



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2026

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/26/3377240

The Worralls, 1 Hollin Lane, Styal, Cheshire SK9 4JH

- 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 Simon Tugby against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/1602/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as “application for full planning permission for the demolition of an existing garage and the erection of a high-quality, sustainable new dwelling at The Worralls, 1 Hollin Lane, Styal, Wilmslow (Application ref. 25/1602/FUL)”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of an existing garage and the erection of a high-quality, sustainable new dwelling at The Worralls, 1 Hollin Lane, Styal, Cheshire SK9 4JH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/1602/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the decision above, the description of development has been amended to remove wording in the banner heading that does not relate directly to the operational development. This has been made solely for procedural clarity and does not alter the scope of the proposal.
3. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to give special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building, its setting, and any features of architectural or historic interest.
4. The Council did not provide details of policies ENV2, GEN1, HER4 and PG10 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Policies Document, adopted December 2022 (“the SADPD”). I have therefore referred to the adopted online version in reaching this decision. I am satisfied that no party has been prejudiced by this approach.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed development would be capable of complying with the general condition of planning permission set out at paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (“the TCPA”) in respect of Biodiversity Net Gain (“BNG”);

- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to its effect on the special interest and significance of heritage assets; and
- whether the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt; having regard to any relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework (“the Framework”).

Reasons

The site and proposal

6. The appeal site lies within the established residential curtilage of The Worralls on the western side of Hollin Lane. It contains a detached garage and associated domestic features, including areas of hardstanding and garden landscaping. The Styal Conservation Area lies to the south, and Grade II listed buildings at “Birch Farm Cottage The Worralls,”¹ lie to the north.
7. The proposal consists of the demolition of the existing residential garage and the construction of a modest, single-storey dwelling within the southern part of the plot, set back from Hollin Lane on land currently used for garden and parking purposes. The building would be contained within established garden boundaries defined by hedgerows and trees. Its form comprises two shallow-pitched gabled roof elements linked by a lower recessed section, with materials of brick, slate and timber, reflecting agricultural building typologies found locally.

Biodiversity net gain

8. Schedule 7A of the TCPA establishes a statutory framework for BNG. In accordance with that framework, planning permissions are deemed to include a Biodiversity Gain Condition requiring that development achieves a minimum 10% increase in biodiversity value, unless a statutory exemption applies.
9. Policy SE3 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010–2030, adopted July 2017 (“the CELPS”), and Policy ENV2 of the SADPD seek to protect and enhance biodiversity. This is through the mitigation hierarchy and the securing of biodiversity net gain, reflecting national policy objectives.
10. The application was accompanied by ecological information, including a biodiversity metric. The Council’s ecologist raised no objection in principle, identifying no unacceptable impacts, irreplaceable habitats, or requirement for protected species surveys. The ecologist’s concern related to the classification of habitats within the submitted metric, in particular the treatment of private garden curtilage, which should be recorded as ‘urban vegetated garden’ in accordance with the DEFRA metric and recognised as part of the Cheshire East ecological network under the SADPD. This was a technical matter concerning metric refinement and delivery mechanisms, rather than any deficiency in baseline ecological information.
11. The Council’s ecologist advised that, following amendment of the metric, any shortfall against the 10% BNG requirement could be addressed through off-site provision, to be secured via the statutory BNG Condition. Planning Practice Guidance (“the PPG”) indicates that refusal is generally not justified where BNG

¹ Official List Entry Name and Number: Birch Farm Cottage The Worralls 1274647

can be addressed through this process. No ecological harm has been identified, and there is no substantive evidence to suggest that compliance with Policies SE3 and ENV2 could not be achieved through the statutory post-permission process.

12. I therefore conclude that it has not been demonstrated that insufficient information was submitted and that the proposal would be incapable of complying with the general condition of planning permission under the TCPA. It therefore accords with CELPS Policy SE3 and Policy ENV2 of the SADPD, and the biodiversity objectives of Framework paragraph 187, subject to the statutory condition.

