



---

## Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 1 July 2025

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by **H Nicholls MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14<sup>th</sup> July 2025

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/25/3361419

#### Land to the East of Lincoln Road, Glington

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Larkfleet Group Limited against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/01150/OUT.
  - The development proposed is outline application for a residential development of up to 95 dwellings with access from Lincoln Road, public open space, sustainable drainage and landscaping with access secured and all other matters reserved (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale).
- 

#### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for outline application for a residential development of up to 95 dwellings with access from Lincoln Road, public open space, sustainable drainage and landscaping with access secured and all other matters reserved (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) at Land to the East of Lincoln Road, Glington, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01150/OUT, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

#### Preliminary Matters

2. The application was made in outline form with all matters save for access reserved for future consideration. In light of this, the plans depicting the scale, layout and related aspects have been treated as indicative in nature.
3. The appeal application was refused on 31 January 2025. The Council indicated in a communication dated 28 April 2025, that it would no longer contest the second reason for refusal (RfR) on landscape and visual impacts. This is despite that some harms would still result from the proposal through the introduction of development in the countryside.
4. A Case Management Conference (CMC) was held 29 April 2025 to discuss procedural matters in connection with the Inquiry. The main parties took part in the CMC and no discussions were held about the merits of the case.
5. The signed Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) of June 2025 indicates that following receipt of revised information relating to the off-site highway mitigation scheme to increase capacity at Lincoln Road roundabout to accommodate the development, and subject to a planning obligation to secure the same, there would be no adverse highway impacts from the scheme. As such, the third RfR relating to this aspect was no longer in dispute between the parties by the time of the inquiry.

6. A communication from the Council dated 20 June 2025 indicated that it had opted not to defend the appeal in light of a change in circumstances relating to its five year housing land supply position. A signed Supplementary Statement of Common Ground (SSoCG), dated 25 June 2025, indicates the agreement between the main parties that the current housing land supply between a range of 4.88 years' worth on the Council's evidence and 3.42 years' worth on the appellant's evidence, with respective shortfalls of between 133 dwellings and 1,709 dwellings against the minimum five year requirement with relevant buffer required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The SSoCG also confirms the agreement that there is an affordable housing need in the area. The evidence details that there are 2,817 households on the Housing Register as at 31 March 2025.
7. As a result of the above, the Council did not seek to offer any evidence and that it agreed with the appellant that, on the basis of the engagement of paragraph 11 d) of the Framework, that there would be no adverse impacts of granting permission that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the appeal scheme, and thus, that planning permission should be granted.
8. A draft version of the planning obligation made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, (S106) was agreed between the main parties and was discussed during the inquiry. The finalised S106 was submitted following the close of the inquiry and is dated 8 July 2025.
9. A new Local Plan, to replace the Peterborough Local Plan (adopted 2019) (Local Plan) is being prepared and is currently at Regulation 18 stage. Though only capable of attracting limited weight at the present time, the appeal site is allocated within the draft Local Plan for residential development<sup>1</sup>.
10. Taking account of all of the above, there are now no main issues in dispute between the appellant and the Council. However, interested parties have expressed concerns in connection with the scheme and I therefore address the following issues below:
  - whether the location, nature and scale of the proposal accords with the development plan;
  - the effects of the proposal on highway safety and capacity; and
  - the effect of the proposal on the landscape character and visual amenities of the area.

## Reasons

### *Location, nature and scale*

11. The appeal site extends to around 7.3 hectares of arable agricultural land to the south of Glinton, bound by Lincoln Road (the B1443) to the west and the A15 to the south. An access exists from Lincoln Road with a track bisecting the site which leads to a care home, Clare Lodge. A recreation ground lies to the north (Glinton Recreation Ground) and residential areas extend to the east and north of the site. The proposal is for up to 95 dwellings with associated new access from Lincoln Road, along with public open spaces and associated infrastructure.

