11. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, details of a means of drainage across the back of the highway (linear drain) across the proposed site access draining to soakaways contained within the applicant's own land shall be provided and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These materials shall be maintained and retained in perpetuity.
12. Prior to the occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted, details of the collection point for household waste shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This should be on an area of hardstanding adjacent to the adopted highway.
13. Prior to the occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted, a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibility and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All landscaping shall be managed in accordance with the approved landscape management plan.
14. Prior to the occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted, further details of any proposed fencing and boundary treatments shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter be maintained and retained in the agreed manner in perpetuity.
15. No external lighting shall be installed on the site until plans and details showing the type of light appliance, the height and position of fitting, illumination levels and light spillage in accordance with the appropriate Environmental Zone standards set out by the Institution of Lighting Professionals in their publication "The Reduction of Obtrusive Light" Guidance Note 01/21 (reference GN01/21), together with details of measures to control the duration when the lighting is switched on have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.  
  
Lighting shall not be installed other than in accordance with the approved details and shall be thereafter be maintained as approved.
16. The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with the recommendations and mitigation measure set out in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal in relation to bats and amphibians and reptiles.
17. The residential unit identified as house number 2 as shown on the (BLOCK PLAN – PROPOSED Drawing No. 102 Revision A) hereby permitted shall only be constructed as a self-build dwelling within the definitions of self-build and custom build housing in the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as

amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016). The first occupation of this unit shall be by a person or persons who had a primary input into the design and layout of the dwelling. The Council shall be notified of the persons who intend to take up first occupation of the unit in the development hereby permitted at least two months prior to first occupation.

**\*\*\*END OF SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS\*\*\***