



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by **S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/W/25/3364263

Land at Landscape Lane, Newport, Isle of Wight PO30 2NG

- 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 Mrs C Ferns (Cotton Trust) against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref is 21/02423/OUT.
 - The development proposed is 12 houses and formation of vehicular and pedestrian access and provision of pedestrian crossing on Staplers Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and outline planning permission is granted for 12 houses and formation of vehicular and pedestrian access and provision of pedestrian crossing on Staplers Road at land at Landscape Lane, Newport, Isle of Wight PO30 2NG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/02423/OUT, subject to the conditions listed at the end of this Decision.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mrs C Ferns (Cotton Trust) against Isle of Wight Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposal is for outline planning permission with access, layout and scale to be considered as part of this proposal. I have dealt with the appeal accordingly.
4. The description of development is taken from the decision notice and the appeal form. This differs from that on the original application form, reflecting changes to the scheme that took place during the determination of the planning application, including a reduction in the number of dwellings proposed from 13 to 12.
5. During this appeal, the appellant submitted a completed Section 106 Planning Obligation, dated 3 September 2025 in respect of off-site highways works, the management of on-site open space and SuDS, and contributions towards mitigation for the impacts of the development on the Solent Special Protection Area (the SPA), the provision of affordable housing and improvements to public rights of way. I return to these matters, which did not constitute reasons for refusal, later in my decision.
6. The appeal site lies within the Zone of Influence of the SPA. Whilst not a matter in dispute, within the context of this appeal, the responsibility for assessing the effects of the proposal on this European Protected Site (EPS) falls to me as the competent authority. For this reason and having regard to my conclusion in

respect of the merits of the appeal scheme, this matter warrants consideration as a main issue.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:

- The impact of the proposal on highway safety and accessibility to facilities and services by means other than the car; and
- The impact of the proposal on the integrity of the Solent SPA.

Reasons

Highway safety

8. The appeal site comprises a rectangular-shaped area of farmland forming part of a larger agricultural parcel to the east side of Landscape Lane. The site runs parallel and adjacent to the whole of the east side of the road, apart from small sections at its northern and southern ends which are occupied by an electricity substation and a detached dwelling respectively.
9. Landscape Lane has a quiet, rural character. It is unclassified and is single width along most of its length, apart from at both ends where it joins Staplers Road and Long Lane. It has no passing places and is subject to a 6'6" vehicle width restriction. There are no pedestrian footways, and the road edges are defined by a grass verge/bank with mature hedging/trees along the whole of the appeal site frontage, and mature landscaping broken up by intermittent vehicular access points, generally with poor access visibility, along the frontages of the residential properties sited along the western side of the road.
10. Moreover, there is a distinct bend in the road roughly halfway along its length which has the effect of further reducing visibility for users of the road. As such, given the characteristics of the road, whilst it is subject to a 30mph speed limit, in practice vehicle speeds would reasonably be expected to be lower than this.
11. Landscape Lane connects with Staplers Road at its northern end and Long Lane to the south. These are significantly busier classified roads, which function as strategic transport links into Newport. Both are subject to a 30mph speed limit at their junctions with Landscape Lane.
12. There is an existing pedestrian footway on the northern side of Staplers Road within the vicinity of its junction with Landscape Lane, and on the southern side of Long Lane within the vicinity of its junction with Landscape Lane. Pedestrian access to these footways from Landscape Lane involves crossing these classified roads.
13. There are also bus stops on both sides of Staplers Road and Long Lane within proximity of their junctions with Landscape Lane. These serve eastbound and westbound services between Newport and Ryde, and are all within the generally recognised¹ 800m conveniently accessible walking distance to bus stops when measured from any part of the appeal site.

