



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 December 2025

by S Hubbard BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/W/25/3373786

Land off Braunston Road, Oakham LE15 6LY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Exeter Court 1 Limited against the decision of Rutland County Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0491/OUT.
 - The development proposed is outline application (with all matters reserved except access) for the construction of 5 no. self-build dwellings, access, car parking, landscaping and associated works
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission, with all matters reserved except access, is granted for the construction of 5 no. self-build dwellings, access, car parking, landscaping and associated works at Land off Braunston Road, Oakham, LE15 6LY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/0491/OUT subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Exeter Court 1 Limited against Rutland County Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The planning application is made in outline with details of access provided for consideration at this stage. All other matters are reserved for future consideration. I have taken submitted plans relating to access as forming part of the application. I have treated other plans as indicative only.
4. As an Appendix to their statement the Council submitted a draft document entitled 'Rutland Highways Development Control General Principles for Development'. This document was referred to as an internal draft and would not have been seen by the appellant prior to it being submitted during the appeal. Nevertheless, the appellant has had the opportunity to comment on it as part of their final comments. Consequently, I consider that the appellant has had a fair opportunity to address this matter.
5. A signed and dated section 106 agreement to secure the proposed dwellings as self-build dwellings was submitted with the appeal. Whilst the agreement required the proposed dwellings to be self-build in the first instance, it allowed the owner to develop the site without some or all of the plots being developed as self-build dwellings should, following a marketing exercise, it be demonstrated there was no interest in the plots for self-build development. Following questions I raised with the parties about whether the agreement would be sufficient to secure the

development as self-build for the purposes of the exemptions from statutory biodiversity net gain as set out in the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024, a deed of variation to the agreement was submitted which removed the possibility of developing the plots as non-self-build development. I address this matter later in the decision.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
- i) highway safety with regard to visibility.
 - ii) the living conditions of occupants of neighbouring properties with regard to disturbance, outlook and privacy.
 - iii) the living conditions for future occupants, with regard to waste disposal.
 - iv) the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Highway Safety

7. The development is proposed to be accessed from an improved and realigned existing access on to Braunston Road which serves 172 Braunston Road. The access includes vehicle to pedestrian visibility splays of 2m x 2m set back from the existing footway.
8. The Council have stated that the splays should be set back from the public highway boundary rather than the existing footway. This would allow for the splays to be maintained should the footway be widened in the future to the public highway boundary. However, no compelling evidence has been submitted by the Council on the likelihood or practicality of the footway being widened in the future, particularly in the context of the footway between the site and the adjacent new residential development on the edge of the town being laid out at a similar width as the footway at the front of the site.
9. The highway authority raised concerns that some pedestrians may walk on the highway verge rather than the footway. However, given the minimal width of the verge, existing vegetation overhanging the verge in the vicinity of the site access and obstructions such as a lamppost, I find the risk of this occurring is small.
10. The appellant has submitted a road safety audit as part of the appeal. The audit concluded no safety related problems from the proposed access design. Whilst the audit did not follow the expected process required by the local highway authority in terms of submission and approval of the brief and involvement and sign-off by the local highway authority, there is no clear evidence before me to indicate that the audit or the brief for the audit was not robust.
11. Given the above, I find that the 2m x 2m visibility splay set back from the existing footway is suitable and would allow vehicles exiting the appeal site to have sufficient visibility in both directions and would therefore not cause an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety.
12. The Rutland Highways Development Control General Principles for Development referred to above states that vehicle to pedestrian splays should be to the back of

the highway boundary. Given this document is an internal draft which has not been subject to public consultation, I afford it only limited weight. Even if the document had been subject to consultation, its requirements would need to be considered in the context of the specific circumstances of the development proposed. In this case, I have concluded that it would not be justified in this instance to require the splays to be set back to the public highway boundary rather than from the edge of the footway.

13. In light of the above, I conclude the proposed development would not result in harm to highway safety with regard to visibility. Accordingly, I do not find conflict with Policy SP15 in the Rutland Local Plan Site Allocations & Policies Development Plan Document (RLPSAP) which seeks to, amongst other matters, require development to make provision for safe access and avoid an unacceptable adverse impact on the highway network.
14. Similarly, I find no conflict with paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) or the Design Guidelines for Rutland Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the National Design Guide with regard to these matters.

Living conditions of neighbouring properties.

