



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2025

by **R Major BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/W/24/3350492

7 Harley Cottage, South View Road, Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire SL9 8RG

- 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 Pete Ryan against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/23/3049/FA.
 - The development proposed is erection of one detached dwelling with associated amenity space, access and parking provision.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of one detached dwelling with associated amenity space, access and parking provision at 7 Harley Cottage, South View Road, Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire SL9 8RG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/23/3049/FA, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. Subsequent to the Council issuing its decision the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. The main parties were given the opportunity to comment on the implications of the revised Framework and I have taken into account any comments raised.

Background and Main Issues

3. The Council's decision notice includes three reasons for refusal. Reason for Refusal 2 asserts that insufficient information was provided in respect of protected species and biodiversity net gain. As part of their Appeal Statement the Council has confirmed that additional relevant information has been received in respect of protected species. Furthermore, the Council stated that as the development would be a self-build dwelling it is exempt from the requirement to provide biodiversity net gain. As such the Council's Appeal Statement comments that they no longer wish to pursue Reason for Refusal 2.
4. The Council was however asked to confirm its position in respect of Reason for Refusal 2 in the event that the development was not secured as a self-build dwelling. In response, the Council confirmed that in such a scenario Reason for Refusal 2 would be applicable. This matter is considered in more detail below. Furthermore, in the interest of clarity, I have split Reason for Refusal 2 into two separate main issues.
5. In view of the above, the main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on highway safety, with particular regard to the suitability of the access;

- whether or not the development is required to provide biodiversity net gain, and if so, whether this is achieved or achievable;
- the effect of the development on protected species and / or their habitats; and
- the effect of the development on the integrity of the Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation.

Reasons

Highway Safety

6. The appeal site is accessed via the private dead-end highway of South View Road which connects to the 30mph public highway of Bull Lane.
7. The appeal submission is accompanied by a Highway and Transport Appeal Statement¹ (HTS) which includes results of a speed count taken from an Automatic Traffic Counter located to the south of the junction of Bull Lane and South View Road. The results show that the average speed of vehicles along this section of Bull Lane was 24.8mph southbound and 25.8mph northbound, with the 85-percentile of speeds being 29mph southbound and 30.3mph northbound. The HTS therefore concludes that traffic is generally travelling within the 30mph speed limit, and I have limited substantive evidence to the contrary.
8. The HTS also demonstrates that a visibility splay of 2.4m x 43m is achieved to the north of the junction, in accordance with the recommendation within the Manual for Streets (2007) for a 30mph highway. However, a visibility splay of 2.4m x 11m, or 2m x 12m, is achievable to the south. I observed on site that visibility to the south is compromised by an existing hedge to the front of a residential dwelling. The HTS explains if this hedge was cut back to the highway edge it would improve visibility by 2-3m. Nevertheless, it is accepted that the existing, and achievable, visibility to the south is below that recommended within the Manual for Streets for a 30mph highway.
9. The evidence before me claims that 14no. dwellings rely on South View Road, and therefore its junction with Bull Lane, for access. As such, the provision of an extra dwelling using this access would represent a circa 7% increase above the existing situation.
10. In terms of numbers, the HTS includes a manual traffic count for vehicles using the junction of Bull Lane and South View Road over a 12-hour period (07:00 – 19:00). The traffic count shows 49no. vehicles entered and 51no. vehicles exited South View Road during this 12-hour period. Using this information the HTS therefore predicts that the appeal proposal would result in approximately 7no. additional two-way vehicle movements over a 12-hour period. This is broadly consistent with the Council Highway Officer's expectation that the proposal would generate in the region of 4-6no. two-way vehicle movements per day.
11. Given the safety concern at this junction relates specifically to visibility as vehicles leave South View Road, the more relevant information is therefore the 51no. vehicles that exited. This represents an average of 1no. vehicle leaving South View Road approximately every 14-minutes over the 12-hour period.