¹ Sustrans: Walkable Neighbourhoods, May 2022

14. Long Lane is served by route 8 which encompasses the east coast towns of Sandown and Bembridge. Route 9 runs along Staplers Road and comprises a comparatively more direct route to Ryde via Wootton and Fishbourne near the north coast.
15. The Council's first reason for refusal relates to harm to pedestrian and highway safety because of the proposal failing to adequately provide for safe pedestrian access and connectivity to the existing public footway network, so that pedestrians would be likely to walk in the live carriageway to use the aforesaid primary bus routes to access local services. The Council is particularly concerned about the omission of new dedicated pedestrian footway link from the site onto Long Lane.
16. This pedestrian link was included in previously proposed schemes, including a refused application for 14 dwellings on the appeal site² and several subsequently revised schemes submitted with the planning application which is the subject of this appeal. However, it was deleted from the current appeal scheme by the appellant prior to the determination of the planning application because the Council considered it to comprise an unsafe pedestrian route.
17. Landscape Lane currently has no pedestrian footways and there are no formal pedestrian crossing points near its junctions with Staplers Road and Landscape Lane. As such, existing occupants of the road as well as other pedestrians using the lane to access Staplers Road and Long Lane must currently walk in the live carriageway to access the aforesaid bus stops and pedestrian footways located on these roads. The Council has not provided any substantive evidence of a history of harm to pedestrian and highway safety associated with this arrangement.
18. The appeal scheme would result in additional vehicular traffic using Landscape Lane, as well as increase in pedestrian trips from Landscape Lane to Staplers Road and Long Lane. However, the evidence before me is that the proposal would be designed to mitigate against harm to highway safety and, significantly, it would also include a number of highway improvements.
19. The 12 new dwellings would be set back from the road frontage and would gain vehicular access via the creation of a single new access point positioned within 50m of the junction of Landscape Lane with Long Lane. This would serve an on-site access road which would run roughly parallel with Landscape Lane, separated from it by an area of soft landscaping. It would incorporate passing bays and have a turning head at its northern end.
20. The Council has raised no objections in respect of the design of the proposed on-site road and the vehicular access, including the proposed visibility splays and the space that would be provided to enable private and service vehicles to access and egress the site in a forward gear.
21. Moreover, whilst there is no available street parking within Landscape Lane, the Council has confirmed that the proposed on-site parking would exceed the requirements of the Council's adopted parking standards, thereby relieving pressure for parking either along the on-site access road or on nearby roads. It has also confirmed that the appeal scheme would provide adequate on-site cycle parking/storage, thereby promoting the use of alternative means of travel other than the car.

² LPA Ref 20/01529/OUT

22. The appeal scheme would incorporate off-site highway works to widen the Staplers Road/Landscape Lane junction, including the repositioning of the centre-point of the junction. The Council has confirmed that this would result in improved junction visibility and turning ability for vehicles proportionate to the amount of vehicular traffic ascribable to the appeal scheme, at a junction that the Council currently considers to be substandard.
23. The Council has raised no detailed concerns about the ability of the existing junction of Landscape Lane with Long Lane to safely accommodate the appeal scheme whilst remaining unaltered.
24. Other notable highway improvements to Landscape Lane would result from the removal of the existing roadside hedge along its eastern side to enable the provision of access visibility splays together with the widening of parts of the road and the provision of a new passing bay within the vicinity of the road bend. The road would be widened to 5.5m over a length of 33m from its junction with Staplers Road and over a distance of 35m from its junction with Long Lane.
25. There is no cogent evidence from the Council to suggest that the capacity of the highway network within the vicinity of the site cannot safely accommodate the resulting increase in daily traffic movements associated with the proposal, taking account of the aforesaid highway improvements to Landscape Lane and its junction with Staplers Road.
26. Moreover, there is no substantive evidence before me that the aforesaid highway improvements would be likely to result in significantly higher traffic speeds along Landscape Lane nor encourage the use of the lane by much larger vehicles than those that currently traverse the road.
27. Having regard to pedestrian accessibility, there are currently no pedestrian footways along Landscape Lane or pedestrian links from this road to the local footway network. The appeal scheme would provide a new footway along most of the western side of the new internal access road, together with a footpath link between the internal access road and the northern end of Landscape Lane, to connect up with Staplers Road, where, in conjunction with the remodelling of this road junction, a new uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point would be provided to link up with the existing footway on the opposite side of that road.
28. There would also be benefits to non-car users because of improvements to the existing bus stops outside 187 and 144 Staplers Road. In the case of the eastbound bus stop, a new shelter would be provided. In respect of the latter, to aid passengers alighting from a westbound bus, a new dropped kerb would be provided opposite the bus stop, which would allow those getting off a westbound bus with wheelchairs, mobility aids or pushchairs, to leave the live carriageway without needing to mount the existing raised kerb.
29. As such, for occupiers of the appeal scheme as well as for existing local residents, pedestrian access to the nearby bus stops and existing footway network in Staplers Road would be made safer. This would result in improved onward connections for non-car users to the facilities and services in Newport and Ryde and in the intervening locations along the route 9 bus service.
30. The inclusion of a new dedicated pedestrian footway link to Long Lane would also comprise a highway benefit, and I acknowledge that the Council consider its

