



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 14 January 2026

Site visit made on 13 January 2026

by J Hills MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/W/25/3373252

Scraptoft Lodge Farm, Keyham Lane East, Scraptoft, Leicestershire LE7 9TA

- 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 CDS Group Ltd against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01140/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as “proposed demolition of farmhouse and outbuildings, to facilitate the erection of a crematorium, dining hall and car parking with associated landscape and biodiversity enhancements.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of farmhouse and outbuildings, to facilitate the erection of a crematorium, dining hall and car parking with associated landscape and biodiversity enhancements at Scraptoft Lodge Farm, Keyham Lane East, Scraptoft, Leicestershire LE7 9TA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01140/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has submitted some revised plans and associated supporting information that was not before the Council when it made its decision. While the plans show that the chimneys would be reduced in height, the alterations would nevertheless materially change the proposal’s appearance as well as resulting in potentially different environmental effects.
3. Additionally, although the information has been provided with the appeal, those originally consulted on the application could be prejudiced as they might have been denied an opportunity to comment on such changes. Having had regard to the Holborn¹ principles, unlawful procedural unfairness could result. The appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme, and I have made my decision on the basis of the plans considered by the Council, on which interested people’s views were sought.
4. The appellant’s replacement Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) dated September 2025 attempts to clarify matters in response to landscape concerns raised by the Council. As such, it does not alter the scheme. This document has been thoroughly reviewed by the Council and can be taken into account.

¹ Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney

5. A revised National Planning Policy Framework Consultation and accompanying Written Ministerial Statement was announced on 16 December 2025. The main parties agree that these documents carry limited weight in the determination of the appeal. I find no reason to disagree.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) whether the site is a suitable location for the proposed development, having regard to local and national policies that seek to control development in the countryside.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The appeal site is in the countryside and comprises a broadly triangular wedge of unkempt land within the eastern rural fringe of Leicester, near Scraptoft. Split over 2 fields, it includes a redundant red brick farmhouse dating to the late 1800's, which, along with the surrounding buildings, is in a poor state of repair.
8. Having paid regard to the landscape submissions, the surrounding area is partly characterised by its sloping valleys, undulating farmland, and streams. These qualifying features, along with some steep hills and occasional small villages such as Keyham, become more pronounced the further one ventures from the urban influences of Scraptoft and Leicester.
9. There is a formalised entrance with a large metal gate that leads to some adjoining land. This land includes a variety of structures and other paraphernalia that is noticeably different from some undisturbed and more tranquil agricultural fields nearby. Furthermore, the presence of the entrance to a natural burial ground opposite the appeal site, a nearby golf club, and sports pitches closer to the edge of Scraptoft do not go unnoticed. Although viewed at a distance, properties on the hillside can nevertheless be seen from the road next to one corner of the appeal site. Collectively, these features add to the sense that the rurality of some of the surrounding area has succumbed to the urban influences of the city.
10. Broadly in the same location as the farmhouse and its associated buildings, the proposed dining hall building would include pitched roofing and Leicester red brick. The Council agreed at the hearing that the design takes inspiration from what exists on the site now. While close to the adjoining road, this combination of modern, yet typical design and commonplace materials would not stand out as incongruous features in the immediate or surrounding landscape. Moreover, the presence of the dining hall in this particular spot would not necessarily be unexpected given the longstanding existence of comparable built form here.
11. The crematorium building would cover a larger footprint than the dining hall. Even if aspects of it reflect other crematoria, it is however acknowledged that the functionality of the intended use has influenced its proposed design and scale. That said, in the context of the overall site, the crematorium would sit comfortably amongst generous grounds. Moreover, the Council does not consider the overall building height to be excessive, though takes issue with the proposed chimneys and their material finish. The crematorium would not mirror design features found in typical agricultural or rural buildings. However, the combination of low building

height, green roofing, local vernacular brickwork, and muted cladding tones would bring in a certain sensitivity of design. The location, next to a burial ground, would be complimentary to the local landscape, rather than being overtly urbanising or appearing out of place.