---

<sup>1</sup> Under emerging Policy LP57.5

12. The development plan currently comprises the Local Plan and the Glinton Neighbourhood Plan (made 2021) (GNP).
13. Local Plan Policy LP3 sets the overall spatial strategy for Peterborough and the requirement for 19,440 dwellings between 1 April 2016 and 31 March 2036. The Policy also sets the overall distribution of residential growth, with the majority of growth in and adjoining the urban area of Peterborough.
14. Policy LP2 of the Local Plan sets the overarching spatial strategy for the district and prioritises the City of Peterborough, before large villages, followed by medium villages and, finally, small villages. The site is located outside the identified settlement boundary of the 'medium' village of Glinton under the Local Plan and is therefore in the countryside in policy terms. Policy LP2 also seeks to prevent development in the open countryside unless in specific circumstances. These circumstances are detailed further in Local Plan Policy LP11, but which are not applicable to the appeal scheme.
15. Policy LP8 of the Local Plan permits rural exceptions housing schemes adjacent to village envelopes. Notwithstanding the 30% provision of affordable housing offered as part of the scheme, the proposal is not promoted as an exceptions scheme and does not have the support of the community that is also a prerequisite of compliance with LP11.
16. GNP Policy GNP1 seeks to strictly control and limit the level of growth within the parish of Glinton to no more than 5% of dwelling numbers (as calculated at 1 April 2018), i.e. through the development of up to 34 dwellings by 2036. Where a development taken cumulatively with others built or in the system since 2018 would result in the total number of dwellings exceeding the total of 34, then it must be accompanied by evidence of clear local community support, or the written support of Glinton Parish Council. There is evidence that a good proportion of the permissible 34 dwellings have already received consent since 2018, but in any event, the proposal would exceed this upper limit taken individually. The proposal has not received the support of the community or Parish Council either.
17. GNP Policy GNP2 has a similar criteria-based approach to Local Plan Policy LP2 in terms of the exceptions to development in the countryside. Again, the proposal does not meet any of the identified exceptions such as to accord with this Policy.
18. Therefore, on the basis of the above, the proposal's location, scale and nature conflicts with, in particular, Local Plan Policies LP2, LP8 and LP11 and GNP Policies GNP1 and GNP2. The appellants does not refute this point.

#### *Highway effects*

19. The proposal includes the construction of a ghost island right turn lane arrangement on Lincoln Road. The existing access to Clare Lodge would be closed and traffic accessing Clare Lodge would utilise the new access. The pedestrian refuge provision, and cycle and bus infrastructure in the vicinity of the new junction and right turn lane would be altered or enhanced, and not in any way detrimentally affected by the proposed works. A condition would secure the provision of the detailed design and implementation of the finally approved scheme of works prior to occupation of any first dwelling. A separate condition would ensure that access to Clare Lodge were provided at all times throughout the construction phase.

20. The capacity of the Glington Road roundabout has been a concern of the Local Highway Authority as it already operates under stress during both AM and PM peaks. However, the scale of the development would not result in a severe impact on the operation of the roundabout when taking account of flows modelled through the industry-standard modelling software JUNCTIONS 10, using the ARCADY module. The junction is already operating at or over capacity on some arms in either the AM or PM peaks, and future trends indicate that the capacity problems would worsen, even without the proposed development. Adding the development into the arrangement would not, in itself, severely compromise the operation of the junction.
21. However, the proposal is to increase the junction capacity by adding a dedicated left-turn lane, increasing the junction entry lanes from two to three on the Werrington Parkway arm. Whilst this mitigation scheme would have a minor worsening effect on some AM peak queues entering the roundabout elsewhere, it would have a much greater improvement effect on the PM peak queues with the development in place. The overall effect of the mitigation scheme would be positive and assist with the absorption of the additional vehicle movements generated by the development on an already busy junction. The LHA has agreed the principle of the adjusted mitigation scheme (Plan Ref LRG-BWB-GEN-XX-DR-TR-101 S2 P3) and the final scheme will be subject of the rigour of assessment under separate highways legislation to ensure matters such as suitability for all types of HGV and pedestrian safety. The implementation of the finalised mitigation scheme would be secured by way of S106 obligations and there is no suggestion that these works would render the scheme financially unviable.
22. I note the concerns of many that the congestion in and around Glington at school drop-off and pick up times is already unacceptable and that it would be exacerbated by the proposed development. There is no simple solution to this problem given the secondary school's large capacity, broad catchment area and the apparent inclination for many to use private vehicles to access the same. However, the proposal would not undermine pedestrian, cycle or bus infrastructure that would continue to encourage people to use sustainable modes of transport and it would provide some additional capacity on the Glington Roundabout to offset some impact. Any future occupiers of the development of school age would at least not be likely to need to travel to school by car given the site's proximity to schools.
23. I have also considered the safety of users of the existing pedestrian crossing of the A15 outside the service station access junction. Whilst not exclusively, this crossing is primarily used by those wishing to access the service station and fast food restaurant, and users have to navigate one lane of traffic exiting Glington Roundabout heading in a westerly direction before reaching the pedestrian island and crossing over two lanes of traffic which are approaching the Roundabout in an easterly direction. The crossing clearly needs to be navigated with due care and attention at the present time, and I am aware that this could be made harder through the addition of another lane of traffic. However, the LHA have the safety of all users of the highway in mind when considering the impacts of a development or any mitigatory scheme of improvements and further analysis of the granular detail will dictate how best to optimise the arrangement for the safety of all.
24. The provision of the internal accesses and parking provision are matters which are to be resolved by way of reserved matters applications to achieve compliance with GNP Policy GNP6.

