



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2026

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/W/25/3373629

Land south of Furtho Lane, Potterspury, NN12 7PZ

- 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 Mr Tim Northey of Abbeymill Homes Ltd and Grand Union Housing (now Amplus Living) against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0642/MAF.
 - The development proposed is full planning permission for the erection of 20 affordable homes with upgrading of Furtho Lane, new access, parking, landscaping and all enabling works, and outline planning permission (all matters reserved) for 3 self-build homes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and full planning permission is granted for 20 affordable homes with upgrading of Furtho Lane, new access, parking, landscaping and all enabling works, and outline planning permission (all matters reserved) is granted for 3 self-build homes, at land south of Furtho Lane, Potterspury, NN12 7PZ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/0642/MAF, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by the appellants against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. Since the application was submitted, the company name of one of the appellants has changed from Grand Union Housing to Amplus Living. Amplus Living is a registered Community Benefit Society.
4. A Unilateral Undertaking (UU) was submitted with the appeal, which the council has confirmed addresses its second reason for refusal. Consequently, given the limited outstanding matters in dispute between the main parties, it was agreed that a hearing was unnecessary.
5. As the term 'entry level exception site' is no longer referred to or defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which is more up to date than the council's development plan, I have removed the entry level exception site reference from the description of development in my decision, to avoid confusion. In earlier versions of the Framework, these were defined as sites suitable for first time buyers or those looking to rent their first home. In May 2021 a Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) replaced the entry level exception site policy with a First Homes exception site policy, which remains extant according to footnote 35 of the Framework, albeit the 25% minimum delivery requirement for First Homes

no longer applies. First Home exception sites should be supported by local authorities unless the need for such homes is already being met within the local authority's area.

6. The hybrid application sought full planning permission for the affordable housing element of the scheme, and outline planning permission, with details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved for future consideration. I have determined the proposals on this basis and treated any plans relating to the self-build housing, other than the red line boundary identifying the part of the site the outline planning permission relates to, as being indicative only.
7. Since the application was determined, another appeal decision¹ has been issued, dated 22 January 2026, in which the Inspector concluded that the council was unable to demonstrate that it has a deliverable five-year supply of housing land. The council's comments were invited on this decision, the findings of which are not disputed.

Main Issue

8. The main issue is whether the proposed development would be proportionate in size to the adjacent settlement of Potterspury.

Reasons

9. Potterspury is a Category A Secondary Service Village. Secondary Service Villages fall third in the settlement hierarchy, after Rural Service Centres and Primary Service Villages, with those in Category A being identified as more suitable for limited development than those in Category B, due to their level of services and proximity to other higher order settlements.
10. This large rural settlement is made up of just over 700 dwellings, together with a range of community services and facilities, including a primary school, pre-school nursery, church, shop and post office, village hall, public house, restaurant, sports and social club, multi-purpose playing pitches, playing fields and play areas, all within walking distance of the site along residential street lit footpaths. Bus stops are located close to the site, and buses travel on roughly an hourly basis throughout the day, except on Sundays, to and from nearby Towcester and Milton Keynes. These locations offer a greater range of services, including employment, education, healthcare and rail travel. Future occupiers of the proposed development would not therefore be isolated or socially excluded and would not need to be reliant upon private cars to meet their day to day needs.
11. The appeal site comprises a large grass paddock adjoining the built-up edge of the village. It is bound by housing on Drovers Way to the west and a further grass paddock to the south, beyond which there is a laser tag/airsoft leisure activity site. Furtho Lane runs adjacent to the north and east sides of the site, creating a strong defensible boundary edge, beyond which there are further agricultural and equestrian fields. Swallowfields Stud is located to the east. Although the site adjoins the built-up edge of the village, it is outside of its existing confines and is therefore classed as countryside.
12. Policy S1 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) December 2014 (the JCSLP) steers most new development towards larger urban

¹ APP/W2845/W/25/3367158

areas and towns, stating that rural service centres and rural areas will also be provided for. It prioritises previously developed land but does not restrict the development of greenfield sites. It limits growth in rural areas, with the emphasis being on enhancing and maintaining the character and vitality of rural communities. Similarly, policy R1 of the JCSP restricts development outside the existing confines of villages to, amongst other things, that which would enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities or would contribute towards and improve the local economy. These policies are broadly consistent with the Framework but should be read in conjunction with policies that support exception sites outside of settlement confines.

