



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2025

by **G Sylvester BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P1560/W/25/3369516

Red House, High Street, Great Oakley, Harwich CO12 5AQ

- 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 the Great Oakley Community Hub against the decision of Tendring District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00280/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of Red House to allow construction of two conventional arrangement dwellings comprising one 2-bedroom dwelling and one 3-bedroom dwelling, and an infill extension between Red House and The Maybush Inn to form a further one bedroom flat incorporating a multi use community facility to the Public House at ground level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of Red House and the construction of two conventional arrangement dwellings comprising one 2-bedroom dwelling and one 3-bedroom dwelling, and an infill extension between Red House and The Maybush Inn to form a further one bedroom flat incorporating a multi use community facility to the Public House at ground level, at Red House, High Street, Great Oakley, Harwich CO12 5AQ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00280/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule and the Unilateral Undertaking dated 5 August 2024.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the appellant's appeal form. No prejudice would be caused to any party by me doing so as it coincides with the one used by the Council in publicising the proposed development. I have nonetheless had regard to the longer description on the planning application form.
3. In determining this appeal, I shall have regard to my statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("the Act") to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. I shall also have regard to my statutory duty under s66(1) of the Act to pay special attention and have regard to the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings.
4. The appeal site lies within the zone of influence (Zoi) of Hamford Water Special Protection Area ("the SPA"), which is a habitats site subject to statutory protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, as amended ("the Regulations"). Under those regulations it is my statutory duty as the Competent Authority (CA) to consider the effects of the proposal on the nature conservation interests of the SPA and be satisfied beyond all reasonable doubt

that it would not have a significant adverse effect on the SPA's integrity. My duty as the CA is therefore reflected in the main issues below.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in this appeal are:

- Whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Great Oakley Conservation Area ("the CA").
- The effect on the significance of the appeal building as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA).
- Whether the proposed development would preserve the settings of the Grade II listed buildings known as Pett's Cottage, Armond House and House Immediately to the North East, Holly Trees, Maltings Farmhouse and Old Scantlings.
- The effect on highway safety with particular regard to parking provision.
- Whether the proposed development would affect the integrity of the SPA.

Reasons

The CA

6. The Tendring District Council Great Oakley Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan, December 2024 ("the CACA"), shows the CA as encompassing the historic core of the village. The significance of the CA, insofar as it relates to this appeal, is predominantly derived from its compact and tightly knit pattern of traditional vernacular buildings that are clustered around what is likely to have been a market square. The relationship between the buildings and the historic street pattern in the CA creates a strong sense of enclosure and a dense streetscape. This is understood to reflect the evolution of the settlement from its medieval origins and expansion thereafter.
7. The appeal building is situated in a prominent corner plot position in the historic core of the settlement. Historic maps in the CACA show buildings in that same position, including a continuous row of buildings between it and the Maybush Inn. There are several references to the appeal site and building in the CACA, which has stood empty for a considerable number of years. It is referred to as "*of particular concern*" being in a state of disrepair with stained and peeling paintwork, cement render and a decaying timber door. It has suffered the loss of its historic windows and replacement with poorly detailed uPVC units. However, there is no substantive evidence of deliberate neglect or damage to the appeal building.
8. The evidence suggests that the appeal building was originally two properties of possible eighteenth century origins with nineteenth century alterations that was enlarged and combined into a single dwellinghouse by the early twentieth century. A sizeable proportion of the building's fabric appears to have historic and archaeological value. However, there is also clear evidence of various modern additions and repairs to the building that have eroded its archaeological interest not least the addition of uPVC framed windows and cement render. Those window frames, which are particularly prominent on its street facing façades, have eroded the building's traditional vernacular appearance, and it is in a poor state of repair.

