



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2025

by T Gethin BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/W/24/3358019

Land at Manor Farm, Noke, Oxfordshire OX3 9TU

- 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 Oxford New Energy Ltd against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
 - The application Ref is 22/01682/F.
 - The development proposed is Development of a ground mounted solar farm incorporating the installation of solar PV panels, associated infrastructure and access, as well as landscape planting and designated ecological enhancement areas.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development of a ground mounted solar farm incorporating the installation of solar PV panels, associated infrastructure and access, as well as landscape planting and designated ecological enhancement areas at Land at Manor Farm, Noke, Oxfordshire OX3 9TU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01682/F, and subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. When the appeal was received, it was considered suitable for it to follow the Hearing procedure. However, subsection (4) of section 319A (determination of procedure for certain proceedings) of the Town and Country Planning Act allows the Secretary of State to change the procedural determination at any time before the proceedings are determined.
3. During the appeal timetable and following the publication of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), part of the Council's reason for refusal fell away. The remaining matters of disagreement between the main parties and the other planning issues raised by all interested parties, being sufficiently clear and understandable from the appeal documents, did not necessitate questioning or discussion. Whilst several people expressed a desire to present their case in person, the views, concerns and local knowledge of all interested parties were also clearly conveyed in their written submissions.
4. Consequently, and having regard to the Planning Inspectorate's guidance (Criteria for determining the procedure), the appeal was deemed suitable to be determined under the written representations procedure. The appeal has therefore been determined on this basis.
5. An amended plan ('Development Framework Plan'), removing all proposed solar panels from areas of flood risk, was submitted with the appeal. The amended plan clearly includes some changes compared to the scheme that was considered by the Council and by interested parties at the application stage. However, the

amendments are not so significant that they would fundamentally change the development proposed or result in a substantial difference from that originally applied for. Accordingly, considering the appeal with regards to the amended plan would neither cause procedural unfairness nor prejudice third parties' interests, and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

6. My attention has been drawn towards the Beckley and Stowood Neighbourhood Plan (BSNP). However, given the plan area is outside of Cherwell District, it does not form part of the adopted development plan which the proposed development needs to be determined against. Whilst its policies are therefore not determinative, I have nevertheless had regard to the BSNP where relevant.

Background and Main Issue

7. The proposed development was refused planning permission because the Council considered that it would have a significant adverse landscape impact and constituted inappropriate development which would cause significant harm to the openness of the Oxford Green Belt. However, during the appeal, the Council confirmed that the appeal site meets the revised Framework's definition of grey belt land. It is now common ground between the Council and appellant that the relevant tests in Framework paragraph 155 are met and thus the appeal proposal does not comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The available evidence, including the submissions of third parties on the matter, does not lead me to a different conclusion.
8. It is therefore not necessary to consider the proposal's effect on the openness of the Green Belt and whether very special circumstances need to be demonstrated. With Policy ESD 14 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (CLP) setting out, amongst other aspects, that development proposals within the Green Belt will be assessed in accordance with government guidance contained in the Framework, I therefore also find that there would be no conflict with this policy.
9. Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape.

Reasons

10. Located in the Otmoor Landscape Character Area and including farmland bounded by hedges and trees in a valley bowl, the site positively contributes to the generally undeveloped character and verdant appearance of the surrounding landscape. The largely flat terrain and the open, relatively sizeable fields on the site and in the locality give the area a somewhat exposed quality. However, the hedges, trees and woodlands in the immediate and wider area reduce the openness of the site's setting; and such planting forms a notable and positive feature in the landscape. Although power lines cross the site and locality, their presence in the landscape, and the associated poles, is limited given their scale and muted appearance.
11. Existing planting breaks up the site and contains it to some extent. This, combined with the topography and other planting in the locality, limits the site's visibility and prominence in the landscape, despite its size. Nevertheless, much of it is clearly visible in close-up views from, for example, the well-used public rights of way that run through the site and along part of its boundaries. I observed on my visit that there are also clear views of varying parts of the site from the nearby section of the popular Oxfordshire Way, including from and between the representative

viewpoints 5 and 6 of the appellant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). Longer distance views are more limited and often restricted to glimpses above/between planting, but are nevertheless still possible, particularly from the higher land in and around Beckley (including in important views as defined in the BSNP) but also from areas in and around Islip and Oddington for example.