13. Policy H3 of the JCSP is supportive of affordable housing on rural exception sites, provided they are within or adjoining the main built-up area of a rural settlement, their form and scale is justified by evidence of need, and arrangements are in place to ensure the housing would remain affordable in perpetuity. There are no restrictions to the size of such sites although the policy supporting text states that these will be small in scale and reflect identified local needs. The glossary at Annex 2 of the Framework also describes rural exception sites as “small” and although this term is undefined, 23 dwellings would be a major development in planning terms and thus would not ordinarily be considered small. Accordingly, I do not consider the proposal to be a small rural exception site, which the Framework does not require to be within or adjacent to a settlement, and policy H3 of the JCSP does not therefore apply to this case.
14. Policies SS1 and LH1 of the South Northamptonshire Part 2 Local Plan 2011-2029 (2020) (the SNLP) support the delivery of housing beyond settlement confines of Category A Secondary Service Villages, where it would comply with policies LH3 and LH5 for entry level exception sites and self-build homes.
15. Policy LH3 of the SNLP relates specifically to entry level exception sites and is supportive of such development adjoining the confines of settlements, provided the scheme comprises at least one type of housing suitable for first-time buyers or renters, has regard to local income and house prices, and arrangements are in place to ensure the housing remains discounted for future eligible households. It is not necessary for such developments to be evidenced by a local needs survey. Although this policy pre-dates the Framework and the replacement of entry level exception sites, it remains relevant to the scheme as a material consideration, given its broad consistency with paragraph 76 of the Framework and the similar aims of entry level and community led exception sites.
16. The council’s reason for refusal refers only to the site failing to meet the criteria for an entry-level exception site, it does not refer to the self-build housing or to any conflict with policy LH5 of the SNLP, which relates specifically to self and custom build sites. I concur with the view that the self-build housing would be suitably located close to the built-up edge of the settlement and that future occupiers would have safe access to its services and facilities. It is also undisputed that the development would comprise housing suitable for first-time buyers or renters or that the UU would ensure suitable prices, rents, eligibility and affordability in perpetuity. Paragraph 71 of the Framework supports mixed tenure sites, which can include a mixture of affordable housing and self-build plots.
17. The crux of the council’s case is that due to the total red line application site area exceeding 1 hectare (ha), it would not meet the criteria for an entry-level exception

site and thus would be contrary to policies S1, R1 and H3 of the JCSLP and policy LH3 of the SNLP. None of these development plan policies restrict the size of exception sites either in terms of site area or dwelling numbers. Whilst the supporting text to policy LH3 states that sites should be proportionate in size, e.g. less than 1ha or not exceed 5% of the size of the existing settlement, this refers to entry level exception sites as introduced by the now superseded 2018 version of the Framework and footnote 33 at that time.