omission to be a missed opportunity. However, I am not persuaded on the evidence before me, that such provision is necessary to make the scheme acceptable, nor that its absence would result in material harm to highway safety or adversely impact upon accessibility to facilities and services for non-car users.

31. I note that the route 8 bus service provides access to certain local facilities and services which are not served by the bus stops at Staplers Road, including those nearby in Pan, so that occupiers of the development would be reasonably likely to use that service. However, the appeal scheme would not prevent pedestrian access to Long Lane, and the bus stops and pedestrian paths therein.
32. Moreover, having regard to the aforesaid proposed dedicated footpath which would extend along the majority of the eastern side of Landscape Lane (either on the appeal site or adjacent to the highway), it would only be a short stretch of the southern end of the road from the new appeal site access point to the Long Lane road junction that would not benefit from a footpath.
33. The appellant removed the previously proposed pedestrian footway, that the Council considered would be unsafe, from the appeal scheme, and the Council has raised no specific concerns about the adequacy of the design of the existing Long Lane junction in relation to its ability to service the proposal.
34. During my site visit I saw no evidence to indicate that it was unsafe for pedestrians to cross Landscape Lane and Long Lane within the vicinity of the junction, where the latter road is subject to a 30mph speed limit. Moreover, there is no evidence before me of any relevant accident history in relation to the immediate vicinity of this road junction.
35. With all of the above in mind, I find that there is no substantive evidence before me that the appeal scheme would endanger pedestrians or curtail their access to facilities and services via both of the aforesaid bus routes.
36. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in material harm to highway safety or accessibility to facilities and services by means other than the car. As such, the proposal accords with Policies SP7, DM2 and DM17 of the *Island Plan: Isle of Wight Core Strategy (including Waste and Minerals) and Development Management Development Plan Document* (March 2012) (the Core Strategy) in so much as these policies, amongst other things, support proposals that increase travel choice and provide alternative means of travel to the car, provide an accessible and safe built environment, and provide and improve accessibility for pedestrian transport.

SPA - Recreation and nitrates

37. The site lies within the 5.6 km Zone of Influence for the Solent SPA. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the Habitat Regulations) require that where a project is likely to result in a significant effect on a European site, a competent authority is required to make an appropriate assessment of the implications on the integrity of the European site in view of its conservation objectives. Any likely significant effects arising from the development need to be considered alone and in combination with other development in the area.

38. The proposed dwellings would support an increase in population, giving rise to a likely increase in use of the habitats sites for recreational purposes and increased discharges of wastewater and surface water resulting in additional nutrients entering the SPA. Potentially significant in-combination effects on the integrity of the habitats sites cannot therefore be excluded.
39. Under Regulation 63 of the Habitats Regulations, I am required, as the competent authority to undertake an Appropriate Assessment (AA) of the proposal based on its likely significant effects on European Protected sites. I have undertaken this on a proportionate basis, having regard to the evidence submitted by the main parties, which includes Natural England (NE) standing advice and the Council's adopted mitigation strategies. These are supported by NE and set out the measures proposed to mitigate for all identified adverse effects that could potentially occur as a result of the proposal.
40. The qualifying features of the SPA include a variety of breeding and non-breeding waterfowl. The conservation objectives include maintaining or restoring the population, distribution and habitats of qualifying features.
41. The proposal would give rise to likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the SPA through increased recreational use of the habitats during occupation (alone or in-combination) causing degradation and disturbance during occupation. Overwintering bird populations inhabiting the protected sites would be particularly vulnerable to disturbance resulting from the increase in visitor numbers.
42. Other likely significant effects could occur because of increased discharge of nutrients in wastewater and surface water during occupation (alone or in-combination) entering the SPA. These impacts would all be at odds with the conservation objectives.