Character, appearance and heritage assets

13. The Framework requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, regardless of the level of harm identified. National policy seeks to ensure that the significance of listed buildings and conservation areas, including their settings, is conserved and enhanced, that any harm to this significance is clearly identified and afforded appropriate weight, and that development resulting in harm is permitted only where it is justified and, where relevant, outweighed by public benefits.
14. Policies SE1, SE7, SD1 and SD2 of the CELPS together with Policies GEN1 and HER4 of the SADPD, reflect this national approach at the local level. They seek to ensure that development is appropriately designed and sustainable, that the significance of heritage assets and their settings is conserved and enhanced, and that any harm is clearly justified and weighed against public benefits.
15. The Grade II listed buildings known as The Worralls and Birch Farm Cottage comprise two separate addresses within a former farmhouse complex and are historically related. The Worralls is positioned between Birch Farm Cottage and the appeal site, forming the immediate foreground in views from Hollin Lane and, from within the appeal site.
16. The significance of the listed buildings derives from their vernacular architecture, traditional materials, and their historic form and relationship, which together illustrate the evolution of a rural agricultural holding. The Styal Conservation Area is of special interest as a well-preserved rural and industrial landscape that demonstrates the development of a dispersed agricultural settlement alongside a late-18th and 19th-century model mill village centred on Quarry Bank Mill. For both designated heritage assets, a setting of open farmland and scattered farmsteads provides the wider spatial and visual context in which their historic form and function can be understood.
17. The appeal site historically formed part of the wider farmstead at Birch Farm; however, its function and character have changed over time and it is now in garden use. While it does form part of the setting of both the listed buildings and the conservation area, its contribution to significance is derived primarily from its spatial relationship rather than from any intrinsic historic fabric or retained agricultural character.
18. In spatial terms, the appeal site does not play a defining role in sustaining the historic hierarchy of the former farmstead. The strongest functional and visual relationships with open countryside lie predominantly to the north and west of the farmhouse, whereas the land to the south, comprising the appeal site, has long been subject to domestic use and incremental change. This is evidenced by the

established garden use and the presence of existing features including a garage, hardstanding, access arrangements and boundary treatments.

19. The land is enclosed by mature hedgerows and trees, is not prominent in wider views, and intervisibility with the listed buildings and the public realm, including the conservation area is restricted and partial, within a surrounding environment that is now distinctly residential in character. The proposed development would introduce a single-storey dwelling of modest scale, taking cues from agricultural building forms and replacing an existing ancillary structure. The overall design is high quality and well considered and would reflect development already within the setting of the Worralls.
20. As such, the proposal would result in a limited change to the perception of openness within this part of the setting to the conservation area and a modest alteration to historic spatial relationships. However, it would not harm the architectural or historic interest of the listed buildings, nor would it undermine their legibility as a former farmhouse and associated cottage, which would remain clearly distinct and separate.
21. Notwithstanding this, the change would result in a limited degree of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II listed buildings, arising from alteration to their setting. There would be a very small amount of consequent harm to the setting of the Conservation Area.
22. There would be less than substantial harm arising from change to their setting. This harm falls within the very lower end of the less than substantial harm range, reflecting the modest scale, considered design and contained siting of the proposed development. Nevertheless, in accordance with Framework paragraphs 212 and 213, great weight is given to the harm.

Heritage Balance

23. The Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. It confirms that housing land supply must be assessed against the revised local housing need figure of 2,603 dwellings per year, including the appropriate buffer. While the Housing Delivery Test result published in December 2024 records a delivery score of 262%, the Council's most recent Housing Monitoring Update (April 2025) identifies a deliverable supply of 10,011 dwellings. This equates to a 3.8-year supply against a five-year requirement of 13,015 dwellings.
24. In this context, the proposal would deliver a single additional dwelling within the settlement of Styal, representing a modest but nonetheless meaningful contribution to housing supply. The site comprises land already in residential use and occupies a position with very good and safe access to local services, facilities and opportunities for movement by non-car modes. This accords with the Framework's objectives for the efficient use of land, the delivery of housing on small sites, and the reduction of reliance on the private car. In doing so, the development would be inclusive and accessible, support health and well-being, and provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers. The design of the dwelling is of high quality. In addition, some economic activity would be generated during the construction phase and through subsequent occupation, and the proposal would secure a net gain in biodiversity, resulting in an ecological uplift beyond baseline conditions and aligning with national objectives to address biodiversity decline.