12. Although the proposed solar panels and related infrastructure would not extend across the entire area, and additional soft landscaping would supplement existing planting, the development proposed would result in a significant and, albeit temporary, long-term change to the site's land cover/use and consequently its character and appearance. Despite the proposed planting providing extensive additional screening and thus limiting views, the proposed panels and supporting structures, along with fencing and other infrastructure, would also be visible to some extent in various short- and longer-distance views; and would read as incongruous, industrial-esque features in the uncluttered, largely undeveloped rural surroundings. Neither the lack of a formal landscape designation nor the area being defined as, in the words of the Framework, a valued landscape change this. In addition, some existing views of the surrounding area and horizon in the immediate vicinity of the panels would be restricted.
13. The harm would be greatest during construction and in the initial operational period but would reduce over time as the additional planting matures. However, whilst such planting would screen much of the proposed development in short-distance views and reduce its presence in the locality, parts of the development would remain visible in those and some more medium- and longer-distance views. As identified in the Council's Review of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment by MCA, the planting proposed may initially also not be as extensive as the submitted LVIA photomontages suggest and may take longer to mature than envisaged. In addition, the development is likely to be more visible during winter.
14. Nevertheless, with many of the vantage points having reasonably expansive, sweeping panoramas of the wider countryside and across the historic area of Otmoor, the development proposed would appear as a relatively small feature in the overall landscape. Although the planting proposed would ultimately enclose the open sections of footpath that run through the site, relatively wide corridors would be provided whilst existing hedges already enclose, for example, a section of the path immediately to the south of the proposed panels. New planting could also be provided and/or existing planting allowed to grow irrespective of the appeal proposal. In addition, given the positive presence of existing hedges and trees on the site and in the surrounding area, the proposed planting, whilst further enclosing the fields and footpaths on the site, would respect and enhance the character and appearance of the site and locality. Furthermore, subject to further details being secured by condition, the additional planting would read as neither unexpected nor harmful to the landscape or the visual amenity of footpath users. In coming to this view, I have taken into account the findings of the Council's LVIA review by Huskisson Brown Associates.
15. Accordingly, I conclude that the development proposed would, despite its temporary nature, harm the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape. However, for the above reasons, and particularly the mitigating effects of the proposed (and existing) planting, the harm would, overall, be moderate rather than significant. Nevertheless, the appeal proposal conflicts with policy C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and CLP policies ESD 5, ESD 13 and ESD 15

given that these set out, amongst other aspects, that proposals will not be permitted if they would be inconsistent with local character; and seek to ensure that development avoids unacceptable adverse visual impacts on local landscapes and is sympathetic to and complements the character of its context.

16. The Council also alleges a conflict with CLP Policy ESD 10 with regards to this matter. However, as my attention has not been drawn to any words in it that are relevant to this issue, it has not been determinative in my decision.

Planning Balance

17. Inconsistent with the Framework's provisions which seek to achieve well-designed places and conserve and enhance the natural environment, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape. Whilst this attracts significant weight, and I recognise that many local people and visitors love the area and consider the existing surrounding landscape to be iconic, outstandingly beautiful and contain many splendid, inspirational views, I have found that the overall harm to the landscape would be moderate rather than significant. Nevertheless, the conflict I have identified with development plan policies in relation to this matter leads me to conclude that the appeal proposal, despite its accordance with various other development plan policies, conflicts with the development plan as a whole.
18. However, the Council recognises the need for more renewable generation capacity and the proposed development would provide various benefits. This includes the generation of up to 26.6 megawatts of renewable energy, estimated to displace approximately 12,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions per annum and meet the equivalent annual electrical needs of approximately 7000 homes.
19. Through the decarbonisation of the electricity network, the proposal would therefore reduce dependence on fossil fuels and support the UK's transition to achieving a low carbon economy. Consistent with the Framework's provisions on planning for climate change, this is critical to meeting the UK's commitments on renewable energy and carbon emissions, and the need to achieve net zero by 2050. It would also assist in the Council's commitment to renewable energy (as per the Climate Emergency and Climate Action Framework 2020) and the meeting of various other objectives to, for example, increase solar generation and reduce carbon emissions. The overall contribution of the appeal proposal to the district's and country's targets do not lead me to a different conclusion.
20. By increasing domestic generation and contributing towards energy security, the proposed development would, over time, also assist to stabilise energy prices and help to serve increasing demand for electricity. In addition, with the new planting and ecological enhancements proposed, it would result in a significant net gain in biodiversity which would, in turn, support the aims of the Otmoor Conservation Target Area. Furthermore, it would provide employment and a permissive path offering an additional walking route in the area; support a rural business/farm diversification whilst not preventing the site (consisting of predominantly lower-quality agricultural land) to be used for some agricultural purposes, such as sheep grazing; and, as agreed by the main parties, the conversion of arable use to uncultivated grassland would increase organic soil matter and thus assist in protecting and improving the soil resource.