12. Turning to the wider landscape implications of the scheme, it is likely that the development would be seen from a number of viewpoints. Road users along Scraftoft Lane and Keyham Lane would be able to glance across intervening fields and see some of the development. The Council's landscape consultant did however agree at the hearing that the proposed landscaping would be effective in screening some of the lower parts of the development. Having driven along this route with verges that are not conducive to walking, my own observations were that vehicles did not travel at noticeably low speeds. Furthermore, the views are, in part, beyond some already disturbed land, and over hedges.
13. It is accepted that the development would be perceived as additional built form in the countryside, though views of it from the surrounding roads would be likely to be fleeting, at best. As such, the scheme would not present as an insensitive or incongruous addition to the landscape from these viewpoints.
14. Recreational users of the public footpaths connecting Keyham with Scraftoft would probably be able to pick out elements of the development amongst generous panoramic views of the wider landscape. These views are principally rural, though the urban areas can be seen at various distances, and the countryside is not devoid of occasional built form.
15. In that context, the appeal site is set in a valley and surrounded by well-established vegetation. While the chimneys may rise above some of the trees, they are but one relatively small element of the overall development. Furthermore, their slim profile would be unlikely to stand out, particularly when viewed directly from the south and north.
16. Additionally, the ornate gardens would be centrally located and surrounded by a combination of existing boundary trees. Screening provided by these trees would be enhanced by a comprehensive planting scheme. The gardens, along with the landscaped parking areas, would not generate any meaningful landscape harm. Furthermore, the footpaths are mostly located generous distances from the appeal site. As such, the sensitive choice of material finish, together with a low-profile design to the crematorium set below the skyline, means the wider landscape and valley setting would not be harmfully compromised.
17. The intensification of the proposed use would inevitably bring with it regular movements of people and activity at and around the appeal site. To some extent this would reduce overall levels of tranquillity, though the effects would be tempered by the nature of the proposed use and generous, landscaped circulation space within.
18. Drawing these matters together, the overall scale of the development would result in it being an occasionally recognisable feature in the landscape. However, it would be well designed and sensitively sited in an area where urban influences are common.
19. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude on this main issue that the development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of

the area. As such, there would be no conflict with policies GD5 and GD8 of the Harborough Local Plan (LP), or Policy S10 of the Scraptoft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) which, collectively in this respect, and amongst other things, aim to ensure new developments are sensitive to landscape setting, inspired by local character and vernacular, while avoiding substantial harm to features of landscape importance. There would also be no conflict with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which says, in part, that decisions should ensure developments are sympathetic to local character.

Location

20. The appeal site is located outside any defined settlement in the LP and NP. In such locations, development is only permitted under certain circumstances. LP Policy GD3 lists a variety of purposes including agriculture, tourism, and recreation where development may be allowed. The proposed use is not specifically referred to in the policy, though criteria (k) and (l) support services and facilities that improve the sustainability of settlements, or other uses which justify and are compatible with a countryside location, respectively. Additionally, proposals that accord with the development plan are offered overarching support through LP Policy GD1.
21. *Compatibility and justification* - I have already found above that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. Additionally, the appellant refers to guidance in respect of the siting and planning of crematoria, which suggests sites should be 2-4 hectares as a minimum and have a tranquil wooded backdrop. The latter points are recognised by the Council as being important site selection factors, which is not an unreasonable position to take. For these reasons, the proposal would be compatible with a countryside location.
22. The Council has raised the matter of a Supreme Court ruling in the case of *Wathen-Fayed v SoS* from July 2025. This is in respect of section 5 of the Cremation Act where the siting of a crematorium cannot be within 200 yards of a dwellinghouse or 50 yards from a public highway. The relevant part of the ruling essentially clarifies that the distance is measured from the building housing the cremator.
23. It is theoretically possible for a cremator building to be located within the main urban area. However, as demonstrated, the minimum land and operational requirements for a facility of this nature represents a significant constraint. As such, it is more likely that sites for this type of community facility may have to be found in the urban fringes and countryside. This is consistent with paragraph 89 of the Framework.
24. In this context, although there is disagreement regarding the methodology and conclusions of the submitted alternative site assessment, it is common ground that planning policy does not require such an assessment. Nevertheless, the Council confirmed at the hearing that it was unaware of any suitable or available sites within the urban area. Taking into account the overall functional requirements of the facility and the constraints identified, in this particular case, a countryside location is justified and, in practical terms, necessary within the context of LP Policy GD3 and NP Policy S8.