Recreation

43. The Council's strategy for mitigation of recreational disturbance is set out within the *Bird Aware Solent Revised Strategy* (September 2024) (the BASRS), which was produced in co-operation with (NE) and which is delivered by the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership. This provides a strategic solution to ensure that the requirements of the Habitats Regulations regarding the in-combination effects of increased recreational pressure on the SPAs arising from new residential development are met through mitigation measures.
44. This is effectively a Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Scheme to fund a package of wardening, education, green infrastructure improvements and monitoring. The required contribution towards the necessary mitigation as detailed within the BASRS, which is a per dwelling contribution based upon the number of bedrooms, would be secured from the proposed development through the submitted Section 106 Agreement. I am therefore satisfied that this passes the Regulation 122 tests. This enables me to conclude that the development would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the habitats sites because of recreational impacts.

Nitrates

45. Sewage from additional new residential development using waste-water treatment works or an on-site package treatment plant that discharge into the Solent

contributes to excess nutrients in the Harbour which leads to eutrophication (algal growth). This harms the ecology and conservation of the SPA. As such, new residential development needs to be nutrient neutral to avoid such harmful impacts.

46. In this instance, the appellant has confirmed that wastewater from the development would be discharged to the existing public sewer. This lies within an area which is served by Southern Water's Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) at Sandown, which does not discharge into the Solent SPA.
47. As such, in accordance with the *Isle of Wight Position Statement: Nitrogen Neutral Housing Development* (January 2024) and NE's advice note *Advice on Achieving Nutrient Neutrality for New Development in the Solent Region* (June 2020), subject to a condition to ensure that foul drainage is connected to the public sewer served by the Southern Water WWTW at Sandown, I am satisfied that the development would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA because of additional foul water discharge.
48. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that, having regard to recreational and nitrate impacts, the proposed development, subject to the aforesaid mitigation measures, would not have an adverse impact upon the integrity of the SPA. As such, the appeal scheme would accord with Core Strategy Policies SP5 and DM12 in so much as these policies seek to protect the integrity of internationally designated sites for nature conservation.
49. This accords with guidance in Paragraph 193 of the Framework which requires significant harm to biodiversity arising from development to be avoided, adequately mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for.

Other Matters

50. In respect of third-party concerns about the principle of residential development in this location, as the site is adjacent to the settlement boundary and within the Medina Valley Key Regeneration Area, the Core Strategy spatial strategy supports the appeal scheme in principle. Moreover, in response to concerns about a lack of housing need, the Council has confirmed that it cannot currently demonstrate the Framework requirement of a 5-year housing land supply.
51. Having regard to interested party concerns about the ability of the proposal to meet local housing needs and to provide more affordable and accessible homes, the Council has confirmed that the appeal scheme is consistent with its identified local housing need and that it accords with the Council's affordable housing policies by providing an off-site affordable housing contribution to be secured by a legal agreement. High property prices and the amount of second homes on the Island are not considerations as part of my determination of this appeal.
52. Third party visual impact concerns are noted. The Council has raised no objection in respect of effects on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to the proposed layout, scale and height of the properties, noting that details of their appearance, together with the scheme landscaping, are Reserved Matters requiring a further application. I have no reason to disagree, subject to appropriate conditions, including those to ensure appropriate external finishes for the approved dwellings, hard and soft landscaping including the replacement of landscaping lost to accommodation the road widening, tree protection measures and external lighting details.

53. In respect of objections about neighbouring living conditions, I am satisfied that material harm would not arise, having regard to the design of the appeal scheme and the juxtaposition and separation distances between the proposed development and neighbouring properties. Impacts during the construction of the development would be mitigated through a condition requiring the implementation of an approved Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Crime/fear of crime concerns raised by the police have been addressed through changes to the scheme.
54. I am satisfied that third-party concerns in respect of impacts upon biodiversity and ecology have been satisfactorily addressed, noting the contents of the submitted Ecological Report and the comments of the Council's Archaeological Officer and the County Archivist in respect of the frontage hedgerow. This is subject to conditions to ensure the recommendations of the Ecological Report are carried out, together with the aforementioned landscaping, tree protection and CEMP conditions.
55. Having regard to drainage and flooding concerns, I am satisfied, based on the evidence before me, that these matters can be dealt with by means of a planning condition and the submitted legal agreement.
56. In respect of the proposed loss of agricultural land, this would comprise a small percentage of the land within the overall agricultural holding and does not comprise higher grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. As such, I am satisfied that no material harm would result to the viability of the existing farm enterprise nor to that of Island-wide agricultural production.
57. Noting concerns about contamination and pollution, I am satisfied, that there is no substantive evidence to warrant the submission of further information regarding on-site contamination given the existing and historical use of the appeal site. Moreover, given the proposed residential use of the site, I am satisfied that there is no cogent evidence that the development would give rise to harmful noise, light or air pollution impacts.
58. In respect of third-party concerns regarding an overload on infrastructure arising from the development, this matter is dealt with by means of the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) requirements.
59. Comments in relation to the Council's procedures during the determination of the planning application are not for consideration as part of this appeal decision. Nor are land ownership details. The proposed off-site highway works on highways land would be controlled by means of a Section 278 Highways Agreement.