21. These environmental, social and economic benefits are extensive and attract significant weight. With a grid connection offer in place, the proposed development and its associated benefits could be delivered relatively quickly. With the current severe grid capacity constraints in the area, the available evidence indicates that there are also currently limited opportunities for such developments elsewhere. Accordingly, I judge that the scheme's benefits would be substantial and are sufficient to outweigh the landscape harm and the conflict with relevant development plan policies.

Other matters

22. There are various designated heritage assets in the surrounding area. This includes the Grade II listed buildings at Manor Farm (the Manor Farmhouse and its farmbuilding and barn) and the Islip Roman Villa scheduled monument.
23. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the (listed) building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Listed under section 1 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, the Islip Roman Villa is of national importance. The Framework sets out that great weight should be given to the conservation of such assets and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Scheduled monuments are identified as assets of the highest significance.
24. The significance of the Manor Farm listed buildings stems from, amongst other aspects, their historic origins, fabric and architecture. Previously associated with the farm complex and illustrating the historic surrounds, their agricultural settings, of which the site forms part of, also contributes to their significance.
25. The principal significance of the Roman Villa, dating from the late 1st to the early 2nd century AD, stems from its below-ground archaeological remains and the important historical information which they contain. Its agricultural and expansive setting and deliberate siting on higher ground contribute to its significance, whilst terracing of the Villa into the hillside also remains and can be appreciated from the Oxfordshire Way footpath. Furthermore, as identified by Historic England, the archaeological remains on the appeal site, although themselves not of national significance, make a minor contribution to its significance and can be considered as forming part of the setting of the scheduled monument.
26. The installation of solar panels and associated infrastructure would change the settings of these heritage assets and result in the loss of some archaeological remains within the site. Although the main parties and Historic England agree that the harm would be at the lower end of the scale, the harm would nevertheless equate to, in the words of the Framework, less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets. In such circumstances, it is necessary to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal.
27. As detailed above, the proposed development would provide extensive economic, environmental and social benefits which, by their nature and extent, would equate to substantial public benefits. Accordingly, despite the considerable importance and very great weight that I afford to the conservation of designated heritage assets, the proposal's public benefits provide clear and convincing justification and outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the scheduled monument and the Manor Farm listed buildings.