25. *Accessibility* - Amongst other things, LP Policy HC2 says that new community facilities will be permitted where they are within easy and safe walking distance of the majority of the community they will serve. Although not advanced as a policy within its reason for refusal, the Council is concerned that the scheme would be in conflict with it. It is common ground that public transport and pedestrian connections to the main built-up area are suboptimal.
26. However, mourners are more likely to wish to arrive together by private vehicle rather than on foot. That said, having walked from the appeal site to Scraftoft, although unpaved, unlit, and not always an inviting option during darkness or inclement weather, it would not be impossible for future staff members to cycle to work from large parts of the city. Once at the appeal site, there would also be easy access to the close network of public footpaths. Opportunities to make the location more sustainable are therefore evident and the scheme aligns with paragraph 89 of the Framework in this respect.
27. Notwithstanding this, the evidence focusses on funeral cortege drive times rather than walking distances for the purposes of site selection. Although extended drive times may be acceptable for a facility of this nature, it is clear that the appeal site lies within a short driving distance of the majority of the community it is intended to serve. There is no compelling justification for assessing the suitability of this proposal on the basis of walking distances. The proposal therefore differs from the types of community facilities listed in the Local Plan such as schools or doctors' surgeries, where pedestrian accessibility might be expected. Accordingly, any conflict with LP Policy HC2 would carry very little weight.
28. Even in the event that some mourners choose not to dine, the pre-ceremony, main ceremony, shower/washing, and prayers are likely to result in a good deal of toing and froing across a number of locations. The proposal would enable all of these aspects to take place in one location, thus reducing overall trip generation. As such, in accordance with criterion (k) of LP Policy GD3, the overall sustainability of movements across Leicester and other smaller settlements in the catchment would be improved.
29. For the reasons given, I therefore conclude on this main issue that the proposed development would be in a suitable location having regard to local and national policies that seek to control development in the countryside. There would be no conflict with LP policies GD1 and GD3, or NP Policy S8.

Other Matters

30. In considering this appeal, I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty set out under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, in particular the need to eliminate discrimination against persons with the protected characteristics of race and/or religion, advancing equality of opportunity for those persons and fostering good relations between them and others. Since I have decided to allow the appeal and grant full planning permission for the proposed development, there will be no interference with these protected characteristics.
31. Interested party representations make claims that regular funerals can affect the daily lives and emotional wellbeing of residents. While I take this seriously, for the reasons set out above, I have found that the proposal would be sensitive to its immediate and wider setting. Having noted the content of the petition in objection

to the scheme, as a matter of clarification, property values are not material to the determination of this appeal.