25. Viewed individually, these benefits are small in scale. However, they are site-specific and consistent with national policy and therefore amount to public benefits for the purposes of paragraph 215 of the Framework.
26. There is conflict with Policies SE1, SE7, SD1 and SD2 of the CELPS, and Policies GEN1 and HER4 of the SADPD, insofar as these seek to conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings. Nevertheless, when the public benefits are considered cumulatively, they are sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm, even attributing great weight to this. Accordingly, I conclude the heritage balance required by paragraph 215 of the Framework is met. The harm would be outweighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt

Local and National Green Belt Policy

27. The Framework states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, with openness and permanence as its essential characteristics. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
28. Policy PG3 of the CELPS treats new buildings in the Green Belt as inappropriate unless they fall within exceptions set out in national policy. Policy PG10 of the SADPD supports limited village infilling within defined boundaries. Limited infilling may therefore not be inappropriate development under Policy PG3 where relevant criteria are met.
29. Although limited infilling is not defined by precise measurements, it is commonly understood to involve the filling of a small gap within a discernible row or frontage of buildings. The appellant places considerable weight on the contention that the site is experienced as part of the settlement. While the site may be perceived as within the village, this does not, of itself, establish that it functions as a gap suitable for infill as intended by Green Belt policy.
30. On the western side of Hollin Lane, the pattern of development is loose and sporadic, characterised by large plots, varied building setbacks and substantial areas of undeveloped land, rather than a coherent or continuous frontage. This stands in marked contrast to the more contiguous and visually related development along the eastern side of the lane. At the appeal site, there is an absence of built form across a wide frontage.
31. While buildings are located to the north, they are separated from the appeal site by garden land and open areas which would remain undeveloped. To the south, there is no continuation of built development towards Altrincham Road, where openness associated with the edge of the conservation area becomes increasingly evident. When experienced from the public realm, the site reads not as a modest interruption within a built-up frontage, but as part of a broader open spatial break because development does not have an imposing presence above hedge lines.
32. In these circumstances, reliance on the general perception of settlement experience is insufficient to overcome the clear absence of a “relatively small gap between existing buildings.” Instead, the degree of separation between buildings and the contribution of the land to openness indicate that the proposal would introduce development into an existing open break, rather than reinforcing an

established pattern of village development, thereby resulting in loss of openness inconsistent with the aims of Green Belt policy.

33. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not constitute limited infilling for the purposes of Policy PG10 or paragraph 154(e) of the Framework. However, policies PG3 and PG10 make no reference to grey belt. This is because these policies predate the December 2024 Framework. Although the proposal would not constitute limited infilling, this does not preclude consideration of whether the site qualifies as grey belt land under the revised Framework.

Whether grey belt

34. For decision-making purposes, grey belt land is defined as land within the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or land that does not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes (a), (b) or (d) in Framework paragraph 143. The PPG² distinguishes between villages, towns and historic towns when assessing contribution to these purposes. For the grey belt assessment, the appeal site is located within a village.
35. The proposal involves a small, contained site within domestic curtilage and would not extend development from a large urban area or create sprawl. The site makes, at most, a weak contribution to Green Belt purpose (a). The site does not lie within a gap between settlements and its development would not reduce separation. It therefore makes no contribution to Green Belt purpose (b). While adjacent to Styal Conservation Area, the site comprises domestic garden land with existing development and does not have a strong relationship with an historic town as envisaged by the PPG. It does not make a strong contribution to Green Belt purpose (d).
36. Taken together, the site does not make a strong contribution to Green Belt purposes (a), (b) and (d) in Framework paragraph 143. I therefore conclude that it may be regarded as grey belt land. Having regard to the “Heritage Balance” above, no heritage impacts arise that would provide a strong reason for refusal for the purposes of Framework footnote 7 to paragraph 11. The gateway tests for grey belt are satisfied.
37. The proposal must therefore be assessed against paragraph 155 of the Framework. This requires use of grey belt land without fundamentally undermining remaining Green Belt purposes, meeting a demonstrable unmet need, and being located in a sustainable location. The ‘Golden Rules’ in paragraph 143(d) do not apply due to the scale of development.
38. For similar reasons to those set out above, the development is small, partly previously developed, and influenced by its village and domestic context and would not encroach into the open countryside, satisfying Framework paragraph 143(c). While it would not involve the recycling of derelict urban land, there is no evidence this is a priority and it is not proven to undermine paragraph 143(e). The proposal would therefore utilise grey belt land without fundamentally undermining the remaining Green Belt purposes when taken together.
39. The Council has acknowledged an unmet housing need through its inability to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, satisfying paragraph

² Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 64-005-20250225

155(b). The site has access to local services, facilities and public transport within walking distance, including the railway station via safe, lit routes, which would be suitable for most users of varying mobility levels. Having regard to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the Framework, I am satisfied that the site is sustainably located and meets paragraph 155(c). Thus meeting all the relevant criteria to be considered.