28. There are other heritage assets in the surrounding area, including historic villages, the Grade II* listed Church of St Giles and its Grade II listed group of headstones and footstone, the Grade II listed Rectory Farmhouse, the Grade II listed Logg Farmhouse and its barn, the Grade II* listed St Andrew's Church, other Grade II listed buildings within Noke and the Islip Conservation Area. However, the Council and Historic England do not allege that the appeal proposal would adversely affect any of them, including through harm to their settings and how the assets are experienced. Due to the degree of separation, topography and screening, there is limited intervisibility between the site and those assets. Having considered the development and visited the site, I therefore concur with that view and find that the development would preserve the significance of these other heritage assets, including with respect to their settings.
29. A Unilateral Undertaking (UU) made as a Deed and pursuant to section 106 of the 1990 Act was submitted with the appeal which secures off-site skylark mitigation on land adjoining the site. The available evidence indicates that the mitigation accords with the development plan and that the UU's obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; are directly related to the development; and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to it. Accordingly, I find that the obligations meet the relevant tests in the Framework and are not incompatible with any of the similar tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended).
30. A number of other matters have been raised by various parties and I have taken them all into account. This includes: grid connection availability and existing capacity being less than the solar farm's stated maximum output; the need for more grid connections to be made available and renewable energy to be developed strategically rather than in a piecemeal way; there being both no urgency to install solar energy and plenty of other land in England that could be used instead; whether the site could be used for alternative agricultural purposes; whether the quality of the land is higher than has been assessed, especially given the contract farmer's above-average crop yields; whether sheep could actually graze around the development; loss of farmland available for food (and biomass) production and a subsequent need to import more food, whereas panels on roofs (totalling a significant area available and closer to where power is consumed) avoids this and helps with occupiers living costs; the need to consider alternatives and using roofs/brownfield land/transport corridors first; there being no site-specific need for the development and the availability and suitability of alternative sites; the short- and long-term efficiency of the panels and their seasonality; energy storage schemes subsequently being required; the power generated would exceed (local) demand and would thus either need to be curtailed or exported at low cost; other sources of energy are needed; the manufacture and decommissioning of the panels; remediation/decommissioning details being needed at this stage; the reversibility of the development and whether the site will be returned to its current state at the end of its lifetime; the extent of community benefits; the development extending up to the Oddington Parish boundary and being closer to the village of Oddington than to the village of Noke; there being significant opposition to (and concern about) the proposed development among local residents and people in the wider area; the advertising of and consultation for the planning application and appeal, and the limited time available for third parties to review and respond to the relevant documents (some of which are alleged to being selective, erroneous and misleading); farming being less harmful to the land, which would allegedly degrade

rapidly following the installation of solar panels; biodiversity enhancement could be done without the proposed development; the impact – through issues such as ‘lake effect’, collision, attraction, noise, pollution and impeding connectivity – on biodiversity and wildlife (including protected species), designated nature conservation sites, the Otmoor Conservation Target Area and the RSPB Otmoor reserve (one of the largest inland wetlands in the country); some ecological mitigation being outside of the site; the permissive path (and any sheep grazing) limiting the benefits of the ecological enhancement areas; maintenance of the path and the need for any fencing of it with regards to livestock; construction works; the scheme opening up opportunities for further development; flood risk and reduction in rainwater infiltration; loss of openness to the green belt; other similar schemes being refused permission; the panels needing to be higher due to the site’s topography; the effect on the living conditions of existing residents and users of the local public rights of way, including with respect to outlook and views, glare, mental health and wellbeing, enjoyment of the countryside, safety, disruption and noise; cumulative landscape impacts with other solar farms; the need for third parties to commission another landscape assessment/review; the project being driven by profit; and whether the site is in a sustainable location.

31. However, whilst I take these representations seriously and recognise the strength and extent of local concern, I have not been presented with compelling evidence to demonstrate that the appeal proposal would result in unacceptable effects in relation to the matters raised or be unacceptable with regard to any of those matters which are related to planning. Consequently, they do not lead me to a different overall conclusion that the appeal should be allowed. Some of the issues raised, such as regarding flood risk, biodiversity, access and construction traffic/works can also be covered by planning conditions.

Conditions

32. I have had regard to the various suggested planning conditions and considered them against the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. I have made such amendments as necessary to comply with those documents, for clarity and consistency, to avoid duplication and to ensure that details are submitted for the Council’s approval where relevant.
33. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the carrying out of the development in accordance with the plans and other documents/reports in the interests of certainty. Conditions setting out the time limit for the operational period of the development and its subsequent decommissioning and restoration are necessary in the interests of landscape character, the environment and highway safety.
34. Pre-commencement conditions 5-9 are necessary in the interests of landscape character, protecting species and habitats, and conserving and enhancing biodiversity. However, to avoid unnecessary duplication, I have incorporated the relevant aspects of the Council’s suggested conditions 6 and 13 into condition 5 and suggested condition 21 into condition 7. Although consultees proposed a more detailed condition, the Council’s suggested Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) condition is also sufficiently precise and allows for all matters that need to be covered by the LEMP to be discussed and agreed between the main parties prior to its submission.