15. The proposed access would be located adjacent to No 170 and No 172 Braunston Road. The addition of five new dwellings would only result in a limited amount of additional vehicular and pedestrian movement. Furthermore, there is a small, planted buffer between No 170 and the proposed access and No 172 benefits from a large plot with the dwelling set back a reasonable distance from the proposed access. Therefore, the development would not result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties in terms of noise, impact from headlights and other disturbance.
16. The indicative layout plan shows the proposed dwellings backing on to properties on Noel Avenue. The plan illustrates back-to-back separation distances of between approximately 21m and 25m which would be in accordance with the separation distances set out in the SPD in terms of maintaining privacy. Accordingly, there would be sufficient land available within the site to allow separation to maintain privacy.
17. The site is separated from the adjacent bungalows by wire fencing which would allow visibility from the appeal proposal through to the rear gardens of the existing dwellings. However, whilst the existing boundary treatments do not provide for privacy, there is sufficient scope for boundary treatments to be proposed as part of a reserved matters application which maintain privacy. Given the ditch which separates the site from the bungalows, I do not consider that boundary treatments to secure privacy would have an unacceptable impact on outlook.
18. The back gardens of the adjacent bungalows are reasonably short albeit there is a ditch which separates the bungalows from the site and there would be scope for significant separation distances between the proposed dwellings and the bungalows. These would ensure there would be no unacceptable impact on the outlook of the properties from the proposed dwellings.
19. In conclusion, the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring

properties with regard to disturbance, outlook and privacy. Accordingly, I do not find conflict with Policies SP5 and SP15 of the RLPSAP which, amongst other matters, require development to protect the amenity of neighbouring uses in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy and other forms of disturbance. Similarly, I do not find conflict with Policy CS19 of the Rutland Core Strategy (RCS), or Policy 2 of the Oakham and Barleythorpe Neighbourhood Plan (OBNP) in so far as they relate to disturbance, privacy and outlook.

Living conditions of future occupants.

20. The proposed dwellings would be sited around 200 metres from the public highway where refuse would usually be collected. The SPD states that bin storage should be provided in a convenient location. The distance from the dwellings to the refuse collection point may be an inconvenience to future occupants. However, my attention has been drawn to other options available to residents for waste collection, such as private waste collection as suggested by the appellant. Therefore, I do not consider this would result in harm to the living conditions of future occupants.
21. Should a private waste collection be provided, the frequency of collections would result in only a limited additional number of vehicular movements. It would therefore not result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties in terms of disturbance.
22. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions for future occupants, with regard to waste disposal. Accordingly, I do not find conflict with Policy SP15 of RLPSAP with regard to the protection of amenity of future occupiers of the proposed development. Similarly, I do not find conflict with Policy CS19 of the Rutland Core Strategy (RCS), Policy SP5 of the RLPSAP or Policy 2 of the Oakham and Barleythorpe Neighbourhood Plan (OBNP) in relation to this matter.

Character and appearance

23. The surrounding character of the area consists of predominantly low-rise residential dwellings with a mix of single and two-storey properties typically arranged in an informal layout with a number of small cul-de-sacs. Open fields and woodland also border the site. The site itself is part of a larger open field with has limited visibility from public vantage points.
24. The proposed development would have a long access drive and its location sitting to the rear of existing residential estates with no connectivity into them, means that the development would be considered 'backland' development. The development would lack integration with the existing urban grain and feel detached from surrounding developments. Accordingly, this form of development would be out of character with its surroundings. Whilst there are other examples of 'backland' development in the vicinity these have much shorter access roads and sit within the built-up area and are therefore not directly comparable.
25. However, the level of harm would be limited, given the small-scale nature of the development, the density of the development and the scope for landscaping which could help integrate the development into the surrounding countryside and minimise the impact on views from the limited public vantage points.

26. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy CS19 of the RCS, Policies SP5 and SP15 of the RLPSAP and Policy 2 of the OBNP which, amongst other matters, require development to contribute positively to local distinctiveness, sense of place and respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

27. The proposed development would be located outside of the Planned Limits of Development for Oakham and would therefore be considered 'countryside' for the purposes of Policies CS4 of the RCS and Policy SP6 of the RLPSAP. Policy CS4 states that development in the 'countryside' will be strictly limited to that which has an essential need to be located in the 'countryside' and will be restricted to developments which support the rural economy and meet affordable housing needs. Policy SP6 states that housing development will not be permitted in the 'countryside' except where it meets the needs of agriculture, forestry or an established enterprise requiring a rural worker to live nearby or affordable housing which would meet a local need. As the proposal does not meet these exceptions it is in conflict with these policies. I deal with this matter further under the planning balance below.
28. It is common ground between the parties that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites albeit the Council has not set out what the level of shortfall is. The appellant estimates the supply to be around 3.38 years inclusive of a 5% buffer. With no evidence to the contrary, I have determined the appeal on the basis of this shortfall. I deal with this matter further under the planning balance below.
29. Highway safety and congestion concerns were raised by interested parties with regard to safety of the access due to its width and concerns over parking provision. The highway authority has not raised any concerns with the width of the access road in terms of congestion or safety issues. The only unresolved concerns raised by the highway authority are addressed in the main issue above. Given the level of development the access road is serving, it would be sufficient for its purpose and no clear evidence that it would lead to congestion or safety issues. The site is sufficiently large enough to accommodate on plot parking provision for occupants and visitors.
30. Concerns have been raised by interested parties regarding loss of sunlight or daylight to neighbouring properties resulting from the development. Given the back-to-back separation distances which could be achieved on the site as described above, I find that the development would not result in an unacceptable reduction in sunlight or daylight to the neighbouring properties.
31. Interested parties raised concern about the impact of the development on flooding. The site is located in flood zone 1 and is therefore at low risk from flooding. A surface water management plan to deal with any risk from surface water run-off can be secured by planning condition.
32. The appellant's Ecological Impact Assessment did not identify any potential issues other than with respect to bats and nesting birds. The assessment identified mitigation measures in respect of these impacts which can be secured by

condition. The assessment also identified enhance measures for bats, birds and hedgehogs. These can also be secured by condition.

33. Concerns were raised by interested parties about the impact from construction activities. A construction management plan can be secured by condition to address these concerns.
34. Interested parties raised concerns about the strain the development would place local infrastructure. I have not been made aware of any concerns from infrastructure providers about the impact of the development, and no evidence has been provided detailing any issues with capacity of local infrastructure.
35. During the determination of the application the Woodland Trust raised concern about the potential impact of the scheme on the Brooke Hill Woodland Trust site. I see no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions on this matter. There is scope to secure an appropriate buffer between the development and the trees associated with the Woodland Trust site which can be secured as part of the landscaping details at the reserved matters stage.

Planning obligation

36. A submitted legal agreement made under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990), together with a deed of variation as detailed above has been agreed between the appellant and the Council. The agreement which includes planning obligations would secure the proposed dwellings as self-build dwellings. This would allow the development to benefit from the self-build exemption from biodiversity net gain as set out in the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024. Accordingly, the planning obligations meet the relevant tests set out in regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and the Framework. The legal agreement addresses the Council's third reason for refusal in the decision notice.

Conditions

37. I have assessed the Council's suggested conditions as to whether they satisfy the tests identified in paragraph 57 of the Framework. In order to satisfy those tests, minor editing of the wording of some of those conditions is necessary for clarity, consistency and enforceability.
38. In addition to the standard time limit for the commencement of the development and the submission of reserved matters, a condition is required for the development to take place in accordance with the submitted plans in relation to access arrangements for certainty.
39. A condition requiring details of materials are necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
40. Conditions requiring a construction environmental management plan, biodiversity enhancement plan and details of lighting are necessary to safeguard species and habitats and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy SLP19 of the RLPSAP, Policy 10 of the OBNP and section 15 of the Framework.
41. Conditions relating to surface water drainage, including during construction are necessary to reduce the risk of flooding and pollution to the watercourse.