9. The appeal building is one of several referred to by the CACA as having had their windows replaced with unsympathetic uPVC units, leading to an erosion of the historic and architectural interest of the CA. In 'Key View 3' looking down Farm Road from the High Street, the CACA identifies the deteriorated condition of the appeal building and the gap site between it and the Maybush Inn as detracting features of the CA. I saw that the gap site weakens the dense streetscape created by the attractive cluster of mostly traditional historic buildings and is harmful to the character and appearance of the CA.
10. Whilst the appeal building has some intrinsic archaeological value as a historic building within the CA, there is nothing to suggest that its fabric is particularly unusual and much of it is hidden in public views by cement render. The evidence indicates that it has been eroded through additions and alterations over the years. Therefore, although the appeal building's historic fabric has some inherent archaeological interest as evidence of construction materials and techniques of the past, it is the building's aesthetic vernacular architecture that makes the greatest contribution to the character and appearance of the CA, and its significance as a designated heritage asset. In 'Key View 2' looking towards the historic marketplace and the heart of the CA, the CACA refers to the appeal building's prominent location and vernacular architecture as a positive contributor to the attractive cluster of historic buildings of different ages, styles and heights.
11. The proposed building's traditional vernacular architecture would include a faithful replica of the existing building, and it would be comparatively enhanced through the fitting of timber framed windows that reflect traditional materials and construction techniques. This would go some way to counteracting the effect of uPVC windows in eroding the historic and architectural interest of the CA, and it may be possible to reuse some reclaimed materials. Given its new-build construction the proposed building would likely remain in a very good condition for many years. Infilling the existing gap between it and the Maybush Inn with the proposed building, which is of an appropriately traditional vernacular appearance, would enhance the strong sense of enclosure and the density of the streetscape around the marketplace. It would appear comparable to the building that previously occupied that gap many decades ago.
12. For those reasons, the traditional vernacular appearance of the proposed development would be an enhancement to the character and appearance of the CA. However, in totality the loss of the historic fabric of the appeal building and its inherent archaeological interest would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA, and its significance as a designated heritage asset would be harmed. The harm would be less than substantial and at a low level on the spectrum of that harm, resulting in conflict with Policy SP7 of the Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond, Section 1, Adopted January 2021 ("the TDLP1"), insofar as it seeks to protect and enhance assets of historical value. However, Policy PPL8 of the Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond, Section 2, Adopted January 2022 ("the TDLP2"), states that where a proposal would harm a Conservation Area, the relevant paragraphs of the Framework should be applied.
13. Those relevant paragraphs include Framework Paragraph 212 which requires that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss is a matter of considerable importance and weight, and requires clear

and convincing justification. Framework Paragraph 215 requires the harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal and therefore I shall return to that matter in my heritage balance.

NDHA

14. Despite its deteriorated condition, the appeal building's traditional architectural appearance and remaining historic fabric are of a sufficient degree of heritage significance to warrant it being treated as a NDHA. However, for the reasons given above its significance is mostly aesthetic insofar as it contributes positively to the attractive vernacular townscape of buildings around the marketplace, whereas its inherent archaeological interest is of much lesser significance. Therefore, the appeal building has a relatively low degree of heritage significance as a NDHA.
15. In this instance, the contribution made by its traditional vernacular architecture would be faithfully replicated by the proposed building and enhanced through the installation of traditional timber windows. It would likely remain in a good state of repair for many years. Nonetheless, demolition would cause the loss of the building's remaining historic fabric and archaeological value, which carries moderate weight against the appeal scheme and conflicts with TDLP1 Policy SP7, insofar as it seeks to protect and enhance assets of historical or natural value.
16. Framework Paragraph 216 requires that in weighing applications that directly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. I shall return to that judgement in my heritage balance.

Avoidance

17. Planning permission¹ was granted for a development that would have had a substantially similar appearance to the appeal scheme in public views. Although the planning application form for that development referred to much of the existing building needing to be rebuilt, it could nonetheless have been reused, subject to a schedule of repairs being derived and agreed through further surveys. I have therefore considered whether the harm arising from the total loss of the existing building could reasonably be avoided through its reuse as previously approved.
18. Structural surveys of the existing building by different engineers are before me in evidence. The appellant commissioned the Davies Burton & Sweetlove Ltd report and has advised that the Council commissioned the CTP Structural Engineering Inspection Report ("the CTP report") by a conservation accredited engineer. It appears to be common ground between those engineers that retaining and reusing the building would, as a matter of principle, be possible to varying degrees. However, even taking the CTP Report as the best-case scenario for the Council, the inspecting engineer advises that the appeal building is severely deteriorated and in a poor state of repair, necessitating a programme of extensive structural repairs.
19. This would require several further detailed investigations to determine the full scope of those repairs. I would require the advice of a soil specialist, involving trial pit excavations, to determine the depth of new foundations for the rebuilding of walls and to ascertain the causes of cracking. Timbers would need to be inspected

¹ 21/00080/FUL

by a timber specialist to determine what could be retained. That temporary work is necessary to prevent further movement of the building and possible collapse is a strong indicator of its poor structural condition.