35. Pre-commencement conditions 10 and 11 are necessary in the interests of highway and public safety. Pre-commencement condition 12 is necessary for the same reason and in the interests of character and appearance. Pre-commencement conditions 13 and 14 are necessary in relation to archaeological matters. Pre-commencement condition 15 is necessary in relation to flood risk. For the same reasons, 16 and 17 are also necessary. Conditions 18 and 19 are necessary in relation to public safety, accessibility and the environment. Condition 20 is necessary with regards to ecology.
36. I have not imposed the Council's suggested conditions 12 and 24 because they are unnecessary given that other legislation covers obstructing rights of way and the licensing of protected species. With the submitted arboricultural report not identifying any trees to be removed and the Council's arboricultural team consultation responses not identifying the need for a condition securing details of a replacement tree, I have not imposed the Council's suggested condition 26 as it has not been shown to be necessary. I have also not imposed the appellant's additional proposed condition covering skylark mitigation because it would result in unnecessary duplication of the details in the UU and the condition that I have imposed that secures a bird mitigation strategy.

Conclusion

37. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance do not provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; and material considerations outweigh the harm that would arise, the conflict with development plan policies and the great weight afforded to the conservation of designated heritage assets. Consequently, material considerations indicate that the proposed development should be permitted notwithstanding the conflict with the development plan as a whole.
38. For the above reasons, the appeal is therefore allowed.

T Gethin

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) Except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and documents: Site Location Plan (Drawing number P19-2636_22, Rev B); Development Framework Plan (Drawing number P19-2636_003_1, Rev N); Inverter Station Elevations and Plan (Drawing number GN-NK-PLA-04, Rev 00); 40' Spares Container Elevations and Plan (Drawing number GN-NK-PLA-06, Rev 00); 20ft Welfare Container Elevations and Plan (Drawing number GN-NK-PLA-11, Rev 00); Private Substation Elevations and Plan (Drawing number GN-NK-07, Rev 00); DNO Substation Elevations and Plan (Drawing number GN-NK-PLA-08, Rev 00); PV Module Elevation and Cross Section (Drawing number GN-NK-PLA-03, Rev 00); CCTV Detail (Drawing number GN-NK-PLA-09, Rev 01); Fence Detail (Drawing number GN-NK-PLA-10, Rev 00); Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals – Sheet 1 of 7 (Drawing number P19-2636_14H); Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals – Sheet 2 of 7 (Drawing number P19-2636_15H); Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals – Sheet 3 of 7 (Drawing number P19-2636_16H); Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals – Sheet 4 of 7 (Drawing number P19-2636_17H); Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals – Sheet 5 of 7 (Drawing number P19-2636_18H); Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals – Sheet 6 of 7 (Drawing number P19-2636_19H); Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals – Sheet 7 of 7 (Drawing number P19-2636_20H); Illustrative Landscape Sections A-C (Drawing number P20-2636-21A); Floodplain Compensatory Storage (Drawing number J14174-NUK-ZZ-ZZ-DR-D-3003, Rev V01); Connection Power Line Constraints Map (Drawing number P19-2636_004-1); Inverter Noise Specification (reference: SC 4000 UP/SC 4200 UP/SC 4600 UP) prepared by SMA Solar Technology; and Geophysical (Gradiometer) Survey (reference: NGR 454500 214000) prepared by Pegasus Planning Group and Green Nation dated July 2021.
- 3) The permission shall expire no later than 40 years from the date when electricity is first exported from any part of the array to the electricity grid network ('First Export Date'). Written confirmation of the First Export Date shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority no later than one calendar month after the event.
- 4) Not later than 24 months before the end of this permission, a decommissioning and site restoration scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, such scheme to include the management and timing of any works and a traffic management plan to address likely traffic impact issues during the decommissioning period. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented within 12 months of the expiry of this permission.
- 5) No development shall commence until a scheme of landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include: a) details of the existing trees and hedgerows to be retained as well as those to be felled, including existing and proposed soil levels at the base of each tree/hedgerow and the minimum distance between the base of the tree and the nearest edge of any excavation; b) details of the proposed tree and shrub planting (including replacements for any removed trees) including their species, number, sizes and positions, together with grass seeded/turfed areas and written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and

grass establishment i.e. depth of topsoil, mulch etc); c) a schedule of landscape maintenance covering a minimum period of five years and including the timing of the implementation of the schedule and procedures for the replacement of any planting that dies, is removed or becomes seriously damaged or diseased within five years of being planted; d) details of the hard landscaping including hard surface areas; and e) details of the enclosures (including gate openings) within the site and along the boundaries of the site.