Green Belt conclusions

40. Policies PG3 and PG10 of the development plan do not fully reflect the Framework's current approach to the treatment of grey belt land. Accordingly, although the proposal conflicts with the development plan in this respect, I afford greater weight to the Framework, and that conflict is not determinative. The proposed development is on grey belt land, and for the reasons given above, the proposal would satisfy Framework paragraphs 143, 154 and 155.
41. I conclude that the proposal is not inappropriate development and does not conflict with the Framework's objectives for sustainable development, including those reflected in Policies SD1 and SD2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy. In these circumstances, it is not necessary to assess harm to openness or to consider whether "Very special circumstances" exist.

Other Matters

42. The Council has referred to Framework paragraphs 212 and 213 in its reason for refusal relating to the Green Belt. These paragraphs concern heritage considerations, which have been addressed separately.
43. Concerns were raised by interested parties; however, matters relating to design, impacts on listed buildings and conservation areas, BNG, and Green Belt policy have been addressed elsewhere in this decision. The remaining issues, such as neighbouring residential living conditions, trees, landscaping, highways and parking were assessed by the Council. It was concluded that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm given the siting and separation distances, would meet adopted parking standards with no highway safety concerns, and would adequately protect trees and hedgerows through appropriate measures. These matters were therefore not considered sufficient to justify refusal, and there is no substantive evidence before me to reach a different conclusion.

Planning Balance

44. The Council cannot demonstrate a deliverable five-year housing land supply. Accordingly, the presumption in favour of sustainable development in Framework paragraph 11(d) is engaged, and permission should be granted unless the application of Framework policies that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusal, or the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
45. For the reasons set out above, I have found that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm, at the very lowest end of the scale to designated heritage assets and associated policy conflict. However the harm is outweighed by public benefits, and the small conflict with those policies. Although the scheme conflicts with local Green Belt policies PG3 and PG10, those policies do not fully reflect the Framework's approach to the differentiated treatment of grey belt land, and greater

weight must therefore be afforded to the Framework. In these circumstances, no Framework policy provides a strong reason for refusal.

46. The proposal would deliver a well-designed dwelling on a sustainable small site, contributing to housing choice and housing delivery, while securing a statutory net gain in biodiversity. These social, economic and environmental benefits, as identified in the Heritage Balance, attract positive weight.
47. I have found the design of the proposal to be acceptable, with no harmful effects on residential amenity, landscaping, highways or future living conditions. Planning conditions can adequately address detailed technical matters. These considerations accord with the development plan and carry neutral weight.
48. When assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole, I conclude that there are no adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places. The presumption in favour of sustainable development therefore applies, and planning permission should be granted.

Conditions

49. I have considered the planning conditions suggested by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. Where appropriate, I have amended the wording for clarity and consistency and ensured that the conditions are reasonable, relevant to the development and site context, and meet all other Framework tests for conditions. In addition to the commencement condition [1], it is necessary in the interests of certainty that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans [2].
50. A condition requiring a Construction Management Plan is necessary to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers during the construction phase [3]. A condition is also necessary to protect trees before any activity commences on site [4]. Conditions are required to address potential land contamination [5], [6], [7] and [10]. A drainage strategy is necessary to ensure the site is suitably drained [8]. Condition [9] is necessary to ensure that the removal of vegetation does not take place during sensitive periods for nesting birds. It is necessary for these conditions to be imposed prior to commencement in the interests of protecting residential living conditions, the environment and ecology.
51. A condition requiring a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy is necessary to secure additional ecological benefits on site [11]. A condition requiring approval of external materials, landscape and lighting is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area [12], [13] and [15]. A further condition is necessary to ensure that the approved landscape details are properly implemented and given the opportunity to become established [14].
52. The Framework states that planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights unless there is clear justification to do so. The site lies within the setting of a Grade II listed building and in close proximity to a conservation area. In this context, extensions, additional structures or alterations under permitted development rights could cause harm to heritage significance or

local character. This provides clear justification for restricting permitted development rights by condition [16].

53. Due to the provisions of Schedule 7A Part 2 of the TCPA, and as none of the statutory exemptions apply in this case, the development may not be begun unless a biodiversity gain plan has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The submitted Biodiversity Gain Plan must demonstrate compliance with Part 1 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act. It is not necessary for the decision to replicate the statutory BNG condition within the attached schedule.