18. The December 2023 version of the Framework introduced exception sites for community led developments on sites that would not otherwise be suitable as rural exception sites. As the development is not small, it would not be a rural exception site as defined by Annex 2 of the Framework. Paragraph 76 of the current Framework is supportive of community led development provided it is amongst other things, adjacent to existing settlements and proportionate in size to them. Footnote 36 indicates that by proportionate in size, it means that sites should not be larger than 1ha in size or exceed 5% of the size of the existing settlement, unless the development plan allows otherwise, which is not the case here. Paragraph 76 does not require evidence of any specific local need.
19. There is disagreement between the main parties as to whether the 1ha and 5% size limits must both be met for a site to be considered proportionate to the size of the settlement. I have been referred to an appeal decision², which refers to an earlier appeal decision, both of which concluded the word 'or' provides options and flexibility. In the absence of any other evidence, and taking the wording at face value, I concur with that view. Had the Framework intended to require both restrictions to be complied with, it would explicitly say that.
20. Moreover, the key requirement of the part of the policy in question is proportionality. What constitutes a proportionate development will vary depending on local circumstances. For this reason, I consider the percentage increase to be a more accurate measure of proportionality. It would be unreasonable to suggest the development would be disproportionate to the size of the settlement simply because it exceeds 1ha, without considering other factors, such as the existing size of the settlement, the area of the site to be developed for housing and the inclusion of large extents of open space and existing highway within the overall site area calculation.
21. The Framework is also unclear as to whether the 5% size increase refers to the area of the settlement, the physical extent of its built form, dwelling numbers or population. The appellants state that the proposal would increase the number of households in the settlement by approximately 3%. I have no reason to doubt this undisputed information. Whilst I cannot be certain the built area of the proposed development site would not increase the built form of the village by 5% or more, having walked around the village and from viewing its whole extent on aerial imagery, it does not appear that this would be the case or that the development would appear disproportionate to the size of the settlement. Therefore, even if I were to agree that the 1ha and 5% elements must both be met, it has not been demonstrated that the site exceeding the 1ha limit would result in any harm that would justify withholding planning permission.

² APP/N1730/W/21/3289388

22. I have been provided with conflicting site areas ranging from 1.12ha to 1.58ha. These areas include both the affordable and self-build housing plots, the existing highway, and a substantial area of open space measuring 0.62ha. When discounting the area of open space, which is much greater than that required to comply with planning policies or to effectively soften the visual effect of the development, the remainder of the built extent of the development would be less than 1ha and would not appear disproportionate to the size of the existing built-up area.
23. Whilst I acknowledge that the open space area forms part of the overall development, it has not been suggested to me that this would be unacceptable in, or harmful to, the countryside. Likewise, the highway improvement works would have no effect on the size of the existing settlement, and discounting the existing highway further reduces the size of the site area.
24. The appellants argue that the self-build housing should not be included in the site area assessed against paragraph 76 of the Framework as this is separate to the affordable exception housing. There is nothing in paragraph 76 or footnote 36 of the Framework to suggest that other homes allowed to support the delivery of exception sites should be discounted from the size or proportionality assessments. As the self-build plots form part of the overall scheme, would be unlikely to be supported on the part of the site proposed without the affordable housing infilling the gap between them and the existing edge of the village, are most likely required to support the overall viability of the proposal, and would add to the increased size of the built extent and growth of the settlement, it is reasonable to consider the total housing numbers or area increase. However, I note that the site area of both the affordable and self-build homes, together with the existing road and any improvements, would in any event be below 1ha.
25. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would be proportionate in size to the settlement of Potterspury, notwithstanding the fact that the open space area would result in the total site area exceeding 1ha. It would therefore accord with paragraph 76 of the Framework, which supports the development of exception sites for community-led development for affordable housing, adjacent to settlements, provided they are proportionate in size, would not compromise areas or assets of importance, and comply with local design policies and standards. As the proposal is an appropriate exception under paragraph 76, I find no conflict with policies R1, S1 and H3 of the JCLP or policy LH3 of the SNLP.

Other Matters

26. Reference is made to surveys undertaken by the parish council in 2022 not identifying support for developments of this size, but I have not been provided with any details of these surveys or their results. Whilst I have also not been provided with an up-to-date housing needs survey undertaken specifically for Potterspury, this is not a policy requirement for this type of exception site, which should be supported unless the council can demonstrate the need for first homes in its area is being met. In this case the council's own evidence confirms that there are 64 households on the housing register that would consider homes in this location. I am also advised that the council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies a shortfall of affordable housing.