Legal Agreement

60. The Section 106 legal agreement would secure a financial contribution towards the provision of off-site affordable housing. The Council has confirmed that a lack of delivery of affordable housing is a significant issue, and that there is an acknowledged need to increase the supply of such housing for the Island. The appeal site lies within a Key Regeneration Area (KRA) where small-scale residential developments are expected to provide financial contributions towards the delivery of off-site affordable housing, to be calculated using a standard formula which accounts for the market value of the development, and which would be secured through a legal agreement. This accords with the requirements of Core

Strategy Policy DM4, which expects all new housing developments to provide for either on-site or off-site affordable housing, and the Council's *Affordable Housing Contributions Supplementary Planning Document* (2017).

61. The legal agreement would also procure a Rights of Way Contribution of £6,000 towards improvements to nearby public rights of way (N35, 36, 119, 204 and 219). This would reasonably be required having regard to the likely resulting increased use of these routes in connection with the proposal and in compliance with the sustainable travel objectives of Core Strategy Policy DM17 and the Council's adopted *Rights of Way Improvement Plan* (2018).
62. I have already set out why I consider the Habitat Mitigation Contribution contained within the Section 106 Agreement to be necessary to mitigate the impacts on the SPA.
63. The legal agreement also includes mechanisms, including a requirement to enter into a S278 Highways Agreement, to secure the aforesaid off-site highways works shown on approved drawing 1498/07H, which, in my consideration of the first main issue, I have already deemed to accord with the objectives of Core Strategy Policies SP7 and DM17.
64. In addition, the legal agreement includes a process for ensuring the future management and maintenance of the communal open space land within the development. This would reasonably be required having regard to the design quality and green infrastructure provision requirements of Core Strategy Policies DM2 and DM12 respectively and the *Isle of Wight Sustainable Drainage SPD* (May 2024).
65. I am satisfied on the evidence before me, including that contained within the Council's Planning Committee Report in respect of the development plan policies and supplementary planning documents relevant to the obligations, that the planning obligations contained within the Section 106 Agreement would meet the three tests set out in Paragraph 58 of the Framework and Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. They would all be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to it. I am also satisfied that the monitoring fee secured would be proportionate and reflect the actual costs of monitoring.

Conditions

66. The Council has suggested 14 conditions if the appeal is allowed. I have considered these in the light of the tests set out in paragraph 57 of the Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and imposed them where I consider them to be necessary and reasonable. Where necessary, I have altered them in the interests of clarity and precision.
67. Some conditions require scheme pre-commencement submission and approval in the instances where such details need to be considered in the construction of the development and therefore go to the heart of the planning permission.
68. In addition to the standard outline permission implementation conditions (1), (2) and (3), it is necessary to define the plans for certainty (4).

69. To ensure that surface and foul water are suitably managed, that any associated flood risk is appropriately guarded against and to prevent harmful impacts upon habitats sites within the SPA, a condition to secure appropriate surface water and foul water drainage schemes is necessary (5).
70. Conditions are required in the interests of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity and safeguarding protected species (6), (7), (8) and (9).
71. In the interests of highway safety, conditions are necessary to ensure appropriate details in respect of the approved road and footway works, the provision of appropriate access visibility splays and on-site parking, and the implementation of an approved Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (10), (11) and (7). The latter would also be in the interests of protecting the living conditions of local residents.
72. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area, conditions are required to ensure appropriate external finishes for the approved dwellings (12), hard and soft landscaping (13), and external lighting (14) and the removal of certain permitted development rights (15).