¹ Prepared by SW Transport Planning Ltd - 29th July 2024

12. It is acknowledged that the number of vehicles leaving South View Road does fluctuate at different times of the day, and the traffic count shows the busiest time was between 15:00 – 16:00 where a total of 7no. vehicles left South View Road. This is equivalent to one every 8-9 mins.
13. In view of the submitted traffic count, I conclude that the junction of South View Road with Bull Lane is currently lightly trafficked.
14. The HTS goes on to calculate that the addition of one dwelling would likely increase the number of vehicles departing South View Road from 51 to 54.6 during this same 12-hour period. I find this figure represents a limited increase in the number of vehicles leaving South View Road during this time period.
15. Furthermore, visibility to the north meets the recommended distance and therefore vehicles turning left out of South View Road have a clear view of any southbound traffic before exiting and joining the carriageway. As such, it is predominantly vehicles turning right out of South View Road that are affected by the reduced visibility to the south (left).
16. The traffic count shows that of the 51no. vehicles that exited South View Road, 18no. (35%) turned right. Whilst I appreciate that this is a single survey, it does show that on this particular day more vehicles turned left out of South View Road. As such, whilst I have found that the proposal for 1no. dwelling would likely result in a limited increase in the overall number of vehicles leaving South View Road, the increase in the number of vehicles turning right would be even less.
17. Nevertheless, I accept that the proposal would result in a limited number of additional vehicle movements turning right out of this junction, and visibility when doing so does not meet the required standard. This in itself however does not mean that the existing access is unsafe, and an assessment of the site-specific circumstances is required.
18. In this regard, it is logical to assume that the visibility splay to the north allows drivers turning right out of South View Road sufficient time and opportunity to look and check that direction first. If it is clear then drivers can gradually edge out into the highway to obtain better visibility of any vehicles approaching from the south, which is on the far side of the highway to the junction.
19. Once they have edged out into the road enough to see beyond the existing hedge, drivers would have reasonable visibility of vehicles approaching from the south. Additionally, any vehicles that do approach from the south would have likely seen the front of any vehicle edging out and begun to slow down to assess the situation if required.
20. In the meantime, any vehicles that emerge from the north would also have sufficient time and distance to slow down if they observe a vehicle has slightly encroached into the highway to exit right out of the junction of South View Road.
21. Whilst not ideal, I nevertheless find this to be the realistic and likely approach that vehicles currently take when turning right out of South View Road, and the approach that the additional vehicles generated by the appeal proposal would also likely take.
22. Furthermore, the HTS shows that there have been no reported accidents at or near this junction in the 24-year period for which accident data is available. This therefore demonstrates that the existing junction has safely served the current levels of traffic

that utilise it and as detailed above I have found that the appeal proposal would result in a limited increase in the number of vehicles exiting this junction.