25. In view of the above, and subject to conditions and the S106 obligations, the proposal would not have a detrimental effect on the safety or capacity of the local highway network and thus complies with Local Plan Policy LP13 and GNP policy GNP9. These policies seek to ensure that developments are located to maximise the use of sustainable modes of transport, minimise or mitigate impact on highway safety and demonstrate that the impact of any development involving new accesses onto, or increased traffic on Lincoln Road are addressed.

*Landscape character and visual effects*

26. The appeal site is a relatively flat, well enclosed field used for arable purposes, views of which are available from the open point of access and from the footpath linking Welmore Road to Lincoln Road. From adjoining roads, the hedgerows and trees prevent views into the site and filter views towards the rear of houses on St Benedicts Close and Ashburn Close.
27. The appeal site is not unattractive but is relatively unremarkable. Its openness and green enclosure contribute a softness to the edge of Glinton where the presence of road infrastructure and the service station add to the urbanising qualities of the area. The addition of dwellings and associated infrastructure would urbanise the site and detract from the openness for which it can be appreciated at the present time. However, given its adjacency to the built edge of Glinton and enclosure by hedgerows and road infrastructure, the development of the site would not appear incongruous or result in any visual merging of the settlement with Werrington. The retention of hedgerows and trees would also help to minimise the effects of the proposal.
28. The indicative masterplan layout shows one way that the development could be laid out at an appropriate density with a mix of house types and areas of open space. The area to the south of the site would be retained as green space so as to provide the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) area and avoid an underground service constraint. This would also have the effect of maintaining the southern built edge of the development to that broadly consistent with Clare Lodge and Holmes Road, thus maintaining some distance from the A15. However, the finer detail of the layout and appearance of the scheme would be more appropriately considered at the reserved matters stage.
29. As such, the proposal would result in harms to landscape character and the visual amenities of the area, albeit of a limited and localised nature. This would raise a degree of conflict with Local Plan policy LP27 and policy GNP2 of the GNP which require development to contribute positively to local distinctiveness and character and create a sense of place through good design.

**Other Matters**

30. In terms of the effects on designated heritage assets, the appeal site is separated physically and visually from Glinton Conservation Area (CA) which also contains a number of listed buildings, including St Benedict's church (Grade I), the Manor and its stables (Grade II\*) and other Grade II listed buildings, including No 18 Welmore Road. The absence of any functional or visual relationship between the appeal site, the CA and listed buildings, other than visibility of the Church spire, means that the site does not contribute to the heritage significance of any of the aforementioned assets. As such, the development of the site would not harm their respective significance or conflict with the heritage aims of the Framework.