32. My attention has been drawn to a scheme in Denham² where it is claimed dining facilities may not have been progressed. Be that as it may, there is little compelling evidence to show that this aspect of the development, or the large showering facilities, would not be of any benefit to some or all of the intended groups, or others in the community. A choice of a range of facility would result and I am therefore satisfied that there would be some benefits in this regard.
33. It is acknowledged that there are other crematoria in the surrounding area that can provide a range of services for a wide demographic of the local population. Even so, having paid very careful regard to the representations made in respect of the need for the proposal, including those from the Westerleigh Group, it has been satisfactorily shown both in the evidence, and at the hearing, that the totality of facilities offered at the appeal site set it apart from anything else nearby. Additionally, although not an explicit policy requirement, it is of note that the Council agrees with the overall need for the development. This proposal is also materially different to the Denham appeal where needs assessments were made in respect of Green Belt constraints.
34. *Highways* – I have paid regard to the good number of representations concerning potential highways impacts of the development. Having driven around the surrounding area, including the one-way system in Scraftoft, the nature of the connecting road network is understood. It was explained at the hearing that there is a draft housing allocation very close to the appeal site and a pending planning application. Given their status, these cannot be given much weight in respect of possible future transport movements.
35. An undisputed fallback exists for a wedding venue at the appeal site that could generate trips for up to 350 guests, where coach and other vehicle movements could not be controlled. This is a material consideration that carries significant weight. Subject to a condition that restricts the use of the dining hall to the wider crematorium site, the Council and local highway authority raise no objections to the proposal on highways grounds. As such, in the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary, I find it unlikely that the proposal would lead to any severe or unacceptable impact on the road network.
36. *Biodiversity* – the concerns are noted including the disruption of undeveloped parts of the appeal site. Subject to appropriately worded conditions, the effects of the development on biodiversity, including protected species have been shown to be acceptable and capable of mitigation. This mitigation includes bat boxes and tiles as part of the development. Furthermore, there is little evidence to demonstrate the scheme is not able to deliver the required net gains in biodiversity.
37. *Pollution* – While the concerns including reference to respiratory conditions are acknowledged, the air quality assessment demonstrates that the development will have an acceptable effect in terms of atmospheric pollution, and no compelling evidence has been provided to the contrary. The appeal site is some distance from the nearest residential properties and therefore noise generated from mechanical services including heat pumps is unlikely to make the development unacceptable. The appellant has confirmed these will meet accepted standards and the Council

² APP/N0410/W/21/3270138

does not object on these grounds. I find no reason to disagree and do not consider a planning condition to be necessary.

38. *Heritage* – The appeal site is physically separated from any conservation areas and would not cause any harm to their significance. Scruptoft Farmhouse is a non-designated heritage asset and the Council's heritage and archaeology team recommend that appropriate recording of the building is carried out, and for the ridge and furrow earthworks. This can be secured using appropriately worded planning conditions. Having paid regard to paragraph 216 of the Framework, the total loss of the assets is noted as is their relatively low level of significance. This is not a matter that formed any part of the reason for refusal, and the Council has agreed that there are no objections to the scheme on heritage grounds. The effects of the development on heritage are acceptable.

Conditions

39. I have made some amendments and omissions to the Council's suggested conditions in the interests of clarity, to avoid duplication, and to ensure compliance with the Framework.
40. In the interests of certainty, I have included a plans condition.
41. Pre-commencement conditions requiring details of foul and surface water drainage management are necessary in the interests of appropriate water management. These include construction method statements which are also necessary in respect of highway safety, the living conditions of those in the general area, and pollution. Other pre-commencement conditions relating to tree protection and levels are needed in the interests of biodiversity and the character and appearance of the area. Historic building survey and trial trenching pre-commencement conditions are reasonable in the interests of heritage.
42. A single habitat management plan condition, rather than the two suggested, is required to ensure appropriate biodiversity gains are secured. An ecological compliance condition is necessary in the interests of protected species, as is an external lighting scheme condition.
43. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, conditions are required concerning landscaping plans and their implementation, as well as external material finishes.
44. Cycle, parking, and access compliance conditions are needed to ensure a safe highway network is maintained. Details are necessary in respect of delivery service access and motorcycle parking for similar reasons and to enhance transport choices. Conditions for the removal of certain permitted development rights for gates and barriers, and the restriction of the dining hall to the wider crematorium use are also necessary in the interests of highway safety.
45. The fallback permission for a wedding venue is said not to include any condition restricting operating hours. Given the nature of the proposed development, I have not imposed the suggested operational hours condition as it has not been shown to be reasonable or necessary to make the development acceptable.