The approved hard landscaping and boundary treatments shall be provided prior to the First Export Date and shall be retained as such thereafter. All approved planting and seeding/turfing shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the First Export Date and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved landscape maintenance schedule.

- 6) No development shall commence until a scheme for the provision and management of a 10 metre wide buffer zone alongside the watercourse has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme. The scheme shall include: plans showing the extent and layout of the buffer zone; details of proposed planting (native species); details demonstrating how the buffer zone will be protected, managed and maintained during and post-development; and details of any footpaths, fencing and bridges proposed. The buffer zone shall be free kept from built development, lighting and formal landscaping other than as detailed in the approved scheme.
- 7) No development shall commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include: a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities to biodiversity; b) Identification of 'Biodiversity Protection Zones'; c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (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 when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works; f) Responsible persons and lines of communication; g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person; h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs; i) Pre-construction surveys for protected species to inform additional avoidance or mitigation requirements during the construction phase should any protected species which could be harmed by the development have moved on to the site since the previous surveys were carried out. The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period in accordance with the approved details.
- 8) No development shall commence until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the LEMP shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 9) No development shall commence until a mitigation strategy for birds has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall include details of the location and design of alternative nest sites to be provided, a timetable for their delivery, and details of on-going management and monitoring. The mitigation shall be provided and managed thereafter in accordance with the approved strategy.

- 10) No development shall commence until full details of the temporary means of access between the land and the highway (construction phase) and the permanent means of access between the land and the highway (post-construction phase), including position, layout, construction, drainage and vision splays (to be kept clear of obstructions higher than 0.6m at all times) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The temporary means of access shall be constructed prior to commencement of the rest of the development in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained and maintained for the period of the construction of the development. Within 6 months of the completion of construction of the development, the temporary access shall be replaced with the permanent access which shall have been constructed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained and maintained for the life of the development.
- 11) No development shall commence until full details of any proposed temporary signage related to the construction of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved signage shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first use of the construction access and remain in situ for the duration of the construction phase.
- 12) No development shall commence until full details of all proposed internal access tracks/roads 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, which shall be retained and maintained as approved.
- 13) No development shall commence until an Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation relating to the application site area and prepared by a professional archaeological organisation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 14) Following the approval of the Written Scheme of Investigation referred to in condition 13, and prior to the commencement of the development other than in accordance with the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation, a staged programme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation shall be carried out by the commissioned archaeological organisation in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation. The programme of work shall include all processing, research and analysis necessary to produce an accessible and useable archive and a full report for publication which shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within two years of the completion of the archaeological fieldwork.
- 15) No development shall commence until a scheme (including implantation timetable) to provide compensatory floodplain storage for loss of floodplain storage for all floods up to and including the 1% climate change flood level, based on a level for level and volume for volume principles, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details and implementation timetable.
- 16) Prior to the First Export Date, the drainage system shall have been implemented in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (reference: J-14174, edition 06, dated May 2023), drawing number 3002 Rev P06 (Conceptual Surface Water Drainage Scheme) and the hydraulic calculations produced via Microdrainage (File SWALE FOR AREAS 1 and SWALE FOR AREAS 2, dated 19/10/2022).

- 17) Prior to the First Export Date, a record of the installed SuDS and site wide drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The record shall include: a) as built plans in both .pdf and .shp file format; b) photographs to document each key stage of the drainage system when installed on site; c) photographs to document installation of the drainage structures on site; and d) the name and contact details of any appointed management company information.
- 18) Prior to the First Export Date, full details of protection, mitigation and improvements of the existing paths within the site and the provision of the proposed permissive path shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details agreed.
- 19) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Construction Traffic Management Plan (reference: P19-2636/TR/01, dated October 2021), Transport Technical Note (reference: P19-2636 TR02, dated October 2022), Pre-development Arboricultural Report and Method Statement Revision 3 (by Wharncliffe Trees and Woodland Consultancy, dated 04 February 2023), and Ecological Appraisal (reference P20-745, by BSG Ecology, dated 16/02/2023).
- 20) No external lighting shall be installed within the site area unless details of any lighting proposed have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting shall thereafter be installed and maintained in accordance with the approved details and no additional external lighting shall be installed without further details being submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

END OF SCHEDULE