27. Having regard to recent appeal decisions in the area, the council also does not dispute that there is an unmet demand for self-build plots within the South Northamptonshire District and I have not been provided with any substantive evidence to the contrary. Although I have been advised that existing plots with planning permission or permission in principle for self-build dwellings in Potterspury have not been delivered, there could be many reasons for this, such as the size and type of plots, price, availability, marketing and location. The lack of interest in existing plots does not necessarily indicate a lack of demand for self-builds in general. The absence of a 5-year housing land supply also suggests that there is a shortage of land for all types of housing.
28. It is apparent that the adjacent Drovers Way development, was completed several years ago. It is within the settlement boundary, does not form part of the proposal before me, and the combined size of the two sites is not relevant to my determination of the current proposal.
29. Given that the development comprises primarily of affordable housing, pepper potting of these is not an option or a requirement. However, the development would provide a mixture of 1 bed flats and 2, 3 and 4 bed houses with a 50/50 tenure split of shared ownership and social rented, and 3 self-build plots, which would assist in facilitating the viability of the scheme as a whole. I am therefore satisfied that the mix of house types and tenures would make a valuable contribution to the area. I have not been provided with any substantive evidence of any existing anti-social behaviour problems resulting from the affordable housing on Drovers Way, or any evidence that would persuade me that providing additional affordable housing in this area would lead to such problems.
30. My attention has been drawn to the section of Furtho Lane running along the northern boundary of the site, passing by the Drovers Way development and Swallowfields Stud, which forms part of a public bridleway. I have carefully considered the concerns raised by the British Horse Society and other interested parties regarding the safety implications resulting from increased traffic using this route, and the diminishment of the enjoyment of the bridleway route for horse riders.
31. The bridleway already forms part of a surfaced road of reasonable width, with good visibility and which already carries traffic to the stud farm, airsoft centre and other premises to the southeast of the site. It is more likely that horse riders from the stud farm and other stables beyond the airsoft centre, would ride eastwards along the bridleway rather than westwards towards existing housing developments and roads leading to the village centre. I also note that the highway improvement works would include the provision of warning signs at the start of the bridleway between the junctions of Grafton Close and Drovers Way, and on the northern approach to the sharp bend adjacent to the north east corner of the site, to make drivers aware of the potential for horse riders to be present. Future occupiers of most of the proposed dwellings would use the new cul-de-sac entrance to be created a short distance beyond the existing houses. The intensification of this relatively short section of the bridleway by domestic traffic travelling at low speeds, would be modest and would not significantly increase the safety risks to horses or their riders.
32. I note that the eastern end of Furtho Lane is not adopted. However, the new estate road would be constructed to adoptable standards, and the UU would secure the

improvement of the existing road and the extension of the footpath. The footpath extension would follow the line of the existing one along the frontage of the Drovers Way development and would be within the paddock land as opposed to requiring the removal of trees and hedges along the opposite side of the road. The local highway authority has raised no concerns regarding traffic increases on the wider road network in the area, and confirmed that subject to conditions, the proposal would not be detrimental to highway safety. I am also satisfied that the development would not result in any flooding or drainage issues subject to the imposition of suitable conditions.

33. As exception sites are by their very nature beyond existing settlement confines, within the countryside, it is inevitable that these would result in a degree of change to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would relate well to the adjacent Drovers Way housing development and would follow the pattern of cul-de-sac developments along the southern side of Furtho Lane. The proposed affordable dwellings would reflect the scale and appearance of others nearby and the self-build housing would be subject to further detailed control at the reserved matters stage. The provision of a strong landscape buffer within the open space area would soften the visual impact of the new housing over time, and as this landscaping would be outside of the domestic gardens and subject to a maintenance and management plan, it would be reasonably safeguarded for the long-term future. Consequently, the change would not result in significant harm.
34. As previously noted, Potterspurty offers a good range of services and facilities, whilst it has not been suggested that any of these are at risk, the increased population resulting from the development would assist in the viability and retention of existing services. I note concerns regarding the capacity of local schools and that the UU would secure a contribution towards primary education in the area.
35. The loss of the equestrian paddock would have a negligible impact on local wildlife, which would be more than compensated for by the bio-diversity net gains (BNG).