23. The Council's Highway Officer has commented that there is no physical restriction that prevents vehicles overtaking on Bull Lane. As such, I acknowledge that if a vehicle travelling north on Bull Lane decides to overtake, and therefore uses the wrong side of the road, there is potential for conflict with a vehicle emerging from South View Road.
24. However, this potential conflict already exists with the vehicles that currently use this junction and for the reason given earlier I have found that the appeal proposal would result in only a limited increase in the number of vehicles exiting this junction. Additionally, given the 30mph speed limit along this highway, and the number of existing vehicle accesses nearby that I observed during my visit, it is unlikely that drivers would consider this to be a suitable place to overtake another vehicle.
25. In terms of overtaking a pedestrian or cyclist, it is likely that when doing so the overtaking vehicle would slow down to carry out this manoeuvre and in doing so would only encroach slightly beyond the centreline of the carriage. This therefore increases the likelihood of it being seen by a vehicle about to exit South View Road. Furthermore, the above-mentioned accident record suggests that there have been no past issues of conflict or collisions between overtaking vehicles and vehicles exiting South View Road.
26. Interested parties have raised concerns over the impact additional vehicle movements associated with the appeal proposal would have upon the surface and drainage of South View Road, suggesting that the appellant should make a financial contribution towards the repair of this road. However, given that South View Road is a private highway, this is a private matter between the relevant parties.
27. Some interested parties have also raised concerns over impacts on car parking. The submitted plans show provision for the parking of at least three vehicles within the curtilage of the proposed dwelling and I find this level of provision to be sufficient.
28. In view of all the above, I conclude that the existing access is suitable to serve the increase in vehicle movements associated with the appeal proposal. The development would therefore not have a harmful impact upon highway safety or result in any harmful inconvenience to highway users. I therefore find no conflict with Buckinghamshire's Local Transport Plan 4 (March 2016 – 2036) and the Highways Development Management Guidance: Managing the transport and travel impact of new developments (July 2018) which seek to ensure that developments provide safe and suitable access. Also, the proposal would satisfy the Framework which seeks to ensure that safe and suitable access can be achieved and only refuse development that would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
29. Whilst not included in the reason for refusal, the Council's Officer Report and Appeal Statement both refer to Policies TR5 and TR7 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999, consolidated September 2007 and February 2011) (LP). For the reasons given above I find the proposal would not conflict with LP Policy TR5 where it seeks to ensure, among other things, that development which results in the increase in the use of an existing site access does not compromise the safe movement and free flow of traffic on the network or the safe use of the road by others.

30. With regard to LP Policy TR7, this policy relates to parking provision and it is unclear from the Council submissions which element of this policy the appeal proposal would conflict with. Nevertheless, as I have found that the appeal proposal would provide sufficient off-street parking provision I find no conflict with LP Policy TR7.

Biodiversity Net Gain

31. There is agreement between the main parties that if the proposed dwelling is appropriately secured as a self-build/custom housebuilding dwelling it would be exempt from the requirement to provide biodiversity net gain. However, if the dwelling is not adequately secured as a self-build property, there would be a requirement to provide biodiversity net gain as required by Core Policy 9 of the South Bucks District Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) (CS).
32. In order to secure the proposal as a self-build/custom housebuilding dwelling a condition has been suggested. However, in my view the suggested condition is not enforceable and therefore would not meet the requirements of paragraph 57 of the Framework. Furthermore, the planning obligation before me does not include a mechanism to secure the development as a self-build/custom housebuilding dwelling.
33. I note the appellant has provided an appeal decision² relating to self-build/custom housebuilding in support of their case. However, in that appeal such provision was secured by a planning obligation and not a condition.
34. In view of the above, I conclude that there is no appropriate mechanism before me to secure the development as a self-build/custom housebuilding dwelling and therefore the proposal is required to provide biodiversity net gain.
35. In this regard, Core Policy 9 does not identify a specific percentage increase in biodiversity net gain that would be required. In such circumstances, it is not uncommon for details of biodiversity net gain to therefore be secured by a planning condition.
36. The appellant's Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report³ (PEAR) states that a new habitat creation is to be implemented on site and the design includes a green roof, along with new tree planting and new hedging, which will result in a net gain in biodiversity. Furthermore, given the modest size of the development proposed within a relatively large site, I am satisfied that a net gain in biodiversity can be achieved on this site through the proposed development.
37. On this basis, I consider it would be appropriate, reasonable and necessary for the details and delivery of biodiversity net gain to be secured by a planning condition. I therefore conclude that subject to securing and implementing an appropriately worded planning condition, the development would provide biodiversity net gain and would not therefore conflict with Core Policy 9 of the CS where it seeks the conservation, enhancement and net gain in local biodiversity resources.

Protected Species

38. The appeal site is situated within a Great Crested Newt Impact Risk Zone and the planning application was accompanied by a PEAR which states that there is a single record of a Great Crested Newt (GCN) within 2km of the site. GCNs are included in

² APP/T0355/W/22/3309281 & APP/T0355/W/23/3314990

³ Prepared by ROAVR Group – Ref 23_PEA_06_07

the designation of 'European Protected Species' within the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the Regulations).