Conclusion

73. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed, and planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

S Leonard

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. Details of the design and external appearance of the buildings and the landscaping of the site, "the reserved matters", shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
2. Application for the 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 before the expiration of two years from the date of the approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
4. Insofar as the details relate to the access, scale of the buildings and layout of the development, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1498/06J - Site Layout, Location Plan & Sketch Street Scene; 1498/07H - Block Plan & Road Junctions; 1498/08D - Sections; 1498/09A - Typical Floor Plans; and 1498/10 - Perimeter Boundary Hedging.

5. No development shall take place until a scheme for the drainage and disposal of surface and foul water from the development hereby permitted, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Foul drainage shall be connected to the public sewer and shall be served by the Southern Water Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) at Sandown. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme, which shall be completed prior to the first occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter.
6. No development shall take place until an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include details of tree protection fencing, which is to be installed for the duration of construction works. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved AMS.
7. No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall include details of:
 - Steps to prevent material being deposited on the highway as a result of any operations on the site in connection with the approved development, including the installation and use of wheel cleaning facilities for vehicles connected to the construction of the development;
 - The parking, loading, unloading, circulation and turning of all construction vehicles, including operative vehicles within the confines of the site throughout the build process;
 - Measures to mitigate potential impacts on nearby residential properties during construction, including noise and dust controls, and working hours and hours of deliveries; and
 - Measure to protect species/wildlife and habitats during construction.The approved CEMP shall be implemented and adhered to for the duration of the construction phase, and the agreed facilities shall be installed prior to the commencement of development and shall be thereafter retained in accordance with the approved details for the duration of the construction phase of the development. Any deposit of material from the site on the highway shall be removed as soon as practicable by the site operator.
8. No development shall take place until details of biodiversity and ecological mitigation and enhancements have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted details shall accord with the recommendations set out in section 4.2 of the submitted Ecological Report, dated 12 August 2024, Ref: AS/PF/1219 Rev. A, by Woodside Tree Consultancy, and shall include the following:
 - Details of existing boundary vegetation to be retained;
 - Details of landscaping, including new planting and boundary treatments;
 - Details of bird boxes and bat tubes to be installed;

- A timetable for landscaping works and bird box/bat tube installation; and
- A Habitat Management Plan.

The approved biodiversity and ecological mitigation and enhancements shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable, and thereafter shall be retained, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved Habitat Management Plan.

9. Site/vegetation clearance shall not be undertaken during the period 01 March to 31 August (inclusive) unless supervised by a suitably qualified and licenced ecologist.
10. Notwithstanding the approved plans, no development shall begin until full details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority: road, junction and footway construction, including the means of surface water drainage there from; junction visibility splays to be provided, including the highway works to be carried out in Staplers Road and Landscape Lane as illustrated on the approved plans; and the new bus shelter and pedestrian crossing to be provided on Staplers Road.
No dwelling shall be occupied until these works have been completed, and the visibility splays have been provided, in accordance with the approved details. Thereafter, nothing that may cause obstruction to visibility shall be placed or permitted to remain within the approved sightlines.
11. No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until its means of vehicle and pedestrian access from the public highway, and on-site parking and turning space, have been provided in accordance with the approved plans/details.
12. No dwelling shall be constructed above foundation level until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of that dwelling 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.
13. Prior to occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted a scheme of hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted scheme shall include details of finished levels or contours, hard surfacing materials, means of enclosure and boundary treatments, existing planting to be retained, new planting (to include location, number/density, size and species of plants), and an implementation plan and timetable.
The landscaping works shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the approved scheme and timetable.
14. Prior to occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted and the installation of any external lighting within the site, an external lighting scheme for the development, and an implementation timetable, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted scheme shall include details of the position, size, height, orientation and appearance of any lighting units, as well as light level and temperature.
The external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved scheme and timetable.

15. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development within Class E of Part 1 or Class A of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of that Order shall be carried out forward of the principal (front) walls of the dwellings hereby permitted and the west facing side wall of the dwellinghouse on Plot 1 (other than that expressly authorised by this permission).