Conclusion

46. For the reasons given, the appeal is allowed.

J Hills

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Ian Ponter BA (Hons) LLM (Distinction) – Barrister, Kings Chambers - Counsel

Mr Oliver Bell BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI – Regional Director, Nexus Planning – Agent

Mr Andrew Moseley BA(Hons), DipTP, MSc, FCHIT, CTPP – Managing Director,
Andrew Moseley Associates – Expert Witness (Highways)

Mr Peter Radmall MA, B.Phil (Landscape Design), CMLI – Director, Peter Radmall
Associates – Expert Witness (Landscape and Visual Impact)

Mr Adam Muspratt Ba (Hons) – Planning Manager, The CDS Group – Expert Witness
(Need)

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mrs Nicola Parry – Development Management Team Leader

Mr Simon Neesam - Director of The Landscape Partnership

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Mr P Elliott – Ward Councillor

Mr Tony Johnson – Chair of Keyham Parish Meeting

Mr Roaihs – Local resident

Ms Singh – Local resident

Mr Knight-Lewis – Westerleigh Group

Mr Dosajh – Member of Sikh community

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with the following plans:

CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 101 P01 - Site Location Plan
CDS-C1119_P01-10 Rev 04 - Masterplan (March 2025)
CRE- PHP- XX- XX- DR- A- 111 Rev P03 - Detailed Site Plan (November 2024)
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714-110 Rev P04 - Proposed Site Plan
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 15 P01 – Crematorium Ground Floor Plan
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 17 P01 – Crematorium Roof Plan
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 18 P01 – Crematorium Elevations
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 19 P01 – Crematorium Building Sections
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 20 P01 – Crematorium Site Sections
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 25 P01 – Substation
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 26 P01 – Flower Court
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 27 P01 – Perforated Cladding Details
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 28 P01 – Entrance Gate
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 30 P01 – Dining Hall Ground Floor Plan
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 31 P01 – Dining Hall First Floor Plan
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 32 P01 – Dining Hall Roof Plans
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 33 P01 – Dining Hall Elevations
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 34 P01 – Dining Hall Building Sections
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 35 P01 – Dining Hall Site Sections
CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 115 P01 – Proposed Cycle Shelter
CDS-C1119_P01-30 – Hard Landscape Plan
CDS-C1119_P01-20 - Planting Plan 1
CDS-C1119_P01-21 - Planting Plan 2
CDS-C1119_P01-22 - Planting Plan 3
CDS-C1119_P01-23 - Planting Plan 4
CDS-C1119_P01-24 - Planting Plan 5

3. No development shall commence on site until details of the existing and proposed ground levels and finished floor levels of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
4. No development shall commence on site until full details of the means of foul water drainage for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained in perpetuity.
5. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until such time as a surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development must be carried out in accordance with these approved details, completed prior to first occupation, and maintained as such in perpetuity.

6. No development shall commence on site until the trees and hedgerows to be retained on the site have been enclosed by protective fencing, in accordance with British Standard 5837 (2010): Trees in Relation to Construction. Before the fencing is erected its type and position shall be approved by the local planning authority, and after it has been erected it shall be maintained for the duration of the works and no vehicle, plant, temporary building or materials, including raising and or, lowering of ground levels, shall be allowed within the protected area(s).
7. No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a written scheme of investigation (WSI), including a programme of historic building survey work, has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For the land and structures that are included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include the statement of significance and research objectives, and
 - The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
 - The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.
8. No demolition/development shall take place/commence until the necessary programme of archaeological work has been completed. The programme will commence with an initial phase of trial trenching to inform a final archaeological mitigation scheme. Each stage will be completed in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI), which has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed mitigation WSI, which shall include the statement of significance and research objectives, and
 - The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
 - The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.
9. No development shall commence on site (including any site clearance/preparation works), until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. Details shall include the following, which shall be adhered to throughout the construction period: -