31. Many local residents express concern about the strain on local infrastructure, including schools and doctors, which would be exacerbated by the new residents of the development. Through the Community Infrastructure Levy regime (CIL), the Council would collect and distribute financial contributions that would help to increase the capacity of such facilities and infrastructure to meet the needs of new residents. Where necessary, such as in the case of the public open space, additional contributions will be collected through S106 obligations to provide for additional usage and contribute towards its maintenance.
32. Whilst there is a suggestion that the proposal would result in the loss of the footpath from Welmore Road to Lincoln Road, this is not the intention and it would indeed remain within any future reserved matters scheme.
33. A number of concerns have been raised in connection with groundwater flooding. However, the site is within Flood Zone 1 and is recorded to have a medium risk of groundwater flooding. Dwellings would be set a modest degree higher than existing site levels to minimise any risks. As part of the production of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), soakaway testing was undertaken which suggests that means other than wholesale reliance on infiltration is likely to be required. The full details of any sustainable urban drainage system, including the use of swales and attenuation ponds, will be the requirement of a planning condition.
34. A greater number of concerns have been expressed in relation to the capacity and performance of the existing foul drainage infrastructure. The proposed development would connect into the existing adopted foul drainage system in St Benedicts Close with the statutory undertaker having confirmed that there is capacity for a development of the scale proposed. Given the availability of a mains connection, there would be no reason to pursue a non-mains solution for the proposal. Beyond the confirmation of the relevant undertaker of the capacity for the scheme to connect, the adequacy of the network, nature of historical problems and maintenance programme of the local sewerage infrastructure have not been extensively detailed or assessed further. As such, I cannot conclude other than that the proposal is capable of being connected to the mains foul drainage network by way of a planning condition.
35. Whilst scepticism has been expressed about the value of the BNG area and the maintenance responsibilities, the S106 has detailed provisions around the provision, maintenance and monitoring of the BNG area such as to ensure it achieves the suggested degree of benefit.
36. Though it has been suggested that the development would compromise the privacy and security of Clare Lodge, there is no inherent incompatibility between a secure institution within a residential setting. There are already houses bordering two sides of Clare Lodge that do not affect its safe operation and there is no reason why the development could not be designed to leave sufficient space for the treed enclosure of Clare Lodge to survive and maintain the high degree of privacy its residents currently benefit from.
37. I note that the proposal follows a number of schemes which have previously been refused<sup>2</sup>. Each of those proposals were assessed on their respective merits in the context of the policy considerations relevant at that particular time. As such, the findings reached by those decision makers do not dictate the outcome of the

---

<sup>2</sup> 21/01464/FUL, and 20/00499/FUL and APP/J0540/W/18/3204584

current proposal. Similarly, nor should any finding on the current appeal dictate the decision on other future schemes elsewhere in Glington.

38. Whilst it has been suggested that there would be harmful cumulative effects from the proposal when taken in combination with a scheme or schemes at Peakirk Road<sup>3</sup>, I have relatively limited details of those schemes and I am not aware that planning permission has been granted for either of them.
39. I have also taken account of the representations that suggest that local support would be more readily offered for smaller schemes of houses, less likely to be out of scale with the village, and particularly those sited to the north of Glington. The objections of local residents and elected representative bodies weigh against the scheme to a degree.

### **Planning Obligation**

40. The final S106 agreement secures the following:
- 30% of the total dwellings to be provided as affordable housing, split between 70% affordable rented and 30% shared ownership, with occupation eligibility and transfer arrangements in respect of the same;
  - The provision of the highway scheme to improve the capacity at Glington Roundabout;
  - The provision of contributions towards the enhancement and maintenance of off-site public open space, commensurate with a scheme of up to 95 dwellings, i.e. the adjacent Glington Recreation Ground;
  - The provision of on-site public open spaces, including natural green space areas and allotments, with maintenance and management responsibility arrangements in respect of the same;
  - Obligations regarding the provision, maintenance and monitoring of BNG.
41. Requests for financial contributions were originally made by the East of England Ambulance to assist with emergency response provision and the Local Education Authority in respect of early years education services. It was identified that the health service enhancement provision was to be secured by way of CIL and that there was no justification for seeking further early years contributions other than via CIL in this case. The Council therefore withdrew the request for early years funding.
42. Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) (CIL), as amended, and the Framework (paragraph 58) set out that planning obligations must only be sought where they meet the relevant tests, including where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the same. The Council has submitted a CIL Compliance Statement outlining the necessity for the various components of the S106 and the methods of calculation for the various financial contributions and the related links to policies of the development plan.
43. I am satisfied based on the agreement between the main parties and the wording of the S106 that all of the obligations are necessary, directly, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development and can be taken into consideration as part of the development.

---

<sup>3</sup> 25/00376/FUL/proposed allocation LP57.6 and separate scheme for Hereward Homes