39. To meet the Regulations, it is necessary to be satisfied that GCNs and their habitats would not be harmed by development. The Council's Statement of Case confirms that the appellant has entered into the Buckingham Council's District Licensing Scheme with NatureSpace. This Licensing Scheme considers GCN conservation and includes a number of 'Protocol conditions'.
40. Entering into this District Licensing Scheme ensures that the proposal would meet the favourable conservation status test and secures adequate compensation for any potential impact. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal meets the relevant tests in the Regulations. It is noteworthy that the Council's Newt Officer has no objection to the scheme, subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the development to take place in accordance with the terms and conditions within the Council's Organisational Licence and the submitted Impact Plan.
41. Additionally, the submitted ground level bat roost assessment found that the trees to be removed had negligible potential to support roosting bats and therefore no further survey works were required. The submitted PEAR also includes details of a number of mitigation measures that should be implemented to reduce the potential impact of the proposal on protected species. The requirement for the development to be undertaken in accordance with the mitigation measures detailed within the PEAR can be conditioned.
42. In view of the above, subject to the imposition of conditions, I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on protected species. The development would therefore accord with Core Policy 9 of the CS where it seeks to ensure that biodiversity resources within South Bucks will be conserved and enhanced

Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation

43. The appeal site is located within the 5.6km buffer zone of the Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation (SAC). This European Site is afforded protection under the Regulations and is recognised for its qualifying features of Atlantic acidophilus beech forests with Ilex and Taxus in the shrub layer (*Quercion robori-petraeae* or *Ilici-Fagenion*); and Beech forests on acid soils.
44. The Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (2020) (SAMMS) provides a mechanism for the competent authority to comply with their responsibilities to protect habitats and species in accordance with the Regulations. The SAMMS has been agreed with Natural England.
45. As the competent decision-making authority under the Regulations, it is my duty to undertake an appropriate assessment to determine with certainty whether appropriate measures could be put in place to avoid or mitigate any likely significant adverse effects, with the aim being to maintain or restore, at favourable conservation status, the natural habitats and species of this European Site.
46. In this regard, it is likely the occupants of the proposed development would visit the SAC, resulting in increased recreational activity that could disturb the protected habitats and species within. Therefore, the development, alone and in combination

with other development, would be likely to have a significant adverse effect on the integrity and conservation objectives of the protected site.

47. The SAMMS applies a tariff-based financial contribution of £2,023.87 for each net home within the buffer zone to mitigate 'in-combination' recreational effects of development on the integrity of the SAC, including a range of habitat-based measures such as access management, monitoring and education.
48. The appellant has put forward a financial contribution as mitigation to address the effects on the SAC and a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) dated 20 November 2024 has been submitted with the appeal which includes a mechanism to contribute £2,023.87 and a £583.00 monitoring fee. The UU has been signed and the Council has confirmed that upon review of the UU they no longer contend the reason for refusal relating to this matter.
49. I am satisfied that the submitted UU would be effective in securing the payment of the required contribution and future monitoring. I am also satisfied that the undertaking to pay the required contribution and monitoring fee meets the relevant tests for planning obligations outlined in paragraph 58 of the Framework and Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.
50. Consequently, I am satisfied that with the mitigation measures in place, the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC, either alone or in combination with other development.
51. For the above reasons, taking into account the planning obligation set out within the submitted UU, I conclude that the development would be capable of providing appropriate mitigation to prevent adverse impacts on the integrity of the SAC. Therefore, I find no conflict with Core Policy 9 of the CS which states that the highest priority will be given to the conservation and enhancement of the Burnham Beeches SAC, and this will be achieved by ensuring that development causes no adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC. The proposal would likewise be in accordance with the relevant provisions in the Framework which seek to ensure development does not adversely affect the integrity of habitat sites.