42. A condition requiring the details of the hard and soft landscaping works is not necessary as this information would be provided as part of the submission of the reserved matters. However, a condition specifying details of tree protection measures and changes in ground levels as part of the landscaping details and a condition requiring elements of the landscaping to be provided during the first planting season following commencement and retention of planted trees and shrubs are necessary for clarity and in the interests of the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings.
43. A condition requiring a construction management plan is required in the interests of highway safety and to safeguard the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings during construction.
44. Conditions relating to the provision of the access and the associated visibility splays are necessary in the interests of highway safety and sustainable drainage in accordance with Policy SP15 of the RLPSAP and paragraph 115 of the Framework. I have omitted the Council's reference to requiring the developer to cover the cost of removing obstructions in the visibility splays condition as the Planning Practice Guidance makes clear that positively worded planning conditions should not be used to require the payment of money. Similarly, I have not imposed a condition suggested by the Council which would require a pre-development condition survey of the highway and subsequently payment for any damage to the highway following completion of development for the same reasons.
45. The Council requested a condition requiring the reserved matters to be based upon the Proposed Access Arrangements Plan (24/200/TR/003 – Rev C) and the Planning Layout drawing (1204(d) Rev D). It is not necessary to have a condition requiring the reserved matters to be in accordance with the access arrangements plan as I have imposed a condition requiring the development to take place in accordance with this plan. It would not be appropriate to require the development to be based on the Planning Layout drawing which details the layout of the proposed dwellings as it is not essential the dwellings are laid out in the way proposed and there could be other arrangements which are acceptable which could be proposed at the reserved matters stage.
46. The Council has also suggested a condition for a phasing plan. Given the scale of the development proposed, this is not considered necessary or reasonable and is not imposed.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

47. The proposal would conflict with Policies CS4 and CS19 of the RCS, Policies SP5, SP6 and SP15 of the RLPSAP and Policy 2 of the OBNP as identified above relating to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole.
48. As identified above, the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. Consequently, paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is engaged. The application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance do not, in this instance, provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed. Therefore, in these circumstances, the Framework states that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits

when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

49. The proposal would be in an accessible location, on the edge of Oakham which is described in Policy CS3 of the RCS as the Main Town and top of the settlement hierarchy. Oakham has a range of job opportunities and higher order services including retail, leisure and health facilities. Accordingly, the development can help facilitate sustainable patterns of movement.
50. The proposal would provide five new homes which would make a contribution, albeit modest, to addressing the shortfall in supply. Whilst there is some dispute about the supply of self-build plots across the county, even if there is a supply to meet needs as set out on the self-build register, the provision of additional self-build plots weighs in favour of the proposal. The proposal would also create employment opportunities during construction and expenditure from future occupants would help support the local economy.
51. Whilst I have found harm to the character and appearance of the area, this harm would be limited and does not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. Accordingly, the proposal benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development and paragraph 11(d) indicates that planning permission should be granted. As such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development and collective benefits of the proposal described above are afforded substantial weight.
52. Policy SP1 of the RLPSAP, reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in an earlier version of the Framework. Given my conclusions on paragraph 11(d) I find that Policy SP1 would also give support to the proposal. Notwithstanding this, for the reasons above I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole.
53. In the context of the absence of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, the conflict with Policies CS4 and SP6 in relation to their approach to identifying the locations suitable for housing development are afforded limited weight due to their potential to limit the supply of housing. The conflict with Policies CS19, SP5, SP15 and Policy 2 is afforded limited weight given the limited harm I have found on the character and appearance of the surrounding area from the proposed development.
54. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that any determination must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the presumption in favour of sustainable development is a material consideration that outweighs the conflicts with the development plan as described above. The decision should therefore be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Accordingly, the appeal should be allowed.

S Hubbard

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, "the reserved matters", shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the location plan shown in drawing no. 1204-4-Rev A (Existing plan(survey)) and drawing nos - 24/200/TR/003 Rev C and 24-200-TR-001 in so far as they relate to matters of access to the site.
- 5) No development above ground level shall be commenced until precise details of the manufacturer and types and colours of the external facing and roofing materials to be used in construction have been submitted to and agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) No development shall take place (including ground works or vegetation clearance) until a Construction Environment Management Plan for Biodiversity (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall include the following details:
 - i) Identification of potentially damaging construction activities;
 - ii) Practical measures and sensitive working practices to avoid or reduce impacts during construction on bats and reptiles;
 - iii) Timing of works to avoid harm to nesting birds;
 - iv) Responsible persons for overseeing sensitive works; and
 - v) Use of protective fencing where required for hedgerows and boundary vegetation.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period.

- 7) No development shall take place until a biodiversity enhancement plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Enhancements shall include (but not limited to) at least three integrated bat boxes, three bat boxes on boundary trees, three integrated bird boxes and three bird boxes on boundary trees and three bee bricks with the makes/models and their locations. The scheme shall include 'hedgerow highways' measuring 15cmx15cm installed within boundary treatments between gardens associated with the dwellings. The biodiversity enhancement scheme shall include planting of hedgerows and trees of native species of local provenance and species to attract pollinating insects as identified in the RHS' 'Plants for Pollinators' database. Hedgerow mixes should include: 80% hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*), plus any one or more of the following: field maple (*Acer campestre*), dogwood (*Cornus sanguinea*), dog rose (*Rosa canina*) and holly (*Ilex aquifolium*). Any enhancement measures need to be shown on all relevant submitted plans. All works are to

proceed strictly in accordance with the approved biodiversity enhancement plan.