## Planning Balance

44. I have identified that the proposal conflicts with policies LP2, LP8 and LP11 of the Local Plan and policies GNP1 and GNP2 of the GNP in terms of its location, scale and nature. There would also be a limited and localised degree of landscape character and visual harm, such as to generate a degree of conflict with Local Plan policy LP27 and policy GNP2 of the GNP. The proposal therefore conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole.
45. The proposal would also result in the loss of around 7.3ha of Best and Most versatile agricultural land. The parties agree that the loss is not unacceptable such to give rise to a separate reason for refusal and that it should attract limited adverse weight. Nevertheless, this harm weighs against the proposal.
46. The parties agree that the provisions of Framework paragraph 11 d) are engaged in this case, owing to the Council's inability to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land.
47. The range between the shortfall acknowledged by the parties of between 133 and 1,709 dwellings is wide. However, in the context of the scale of a shortfall of at least 133 dwellings and evidenced need for affordable housing in the area, the provision of up to 95 mixed market and affordable homes would be a significant benefit of the scheme. If the shortfall is at the more severe end of the range, then clearly the benefits would be weightier still. The scheme also appears capable of being delivered in a timely manner.
48. The further benefits of the scheme include the provision of BNG to a greater level than statutorily required, with detailed management provisions to embed the enhancements for the long term. This benefit attracts modest positive weight.
49. Notwithstanding the conflict with the locational policies of the development plan, the site is within a medium village which benefits from a shop, public house, primary school, village hall and secondary school. There are also regular bus services available from stops adjacent to the site to the nearby city centre and a neighbouring recreation ground. The site is therefore sustainably located for the nature and scale of development proposed and this aspect attracts modest weight in favour of the scheme.
50. There would be further economic benefits from the scheme during the construction phase and beyond through the occupation of the site by new residents. I attach limited weight to these benefits that would be common of any similar housing scheme.
51. In the absence of any Framework policies that protect areas or assets of importance that provide a strong reason for refusal, I have considered the proposal against Framework paragraph 11 d) and with particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes. Even taking account of the representations against the scheme, I find that the adverse impacts of granting permission would not significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

## **Planning Conditions**

52. In the interests of certainty, conditions are needed to clarify the reserved matters, the approved plans and the timescales for seeking approval and commencing works on the development.
53. A condition is needed to clarify the accessibility standards which shall apply to all or a specified proportion of the proposed dwellings. In order to achieve a satisfactory development, conditions are also needed to specify the water efficiency standards, noise mitigation measures, bin storage and collection points and the need for fire hydrants.
54. In respect of landscaping, conditions are needed to specify the level of detail of hard and soft landscaping required to accompany an application/s for reserved matters. A separate condition is also needed to secure details of the management of public areas of landscaping (separate of public open space). For further certainty, conditions are also needed in respect of site and finished floor levels.
55. In respect of the biodiversity value of the site, conditions are required in connection with habitats management and monitoring, ecological enhancements and the need for a construction phase ecological management plan. For similar reasons, a condition is needed to secure a sensitive lighting design strategy. A condition suggested by the Council to require a re-evaluation of the biodiversity baseline value and potential further survey work is not considered reasonable and has not been imposed.
56. For the reasons outlined above, conditions are needed to ensure the provision of a satisfactory surface water drainage scheme and connection to the foul drainage infrastructure prior to occupation of any dwellings.
57. In the interests of preservation of any archaeological features, a relevant condition is needed.
58. Should any unidentified contamination be identified, the relevant condition would ensure it were remediated prior to any occupation of the development as necessary.
59. In the interests of highway safety, efficiency and to promote sustainable modes of travel, conditions are needed to secure the provision of the access in accordance with the approved plan; the closure of the existing access (whilst maintaining access to Clare Lodge throughout the construction phase); the submission and implementation of a full travel plan, and adherence to a construction traffic management plan.

## **Conclusion**

60. In view of the above, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies and indicates that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole in this case. As such, appeal is allowed.

*H Nicholls*  
INSPECTOR

## **APPEARANCES**

### **FOR THE APPELLANT:**

Mr Peter Goatley KC, Counsel	Instructed by Mr Mark Basett of Freeths
Ms Chatura Saravanan	Counsel, assisting Mr Goatley
Mr Mark Basett	Freeths LLP

### **FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:**

Ms Clare Parry, Counsel	Instructed by Ms Emily Johnson of Peterborough City Council
Mr Asif Ali	Peterborough City Council
Ms Gemma Wildman	Peterborough City Council
Ms Robyn Green	Peterborough City Council

### **INTERESTED PARTIES:**

Mr David Cowcill	Local resident
Mr Bob Randall	Vice Chair, Glinton Parish Council

### **INQUIRY DOCUMENTS:**

Document 1	Appellant opening statement
Document 2	Council opening statement
Document 3	Additional landscape management condition
Document 4	Appellant closing statement

### **DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AFTER THE INQUIRY:**

Document 5	Letter from Glinton Parish Council, dated 4 July 2025
Document 6	Planning obligation, executed 8 July 2025

## SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale (hereinafter called 'the reserved matters') shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development takes place and thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved.
- 2) Application/s for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan:
  - Site Location Plan (Drawing No.: 11342 FPCR XX XX DR L 0007 P0).
- 5) The plans and particulars to be submitted under condition C1 above shall:
  - i. Demonstrate that all residential units meet with Building Regulations Part M4(2); and
  - ii. Identify the location of housing units (5% of the total number of housing units) which meet Building Regulations Part M4(3)(2)(a) and demonstrate how the external and internal layout meet Part M4(3)(2)(a).
- 6) No development shall take place until a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan addressing the creation of mitigation and compensation habitat as outlined within the Ecological Impact Assessment and Biodiversity Metric.

The HMMP shall include the following:

  - a) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed works.
  - b) Review of site potential and constraints.
  - c) Detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) to achieve stated objectives.
  - d) Extent and location/area of proposed works on appropriate scale maps and plans.
  - e) Type and source of materials to be used where appropriate, e.g. native species of local provenance.
  - f) Timetable for implementation demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of development.
  - g) Persons responsible for implementing the works.
  - h) Details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance.
  - i) Details for monitoring and remedial measures.
  - j) Details for disposal of any wastes arising from works.

The HMMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be retained in that manner thereafter.
- 7) No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a construction ecological management plan

(CEcMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEcMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following:

- a) Summary of potentially damaging activities.
- b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones", as applicable.
- c) Practical measures (physical measures, sensitive working practices, and biosecurity measure) to avoid or reduce negative impacts during construction (which may be provided as a set of method statements)
- d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- e) The times during construction, roles and responsibilities of an ecological clerk of works.
- f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- g) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEcMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details.

- 8) Prior to the commencement of any site works, ecological enhancements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include but not be limited to:

- x 9 integrated swift boxes in groups of at least 3
- x 9 integrated house sparrow terraces
- 1 in 10 new dwellings incorporates an integrated bat box such as Habitat Bat Boxes and Schwegler 1FR and Schwegler 2FR (or similar, equivalent).
- Bat boxes on suitable retained trees and should also be installed in groups of 2-4 per tree. Box designs should be suitable to provide roosting opportunities for a wide range of species, such as Schwegler 1FF and 2F boxes (or other similar, equivalent designs).

The details to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing should also include locations of the proposed enhancements and height off the ground as well as a timetable for implementation. The approved details shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable and maintained as such thereafter.

- 9) The plans and particulars to be submitted under condition 1 shall include a scheme for soft landscaping of the site. The scheme shall include, but not be limited to, details of the following:
  - full and detailed landscaping scheme is submitted for the entire site, including all boundaries, street tree planting and planting within open spaces, front & rear gardens, where appropriate and with suitable and appropriate tree/hedge & shrub species. This should include British Standard nursery stock sizes of all planting throughout the scheme, all to comply with BS8545:2014.
  - including the carriageway, parking areas and footpath/cycleway, together with any land drainage, including SUDS features. Swales should be

suitably protected against future damage/liability from tree root encroachment/damage.

- full tree pit details (sections), with dimensions, showing all installation features, including means of watering, support, protection, together with all products to be used to protect the adjacent features above from damage, such as root barriers, root directors, deflectors, 'RootSpace', and supported by the applicants Highway/Structural Engineer or Landscape Architect and to manufacturers recommendations/design guides; and include on a plan,
- details showing the extent of the above protection barrier/s, including the installation of barrier/s 2m beyond the mature crown spread of the trees in question, together with suitable and appropriate soil volumes.

The approved soft landscaping shall be carried out within the first available planting season following first occupation of the development, or alternatively in accordance with a timetable for landscape implementation which has been approved as part of the submitted landscape scheme.

Any trees, shrubs or hedges forming part of the approved landscaping scheme (except those contained in enclosed rear gardens of the dwellings) that die, are removed or become diseased within five years of the implementation of the landscaping scheme shall be replaced during the next available planting season by the developers, or their successors in title with an equivalent size, number and species to those being replaced. Any replacement trees, shrubs or hedgerows dying within five years of planting shall themselves be replaced with an equivalent size, number and species.