20. The CTP report suggests that extensive underpinning could be avoided if the ground floor level was not lowered in the previously approved conversion scheme. However, the 'proposed sections' drawing, whilst annotated with a note referring to a drop in floor level to increase the ceiling height, is caveated with a question mark against that possibility, and the note on the drawing refers to the ground level being approximately the same as the Maybush Inn. Therefore, it is unclear from the approved drawings that are before me whether the floor level would have been lowered.
21. Based on contractor estimates the appellant's position is that underpinning alone would run to a significant cost. The projected total repair and fit out costs of the reused building would have far exceeded the reinstatement value of a faithful new build by a wide margin, and far beyond the reach of a volunteer led community trust. Even if extensive underpinning could be avoided, neither CTP nor the Council have provided any estimated costs for those further investigation surveys or the full scope of the structural repair works that it suggests are necessary in order to reuse the building, nor how they might compare to the appellant's cost estimates. To my mind there is also inherent uncertainty as to what might be uncovered by those further surveys and investigations.
22. Whether the reuse of the existing building would be viable goes to the very heart of whether there is a realistic prospect of it being reused. The consequences of the building remaining unused and continuing to deteriorate would, based on the evidence before me, indicate a strong likelihood of parts of the building collapsing, resulting in its incremental loss. In that scenario, the deteriorated condition of the appeal building and the gap site between it and the Maybush Inn, will likely persist and worsen over time. Any public benefits of the proposed development might not come to fruition.
23. In the face of the appellant's evidence the Council has provided no substantive evidence of its own to indicate that the previous scheme to reuse the building, or an alternative scheme, would be financially viable or could be made so. Taking all the above into account, I find that the scheme to reuse the existing building would not, on the balance of the evidence before me, have a reasonable prospect of being financially viable. Consequently, in this instance, the loss of the NDHA and the resultant low level of less than substantial harm to the CA, could not reasonably be avoided by reverting to the previous scheme of reusing the building.

Heritage balance

24. The proposed community facility would encourage social interaction and support healthy, inclusive communities. I share the Council's view that it would accord with TDLP2 Policy HP2, which supports enhanced community facilities and encourages their co-location, as would be the case here. It would likely benefit the operation of the Maybush Inn both practically and economically, which is the only public house in the village and an important community facility.
25. The proposal would provide modern, energy efficient homes, including smaller units that are likely to be more affordable to a wider range of occupants. Even with the Council's current land supply and housing delivery record, the proposal would

make a beneficial contribution to increasing the supply of housing in a location considered sustainable by the Council. Construction and occupation of the proposed development would bring short term and lasting economic benefits, including supporting employment and trade in the construction industry. Future residents would be expected to support services, businesses and facilities within the local economy, and could well contribute to the community life of the village. A proportion of renewable energy consumed by the development would be generated by it.

26. Cumulatively, those are important public benefits of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm arising from the loss of the NDHA and the great weight that I attach to the low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset. In this instance and based on the specific facts of this case, which are unlikely to be repeated in many situations, those public benefits amount to the clear and convincing justification required by the Framework for the harm caused to those heritage assets.
27. Taking all the above into account, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be consistent with TDLP2 Policy PPL8 insofar as harm to a conservation area should be assessed against the relevant paragraphs of the Framework that require it to be balanced against the public benefits of the scheme. As such, there would be no conflict with the historic environment policies in the Framework. Given that TDLP1 Policy SP7 does not require a heritage balancing exercise, which is a requisite of the Framework, I give very limited weight to the conflict with that Policy, which is outweighed by the proposal's public benefits.

Listed buildings

28. The listed buildings of Pett's Cottage, Armond House and House Immediately To The North East, and Holly Trees are located roughly to the south east of the appeal site and on the opposite sides of the High Street. Maltings Farmhouse and Old Scantlings are located further along Farm Road, beyond its junction with Back Lane. The locations of those buildings and their listing descriptions are set out in the CACA. They are generally of timber-framed construction with rendered or boarded timber walls and roof coverings of either plain tiles or thatch. On the evidence before me and insofar as it relates to this appeal, the special interest and significance of those listed buildings are largely derived from their respective ages and their distinctive vernacular architectural styles and detailing.
29. The appeal development would infill the gap in the street scene that has existed for decades with a building of an appropriately traditional appearance, thus enhancing the dense streetscape that is a historic characteristic of the area, and part of the settings to those buildings. Aesthetically, the vernacular architecture of the proposed development would be a faithful replica of the existing, with the enhancement of appropriately traditional timber windows. For those reasons, the proposed development would preserve the settings of those listed buildings, consistent with TDLP2 Policy PPL9.

Parking and highway safety

30. A sizeable proportion of the properties in the area of the appeal site appear to have no off-street parking spaces. At the time of my site visit on a weekday afternoon several cars were parked in the marked-out bays either side of the War

Memorial, and along the parts of the High Street carriageway where there are no restrictions, such as the double yellow lines at the junction with Farm Road.