Other Matters

52. The proposed dwelling would have a more modern and contemporary design when compared to the existing dwellings within the vicinity. However, I consider the size, height, design and overall appearance of the proposed dwelling to be acceptable. Furthermore, given the location of the plot, at the end of a cul-de-sac and within a heavily treed site, I do not find that the appeal dwelling would be an unduly prominent feature within this residential setting.
53. I do not find the proposed development for one dwelling would result in undue impact upon neighbouring occupiers by way of noise and pollution once the development is occupied. I am however alert to the potential impact of the construction works on surrounding occupiers, including matters relating to noise, dust and access. I have therefore included a planning condition which requires a Construction Management Plan, including details of the parking of operatives vehicles, measures to reduce dust emission and the hours of operation, to be submitted to and approved by the Council prior to commencement of the development.

54. The proposal would result in the loss of two trees to allow for the construction of the dwelling. These trees are subject to an area Tree Preservation Order⁴. The trees to be removed are both identified as Category C trees within the submitted Arboricultural Implications Assessment⁵. The Council's Arboricultural Officer has raised no objection to their removal and the proposal provides opportunity for replacement tree planting within the appeal site which can be secured by condition.
55. Whilst noting the natural changes in topography within the surrounding area, the proposed dwelling would be located a sufficient distance away from surrounding dwellings to avoid any harmful impacts on living conditions by way of overbearing impact, overshadowing and loss of privacy through overlooking. A concern has also been raised in respect of an increase in risk of ground subsidence as a result of the proposed development. However, I have no substantive information or evidence before me in respect of this matter.
56. As detailed earlier, I have concluded that there is no appropriate mechanism before me to secure the development as a self-build/custom housebuilding dwelling. This however is not a matter which alters my overall conclusion of the appeal proposal.

Conditions

57. The Council has provided a list of suggested planning conditions, which I have considered against paragraph 57 of the Framework, and the advice contained in the Planning Practice Guidance, and I have edited to improve precision and enforceability.
58. In addition to the standard time limit condition (1), I have attached a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty (2). Whilst not requested by the Council, I have included a pre-commencement condition which requires the submission of a construction management plan (3). This pre-commencement condition is necessary to protect the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties throughout the construction phase.
59. In the interests of securing biodiversity net gain at this site, it is necessary to impose a pre-commencement condition (4) to ensure that they are delivered within an appropriate timeframe. I have also imposed a pre-commencement condition requiring details of the finished floor level of the proposed dwelling and ground levels to be submitted (5). This pre-commencement condition is necessary to safeguard the visual amenity of the area and to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
60. I have imposed a condition requiring the full details, or samples, of the external materials (6) to be used in the development to be submitted to safeguard the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
61. Again, whilst not included by the Council, I have attached a condition requiring a detailed landscaping and planting plan to be provided (7), including details of the materials to be used on any new hard surfacing areas. This condition is necessary to ensure that appropriate replacement planting is provided to mitigate for any felled trees and vegetation removal, and in the interest of visual amenity.

⁴ TPO No. 6, 2008

⁵ Prepared by Merewood Arboricultural Consultancy Services – Dated 21/07/2023

62. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Council's Organisational License (8) is required to ensure that any impact upon GCNs and their habitats are adequately mitigated.
63. The Council suggested a condition requiring the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in order to safeguard protected species and their habitats. Within their Final Comments the appellant expressed their view that this condition was not required. Upon review I found that the submitted PEAR sufficiently details the potential impacts of the appeal proposal on protected species and includes a number of proposed mitigation measures.
64. As such, whilst I do not consider it reasonable to require the appellant to provide a CEMP, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the mitigation and enhancement measures detailed within the relevant sections of the submitted PEAR (9). This condition is necessary to ensure that protected species and their habitats are protected during the construction phase of the development.
65. A condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the measures detailed within the submitted Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement (10) has been imposed to ensure that the retained trees are adequately protected. I have imposed a condition to manage water use within the development (11), to comply with Local Policy relating to water efficiency.
66. A condition requiring the proposal to provide the car parking spaces and vehicle manoeuvring areas, as shown on the approved plans, has been attached to minimise the need for off-site parking and to ensure vehicles can safely manoeuvre within the site (12).
67. The Council has suggested a condition requiring the development to be constructed as a self-build dwelling. However, as detailed earlier in this decision, my view is that the suggested condition is not enforceable and therefore would not meet the requirements of paragraph 57 of the Framework. As such this condition has not been attached.