- 10) Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling, a landscape management plan (LMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LMP shall cover any public landscaped areas, excluding formal public open space. The plan shall include but not be limited to the following details:

- Management responsibilities
- Maintenance schedules

The management plan shall be implemented in accordance with a timetable contained therein and as approved, unless a variation is first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- 11) The plans and particulars to be submitted as reserved matters for each Development Phase/sub-phase shall be accompanied by a detailed scheme for hard landscaping. The details shall include but not be limited to:

- External paving and surfacing materials;
- All boundary treatments and enclosures including those on the edges of the site;
- Street furniture including bins and signage; and
- External lighting to all highways and private driveways.
- Site levels

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the area or building to which

they relate or in accordance with any alternative timeframe as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- 12) The plans and particulars to be submitted as reserved matters under condition C1 shall include details of existing and proposed site levels including the finished floor levels of all new dwellings and any associated parking which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 13) No external lighting shall be erected until, a “lighting design strategy for biodiversity” for all lighting across the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall:
  - a. identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for ecological constraints that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and
  - b. show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the Local Planning Authority.

- 14) The plans and particulars to be submitted under condition 1 shall include a scheme for bin collection points which shall show a detailed bin storage design for each dwelling. The approved scheme shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the dwelling(s) which it serves. It shall be retained thereafter for the storage of refuse and recycling bins only.
- 15) Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme should include but not be limited to:
  - In addition to swales and ponds features, the use of permeable paving with geotextiles for driveways.
  - The use of rainwater using rainwater butts for every plot.
  - Section drawings of all drainage features.

The approved details shall be carried out in accordance with the approved works.

- 16) No development which comprises the erection of a building required to be served by water services shall be undertaken in connection within any Development Phase of the development hereby permitted until full details of a scheme including phasing, for the provision of mains foul sewage

infrastructure on and off site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Prior to the first occupation of any Development Phase, the foul water drainage works relating to that Development Phase must have been carried out in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

- 17) Notwithstanding the submitted information no development above ground works shall take place until provision has been made for fire hydrants in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling to be served by the scheme, written confirmation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that the scheme has been implemented in full and is certified as being ready for use.

- 18) The development hereby permitted shall be constructed to ensure that each dwelling achieves water usage of no more than 110 litres per person per day.
- 19) a) Prior to commencement of development a Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation (WSI) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The WSI shall detail the programme of archaeological work and include the statement of significance, research objectives, the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording, and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works, with timetables and any phasing of work. It will also detail the programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication and dissemination, and deposition of archival materials.

Should significant remains be encountered in the course of the fieldwork, the LPA shall be informed, and the applicant shall ensure that any such exposed remains are undisturbed until their significance can be determined and consideration of their reburial/retention in situ or other mitigation is addressed.

- b) Prior to commencement of development an Evaluation Report, including any mitigation measures, as required, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then only proceed in full accordance with the approved details.
- 20) Prior to the commencement of any development a scheme for protecting the noise sensitive parts of the development as outlined in the Acoustic Associates Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works which form part of the scheme should be completed before any part of the noise sensitive development is occupied and shall thereafter be retained and maintained as such in perpetuity.
- 21) If, during development, contamination not previously considered is identified, then the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately, and no further work shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a scheme for dealing with the suspect contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

- 22) No development shall take place until the detailed design of the site access works, in accordance with the general arrangement set out on drawing LRG-BWB-GEN-XX-DR-TR-100-S2-P6, and to include the right-hand turn lane, pedestrian refuge island, and the dropped kerb crossing repositioning has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- No dwelling shall be occupied until the site access and associated works have been carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 23) No development shall commence until a scheme for the closure of the existing access onto Lincoln Road has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of how access to Clare Lodge will be maintained during the construction period and a timetable for implementation. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 24) Prior to the first occupation of the development a full travel plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The travel plan shall be written in accordance with current industry best practice including guidance of the Department of Transport. The development shall thereafter be occupied/operated in accordance with the approved travel plan or a plan as subsequently modified and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 25) No development shall take place until a Construction Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Management Plan shall include but not be limited to the following:-
- a) A scheme of chassis and wheel cleaning for all construction vehicles to include the details of location and specification of the system, together with hard surfacing laid between the apparatus and public highway in either concrete or tarmacadam, to be maintained free of mud, slurry and any other form of debris whilst in use;
  - b) Haul routes to the site;
  - c) Hours of delivery;
  - d) Banksman to ensure that vehicles can access the site upon arrival to ensure that there is no queuing on the public highway;
  - e) Details of site compounds, storage area and contractor and visitor parking;
  - f) Details of any temporary lighting which must not directly light the public highway.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan.

ENDS -----