- a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- b) loading/unloading and storage of plant, materials, oils, fuels, and chemicals
- c) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing;
- d) wheel washing facilities and road cleaning arrangements;
- e) measures to control the emission of dust during construction;
- f) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from site preparation and construction works;
- g) measures for the protection of the natural environment;
- e) hours of construction work, including deliveries and removal of materials;
- f) full details of any piling technique to be employed, if relevant;
- g) location of temporary buildings and associated generators, compounds, structures, and enclosures
- h) routeing of construction traffic
- i) full details of any floodlighting to be installed associated with the construction of the development
- j) management of surface water on site during construction of the development.

10. No development shall commence on site (including any site clearance/preparation works), until a Construction Environmental Management Plan for biodiversity has been submitted to the local planning authority or approval in writing. Details shall provide for precautionary working methods including identification of potentially damaging construction activities, identification of biodiversity protection zones such as the watercourse buffer, badger sett buffers (which should be clearly indicated on construction plans) and root protection areas around retained hedgerows and trees, practical measures and sensitive working practices to avoid or reduce impacts during construction, timing of works to avoid harm to nesting birds, responsible persons for overseeing sensitive works and use of protective fencing where required.

11. No above ground work shall commence on site until a Landscape Management Plan (LMP) has been submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. Details shall include the specification, the timing of the completion of, and the arrangements for the management and maintenance of hard and soft landscaping. Thereafter the approved LMP shall be adhered to.

All soft landscaping comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of any of the buildings to which it relates or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. All shrubs, trees and hedge planting shall be maintained free from weeds and shall be protected from damage by vermin and stock. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years from the date of first occupation of the development, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species. All hard landscaping shall also be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

12. No above ground work shall commence on site until a schedule indicating the materials to be used on all external elevations of the development hereby

approved (and material samples if requested) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

13. No above ground work shall commence on site until a scheme for external lighting (including details of permanent external lighting including layout plan, contour plan, a virtual plan, lighting type, luminaire type, intensity, mounting height, aiming angles and luminaire profiles) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved and retained as such in perpetuity. Any additional external lighting shall be installed in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
14. No development shall commence on site until a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) has been submitted to approved in writing by the local planning authority. As part of the details to be supplied, evidence (including soil samples) on how the proposed 'lowland meadows' will be achieved and managed shall be included. Thereafter the development shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the HMMP for a minimum period of 30 years.
15. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until such time as the access arrangements shown including visibility splays on Proposed Site Plan drawing number CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714-110 P04 have been implemented in full.
16. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be first occupied until a Delivery and Service Management Plan (DSMP) which sets out management and control measures for goods vehicle movements associated with that part of the development has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the agreed DSMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
17. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until such time as off street car and coach/ HGV parking provision (with turning facilities) has been provided, hard surfaced (and demarcated) in accordance with Proposed Site Plan drawing number CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714-110 P04. Thereafter the onsite parking and turning provision shall be kept available for such uses in perpetuity.
18. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until such time as secure cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with Proposed Cycle Shelter drawing number CRE-PHP-XX-XX-DR-A-4714 115 revision P01. Thereafter the onsite cycle parking provision shall be kept available for such use(s) in perpetuity.
19. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until such time as secure powered two-wheeler (motorcycle, scooter) parking has been provided in accordance with details first submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the onsite parking provision shall be kept available for such use(s) in perpetuity.

20. The dining hall shall be used in conjunction with the cremation service only and for no other purpose.
21. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 2 of Schedule 2, Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no gates, barriers, bollards, chains or other such obstructions shall be erected to the dining room service access.
22. The development shall be implemented in strict accordance with the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures set out within both the Ecological Impact Assessment (19.08.2024) and the Preliminary Roost Assessment and Bat Survey Report (28.08.2024) both undertaken by Pioneer Environment.