Planning Obligation and Conditions

36. A completed UU has been submitted, which would ensure that the proposed 20 dwellings for which full planning permission is sought would be provided as affordable housing and retained as such in perpetuity, and that the 3 dwellings for which outline planning permission is sought would be self-build dwellings. The UU would also secure a contribution towards primary education in the area serving the development, a contribution towards local library services, a contribution to cover the provision of waste and recycling facilities for the proposed properties, the provision of highway improvement works including bridleway warning signs and footpath improvements and extensions, the provision of appropriate levels of public open space and BNG, together with measures to secure their future maintenance and management, and a monitoring fee. I am satisfied that each of these obligations is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, is directly related to the development, and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. Therefore, they meet the tests within CIL Regulation 122 and the Framework, and I have taken them into account in reaching my decision.

37. Standard conditions relating to time limits for commencement, the submission of reserved matters, and compliance with the approved drawings, are necessary to provide certainty on these matters.
38. There is no evidence before me to suggest the site is likely to be contaminated as a result of previous or nearby uses. However, given the scale of the development and its sensitive end use, a precautionary approach is reasonable and as such a condition is necessary to ensure appropriate investigations are undertaken and where necessary remediation is agreed, to ensure the safety of future occupiers of the development, and of those living adjacent to, or working on the site.
39. A construction method statement, including hours during which construction works and deliveries may take place, is necessary to ensure disturbance to nearby residents and businesses is minimised as far as reasonably possible.
40. Details of external materials, architectural details and boundary treatments are necessary to ensure an appropriate end appearance. Bicycle stores and bin storage areas are annotated on the site plan but as no elevations or materials have been supplied, a condition is necessary to ensure these are of acceptable appearance. Landscaping is reserved for the self-build dwellings, but due to the limited landscaping information submitted in respect of the affordable housing area, a condition is necessary to agree landscaping details, together with its future management, to ensure a satisfactory development.
41. Conditions to ensure compliance with the approved drainage scheme are necessary to avoid the risk of flooding. The improvement works to the existing highway are covered by the UU, and any temporary disruption or diversion of the public footpath/bridleway would need to be subject to agreement with the highway authority. However, conditions are necessary to ensure the new access, turning and parking facilities are provided and retained, in the interests of highway safety and the general amenity of the site. In the event that the council's refuse vehicles are unprepared to access private roads, despite appropriate access and turning facilities being provided, a waste plan is necessary to secure alternative means of household refuse disposal.
42. Given the limited ecological value of the site, its ongoing equestrian use that was apparent at the time of my visit, and the only trees/hedges being those adjacent to existing residential development that are to be retained, I do not consider an updated ecological survey to be necessary prior to the commencement of the development. It is however necessary to impose a condition to ensure the recommendations set out in the ecological assessment are followed, to protect and enhance the value of the site. As external lighting guidance forms part of the recommendations in the ecology report it does not need to be controlled by an additional separate condition. Likewise, the provision and future management of ecology, BNG, open space and landscaping enhancements covered by the UU, and other conditions, do not require duplication.
43. As the affordable houses are on generous plots, the addition of modest extensions or outbuildings would not be detrimental to the overall appearance of the site or the living conditions of occupiers of adjacent properties. The scale and design of the self-build plots is as yet unknown, and flats do not benefit from permitted development rights. A condition removing permitted development rights from all plots would not be reasonable or necessary. However, given the edge of

settlement rural location, I consider it reasonable to remove permitted development rights for upward extensions in order to protect the character of the area.