Conclusion

68. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, the proposed development would accord with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate it should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore allowed.

R Major

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Location Map
 - 002 Existing Site Plan
 - 101 Proposed Site Plan
 - 102 Proposed Block Plan
 - 201 Ground Floor
 - 202 First Floor
 - 205 Garden Plan (Rev A)
 - 301 Section
 - 302 Section
 - 401 West Elevation (Rev B)
 - 402 North Elevation (Rev B)
 - 403 East Elevation (Rev B)
 - 404 South Elevation (Rev B)
- 3) No development hereby permitted shall take place until a detailed Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The CMP shall detail the arrangements for:
 - a) the parking of vehicles for site operatives and visitors;
 - b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - c) storage of plant and materials used in the construction of the development;
 - d) wheel washing facilities;
 - e) measures for the control and reduction of dust and dirt during construction;
 - f) measures for the control and reduction of noise and vibration;
 - g) how traffic would be managed to minimise disruption; and
 - h) hours of operation.

The construction of the development hereby approved shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved CMP.

- 4) No development hereby permitted shall take place until a scheme for the provision of biodiversity net gain measures on the site, including a timetable for implementation, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out thereafter in accordance with the approved scheme for the lifetime of the development.
- 5) No development hereby permitted shall take place until details of the proposed finished floor levels of the dwelling and the finished ground levels in relation to the surrounding land, taken from a fixed datum point, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be implemented and retained in accordance with these approved details.

- 6) Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application, no above ground construction works shall take place on the development hereby permitted until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
- 7) No above ground construction works shall take place on the development hereby permitted until a detailed landscape and planting plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include a clear key or legend corresponding to the landscaping plan and provide the following information:
 - a) Species (both Latin & Common names) for all plants;
 - b) Locations of all plants or areas of planting;
 - c) Plant numbers or planting densities;
 - d) Sizes of all plants and trees 'at time of planting'; and
 - e) Details of all hard-landscaping areas including details / samples of materials.

The approved scheme shall then be implemented within the first planting season following the occupation of the development, or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or shrubs which, within a period of 5 years from first planting, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season, with others of a similar size and species.

- 8) The development hereby permitted shall take place in full accordance with the terms and conditions of the Council's Organisational Licence (WML-OR112, or a 'Further Licence') - Certificate Number NSP588BUCKS; and with the proposals as detailed on plan "Harley Cottage: Impact plan for great crested newt District Licensing (Version 1)", dated 27th November 2023.
- 9) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in complete accordance with the mitigation / enhancement measures detailed / recommended within Table 6.1.1 and sections 8.5 – 8.14 of the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report, prepared by ROAVR GROUP, Project: 23_PEA_06_07, Version 2.0 dated 25/07/23.
- 10) The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the measures detailed within the submitted Arboricultural Implications Assessment (Merewood Arboricultural Consultancy Services – Dated 21/07/2023) and the Arboricultural Method Statement (Merewood Arboricultural Consultancy Services – Dated 21/07/2023). All measures shall be undertaken under the supervision of a retained arboricultural specialist in order to ensure that the phasing of the development accords with the stages detailed in the Arboricultural Method Statement and that the correct materials and techniques are employed.
- 11) The dwelling hereby approved shall be constructed to meet, as a minimum, the higher standard of 110 litres per person per day using the fittings approach as set out in the 'Housing: optional technical standards' guidance and prescribed by Regulation 36(2)(b) of the Building Regulations 2010.

- 12) All car parking, servicing and turning facilities, as shown on the approved plans, shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall be retained as such, and kept available for the intended purpose, thereafter.

***** End of Conditions *****