- 8) Prior to the installation of external lighting, full details including height, design, location, intensity and measures to reduce spillage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The lighting installation shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 9) No development shall take place, including any groundworks or site clearance, until a Construction Surface Water Management Plan (CSWP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include:
 - i) Measures to control surface water runoff during construction;
 - ii) Temporary sustainable drainage system features or settlement controls if required;
 - iii) Pollution and sediment management measures; and
 - iv) Phasing and responsibilities for implementation and maintenance during construction.

The approved CSWP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period.

- 10) No development shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The sustainable drainage system shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the scheme
- 11) Details of landscaping submitted as part of the reserved matters shall include any proposed changes in ground levels and accurately identify spread, girth and species of all existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows on the site and indicate any to be retained. The protection measures for the retained trees and hedgerows shall comply with the recommendations set out in the British Standards Institute publication "BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Construction" and shall be retained throughout the construction phase of the development.
- 12) All changes in ground levels, hard landscaping, planting, seeding or turfing shown on the approved landscaping details shall be carried out during the first planting and seeding season (October - March inclusive) following the commencement of the development. Any trees or shrubs which, within a period of 5 years of being planted, die, are removed or seriously damaged or seriously diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
- 13) No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CMP shall provide for:
 - i) Haul routes to and from the site.
 - ii) A detailed design for the construction access to allow two of the largest anticipated vehicles to pass one another from the agreed haul route direction/s of Braunston Road, or details of how construction and

delivery vehicles will be managed to ensure only one vehicle can use the access at any one time.

- iii) Details of loading/unloading together with turning areas within the site and details of how deliveries will be managed to ensure that all vehicles can access the site immediately upon arrival to ensure there is no parking, waiting, loading/unloading or queuing on the public highway.
- iv) Safe pedestrian access from the public highway to any site office.
- v) Full details of any off-site traffic management including pedestrian protection measures along the site frontage of Braunston Road and beyond where necessary.
- vi) Details of site compounds, storage area and contractor/visitor parking/turning.
- vii) Details of the site enclosure or part thereof and gated site security and the erection and maintenance of any security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate.
- viii) A scheme for monitoring, reporting and control of construction noise and vibration including hours of working and scope for remedial action.
- ix) A scheme for the control of dust and scope for remedial action in the event that dust is identified as an issue or any complaints are received.
- x) Confirmation of any tree protection measures where works are within 30m of existing trees to be retained.
- xi) Details of any temporary lighting which must not directly light the public highway.
- xii) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from the construction works.
- xiii) A scheme of chassis and wheel cleaning for all construction vehicles to include the details of location and specification of a fully working jetted drive-thru bath type wheel wash system together with hard surfacing laid between the apparatus and public highway in either concrete or tarmac, to be maintained free of mud, slurry and any other form of contamination during the period of construction with all exiting vehicles passing through. A contingency plan including, if necessary, the temporary cessation of all construction operations and movements to be implemented and any affected public highway thoroughly cleaned immediately with mechanical sweepers in the event that the approved vehicle cleaning scheme fails to be effective for any reason.
- xiv) Details of site notice with contact details and a scheme for dealing with complaints.

The approved CMP shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

- 14) Prior to first occupation the shared access road will remain ungated.
- 15) Prior to first occupation the first 10m of the shared access road together with the widened and reconstructed dropped vehicular access will be laid out as shown in the Proposed Access Arrangements plan reference 24/200/TR/003 Rev C included within Appendix BGH 3 of the Transport Statement dated April 2025 with a bound surface treatment which is designed and constructed to ensure no private surface water can flow on to the public highway.

- 16) The vehicle to vehicle and vehicle to pedestrian visibility splays shown on the Proposed Access Arrangements plan reference 24/200/TR/003 Rev C included within Appendix BGH 3 of the Transport Statement dated April 2025 shall be provided and be free of any obstruction over 600mm above ground level prior to first use of the access, including use for construction activities and shall be retained as such thereafter.