31. As the proposed development would not be served by any off-street parking spaces, it would conflict with the Essex Parking Standards which I am advised would require 5 off-street parking spaces. Although the District Council would accept a reduced level of parking provision as the appeal site is within a sustainable location, it found no off-street parking provision to be unacceptable.
32. At the time of my visit several parking spaces were available on the High Street and in the bays near the War Memorial and on wider sections of Farm Road. There would have been more than sufficient space to accommodate parked vehicles from the appeal development in those locations. No cars were parked in breach of parking restrictions. Whilst demand for on-street parking is likely to be higher during the evenings and weekends when residents are expected to be home, there is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the area suffers from a high level of parking stress.
33. High Street is part of the B1414 and is a fairly typical rural B-road predominantly connecting sparsely distributed rural settlements. At the time of my visit there was a light and sporadic flow of traffic through the village and vehicle speeds were relatively low, which I attributed to the speed limit and drivers exercising a degree of caution when travelling through a built-up area. I also saw that the A120 appears to carry the bulk of traffic to and from Harwich. Whilst my observations are a snapshot in time, no substantive evidence has been advanced to indicate that the conditions I observed were abnormal.
34. There were instances during my visit where parked vehicles on High Street obstructed the flow of traffic. Some vehicles travelling through the village had to slow to a halt and wait for vehicles travelling in the opposing direction to pass before continuing their journey. Whilst this slowed the flow of traffic and occasionally caused a few waiting vehicles to form short queues, they persisted for only a short period of time. Furthermore, because there is good forwards visibility along High Street, the drivers of those vehicles had more than sufficient time to see and safely react to the presence of parked vehicles and those travelling towards them in the carriageway.
35. Parked vehicles associated with the appeal development could increase the probability of the flow of traffic being slowed in that way. However, based on my observations it would not lead to anything more than a negligible effect on the free flow of traffic and the likelihood of collisions between vehicles would be sufficiently low and not unacceptable. Those effects would fall well below the Framework's level of severe and would not justify refusing planning permission on the grounds of highway impacts. It cannot reasonably be assumed that existing and future residents would deliberately park dangerously in restricted areas, such as on double yellow lines around junctions. There are actions that can be taken by the authorities outside of the planning process to address such parking.
36. Taking all the above into account, I conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to highway safety and therefore its technical conflict with the parking standards carries negligible weight against it. Consequently, the proposed development is consistent with TDLP2 Policy SPL3 insofar as it seeks to ensure

that the highway network will be able to safely accommodate the additional traffic the proposal will generate, and the parking provision proposed is adequate.

SPA

37. The evidence indicates that the SPA is estuarine habitat supporting large populations of internationally important overwintering bird species. Occupiers of new housing development within its Zol are expected to visit the coastline for recreational purposes, which has been shown to cause increased disturbance to those bird species leading to declining populations and harm to the integrity of the SPA. That harm is contrary to the nature conservation objectives of maintaining or restoring the natural habitats and species of the SPA at favourable status.
38. Occupants of the proposed residential units are likely, in combination with other housing developments in the Zol, to have a significant adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA, through increased incidences of recreational disturbance. Therefore, TDLP1 Policy SP2 requires new residential development to mitigate its recreational disturbance on the SPA by contributing financially to the delivery of the strategic mitigation strategy in the Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy, Supplementary Planning Document ("the RAMS") and through proportionate financial contributions.
39. The appellant has submitted a signed Unilateral Undertaking to obligate payment of a financial contribution towards the delivery of the mitigation measure in the RAMS. The Council is satisfied through its Habitats Regulations Assessment that the planning obligation is legally sound and would be effective in delivering that mitigation and avoiding adverse effects on the SPA. Natural England is satisfied that the RAMS contribution would be appropriately secured and would avoid harm to the SPA. Consequently, in discharging my duty under the Regulations, I conclude through my AA that I have scientific certainty that the proposed development would have no adverse effects on the nature conservation interests of the SPA, consistent with TDLP1 Policy SP2 and the RAMS.

Other Matters

40. The matters raised by interested parties opposed to the scheme relate mostly to the Council's refusal reasons and are addressed under my main issues above. Where they do not, they have been addressed within the Council's Committee Report, and I share those views of the Council.