Conclusion

44. The proposal would accord with the development plan and the Framework and there are no other material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with these. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

R Bartlett

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby granted full planning permission shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby granted outline planning permission shall begin not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 3) Application(s) for approval of the reserved matters for the self-build dwellings shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.
- 4) Details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale "the reserved matters" of the self-build dwellings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any part of that development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 5) The development hereby granted full planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Location Plan POT-PL01D, Self-Build Boundary Plan PL001C, Site Layout POT-PL02G, Open Space Plan POT-PL03D, Apartment Plans POT-PL05, Apartment Elevations POT-PL06, 2B House Plans POT-PL07, 2B House Elevations POT-PL08, 3B [END] House Plans POT-PL09, 3B [END] House Elevations POT-PL10, 3B [DET] House Plans POT-PL11, 3B [DET] House Elevations POT-PL12, 4B House Plans POT-PL13, 4B House Elevations POT-PL14, Street Scenes POT-PL20B, Parking Plan POT-L25C, Materials Plan POT-PL26C, Tenure Plan POT-PL27A and Landscape Strategy Plan 8118/ASP5/LSP A.
- 6) No development shall take place on any part of the site until an assessment of the risks posed by any contamination, carried out in accordance with British Standard BS 10175: Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of Practice and the Environment Agency, Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) (or equivalent British Standard and Model Procedures if replaced), has been

submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. If any contamination is found, no development shall take place until:

- i) a report specifying the measures to be taken, including the timescale, to remediate the site to render it suitable for the development hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority;
- ii) the site has been remediated in accordance with the approved measures and timescale; and
- iii) a verification report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

If, during the course of development, any contamination is found which has not been previously identified, work shall be suspended until:

- iv) additional measures for the remediation of the site have been carried out in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and
 - v) a verification report for all the remediation works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 7) No development shall take place on any part of the site until a Construction Method Statement, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall include, but not be limited to, hours of construction works and deliveries. Separate Statements or Methods may be submitted in relation to the outline and full planning permissions. The approved Construction Method Statement(s) shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for each phase of the development.
- 8) No buildings shall be constructed above ground level until details of the materials to be used in the construction of their external surfaces (e.g. bricks, tiles, ridge tiles, doors, windows, surrounds, architectural details, meter boxes, hand rails, rainwater goods, and eaves and verge details) 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) Prior to the commencement of any boundary enclosure works, details of the positions, height, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The boundary treatment of each property shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to its occupation.
- 10) Prior to the commencement of the construction of any cycle stores connected to the affordable housing, details of the height, design and materials of these shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No affordable dwelling shall be occupied until its cycle storage space has been provided in accordance with the approved details.
- 11) No development of the affordable housing site shall take place above ground level until a scheme of landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of all existing trees and hedgerows on or adjacent to the land, identify those to be retained and set out measures for their protection throughout the course of development. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of

the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

- 12) Before the affordable housing development is first occupied a landscape management plan, including long term management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All landscaping shall be managed in accordance with the approved landscape management plan.
- 13) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Drainage Strategy and Flood Risk Assessment produced by PHG Consulting Engineers, dated 18 September 2024. No dwelling shall be occupied until a verification report has been submitted for the part of the site it is situated on, which demonstrates compliance with the approved drainage scheme.
- 14) No dwelling shall be occupied until a surface water management strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage of the site shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved strategy.
- 15) No dwelling shall be occupied until that part of the service road which provides access to it has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans. The service road as constructed shall be retained thereafter.
- 16) No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicle parking and turning facilities, and the cycle storage facilities, have been provided in accordance with the details shown on the approved drawings. Thereafter those facilities shall be retained for their intended purpose.
- 17) No dwelling shall be occupied until a household refuse waste and recycling management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The disposal of waste and recycling refuse from the dwellings shall thereafter be dealt with in accordance with the details of the approved plan.
- 18) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out in Section 6 of the Preliminary Ecological Assessment and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment by Windrush Ecology dated September 2024 and any subsequent updated ecological assessment.
- 19) 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 permitted by virtue of Class AA of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Order shall be undertaken.

END OF SCHEDULE