Conditions

41. The Council has suggested a number of planning conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. I have considered them in accordance with the tests for imposing conditions set out in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. Where necessary, I have amended the wording of the suggested conditions to ensure compliance with the tests.
42. In the interests of certainty of the planning permission granted, it is necessary to specify the approved plans. However, there is limited justification for imposing a general requirement for carrying out the proposed development in accordance with the submitted supporting documents or in accordance with future documents submitted to discharge conditions or any non-material amendments.

43. Given the outcome of my heritage balance and in accordance with Framework Paragraph 217, it is necessary to prevent demolition of the existing building until all reasonable steps have been taken to ensure the new development approved under this permission will proceed in a reasonable timescale thereafter.
44. To avoid unacceptable disruption the demolition and construction works should be carried out in accordance with an approved Construction Management Plan which could include those measures listed by the Council. However, I have omitted the non-exhaustive list of recommended measures to give the parties flexibility as to what needs to be addressed by the Construction Management Plan at the time the condition is discharged.
45. To ensure recording of the appeal building's archaeological interest and the investigation of any underlying ground-based archaeological remains, a condition is necessary. To avoid duplication, I have amalgamated and simplified the suggested conditions to align with those recommended by the Archaeology and Heritage officers.
46. To preserve the character and appearance of the CA, conditions requiring the approval of the external materials of the development, including detailed drawings of doors and timber framed windows, and details of eaves, verges and fascias, are necessary. Details of the placement of the solar panels are acceptable and shown on the drawings, and do not need controlling. There is no convincing justification in the evidence before me for controlling small scale additions such as external signage, lighting, grills, vents, satellite dishes, meter boxes and alarm boxes.
47. A condition is necessary to ensure adherence to development plan policies that require water and energy efficiency measures. However, I have omitted the non-exhaustive list of required measures, not because they were necessarily unacceptable, but to give the parties flexibility over those that are appropriate at the time the condition is discharged.
48. Whilst the approved drawings show space for cycle parking and bin storage, they do not show the detailed designs of those facilities, which are necessary for the satisfactory servicing of the development and to encourage cycling as a sustainable transport mode. Therefore, it is necessary to secure those details by a planning condition. I have omitted references to powered two-wheelers as TDLP Policy SPL3 appears to refer only to cycle parking, which in any case could include powered cycles.
49. Securing electric vehicle charging points would be unreasonable as no off-street parking spaces would be available, and on-street parking immediately adjacent to the proposed building is largely restricted by double yellow lines. Securing fibre optic broadband and implementing non-specific waste reduction measures have not been justified with any specific evidence or reference to the development plan. As such, they would not be necessary in this instance to make the development acceptable.
50. Conditions 3, 4 and 5 require agreement prior to the commencement of development either because they affect how the development is undertaken from the outset and/or their satisfactory delivery could be prejudiced if deferred to a later stage of development. Agreement to those conditions has been given.

Conclusion

51. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal proposal is consistent with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, to indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, the appeal is allowed.

G Sylvester

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 22-1238-01 Revision A, 22-1238/02 Revision A, 22-1238_03 Revision A, 22-1238-10 Revision A, 22-1238-11 Revision A, 22-1238_12 Revision A, and 22-1238/05.
- 3) No demolition shall take place until arrangements have been put in place to secure the implementation of the development approved under this permission and details of those arrangements have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The arrangements shall include details of the timescale for carrying out the development approved under this permission.
- 4) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall then be undertaken in accordance with that plan.
- 5) No development, including demolition, shall take place until:
 - (i) an archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; and
 - (ii) any necessary safeguarding measures to ensure the preservation in situ of important archaeological remains and/or further archaeological investigation and recording identified in the WSI have been undertaken in accordance with a specification and timetable that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details within the WSI.

- 6) No development shall commence above slab level until details of the types and colours of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 7) Window frames shall be constructed from timber. No development shall commence above slab level until details of the doors and windows to be installed in the development hereby permitted, including detailed elevation and section drawings (including sections through head, jamb – including construction details of surrounding fabric – stile, mullion, transom, meeting rail, glazing bar, bottom rail, sill or leaded glazing), at scales of 1:20 or 1:1 as appropriate, 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.
- 8) No development shall commence above slab level until detailed drawings of the eaves, verges and fascias of the building hereby permitted, including section and elevation drawings at scales between 1:20 and 1:1 as appropriate, 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.
- 9) No development shall commence above slab level until a scheme for the provision and implementation of water and energy efficiency measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme and the measures therein shall be implemented as approved and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development and thereafter retained and maintained.
- 10) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the cycle parking facility, and the recycling and refuse bin storage and collection facilities have been provided in accordance with details which have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the approved facilities shall be retained.

End of schedule