Conclusion

54. The proposal would conflict with the development plan but the material considerations indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR

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 permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved plans:
 - i. Drawing No. UP066_M100 – Location Plan, dated 23 April 2025;
 - ii. Drawing No. UP066_M102 – Proposed Floor Plan;
 - iii. Drawing No. UP066_M103 – Proposed Elevations;
 - iv. Drawing No. UP066_M104 – Landscape Plan;
 - v. Drawing No. UP066_M105 Rev. 1 – Softworks Plan, dated 25 July 2025;
 - vi. Drawing No. UP066_M106 – Illustrative Section, dated 7 August 2025; and
 - vii. Drawing No. UP066_M110 – Listed House Setting, dated 5 August 2025.
- 3) Prior to the commencement of development, a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved Construction Management Plan shall include details of the following measures:

- i. hours of construction works and deliveries;
- ii. measures to mitigate dust and noise arising from construction activities;
- iii. delivery routes to and from the site;
- iv. arrangements for contractor parking; and
- v. site waste management procedures.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan for the duration of the construction works.

- 4) No development or other operations shall commence until a scheme for the protection of retained trees, shrubs and hedges has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be produced in accordance with BS 5837:2012 – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction: Recommendations (or any subsequent revision) and shall provide for the retention and protection of all trees, shrubs and hedges growing on or adjacent to the site, including any trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order.

The approved scheme shall include the following provisions:

- i. The approved tree protection scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the commencement of any works on site, including tree felling, tree pruning, demolition works, soil movement, temporary access construction or widening, and the use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery.
- ii. No excavations for services, storage of materials or machinery, parking of vehicles, deposition or excavation of soil or rubble, lighting of fires, or disposal of liquids shall take place within any area designated as protected in the approved scheme.
- iii. Protective fencing and other tree protection measures shall be retained intact for the full duration of the development and shall not be removed or repositioned without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

All works shall thereafter be carried out and completed in full accordance with the approved tree protection scheme.

- 5) No development (other than demolition and site clearance works) shall commence until:
- i. a proportionate risk assessment and, where appropriate, a site sampling exercise shall be undertaken to assess the risks posed by land contamination. The assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; and
 - ii. where the approved risk assessment demonstrates that remediation is necessary, a Remediation Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Once approved the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

- 6) No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied or brought into use until a Verification Report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Verification Report shall be prepared in accordance with the approved Remediation Strategy and shall demonstrate that the remediation measures relevant to that part of the development to be occupied or used have been fully implemented.
- 7) If, during the course of development, contamination not previously identified is discovered, no further works shall be undertaken in the affected area and the Local Planning Authority shall be notified in writing. Prior to any further works being carried out in that area, a further site investigation and risk assessment shall be undertaken and, where necessary, a remediation scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any remediation shall be implemented in full in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 8) No development shall commence until a drainage strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The submitted drainage strategy shall include:

- i. Surface water run-off rates, including greenfield Qbar and post-development runoff estimates, demonstrating that greenfield run-off rates shall be matched unless proven unfeasible, or that a minimum of 50% betterment shall be achieved for brownfield sites, with a restricted discharge rate not exceeding 5 l/s per hectare and not lower than 2 l/s per hectare;
- ii. Details of hydraulic design up to the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) storm event, in accordance with the current Gov.uk Climate Change Allowances;
- iii. Details of any boundary drainage, demonstrating that any flooding shall remain within the site and, where calculations show flooding on site, that the development and properties shall remain safe;
- iv. Confirmation that the scheme is designed in accordance with the drainage hierarchy, as set out in the Non-Statutory sustainable drainage systems ("SuDS") Technical Standards Guidance (2016), paragraph 3.7;
- v. Details of pipe diameters, gradients, cover levels and invert levels;

- vi. Demonstration that the strategy incorporates SuDS proportionate to the scale of the development, in accordance with paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework;
- vii. Demonstration that foul and surface water drainage shall be provided via separate systems;
- viii. Hydraulic modelling for all storm durations, identifying the critical storm duration from 15 minutes to 7 days, with modelling undertaken for the 1% AEP storm event;
- ix. A full management and maintenance schedule for the lifetime of the development, including contact details of the responsible party and details of inspection and testing arrangements; and
- x. Confirmation that the development shall be constructed in full accordance with the approved drainage strategy.

The approved drainage strategy shall be implemented in full prior to the occupation of the development and shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved management and maintenance schedule.

- 9) No removal of any vegetation, or the demolition, extension or conversion of buildings, shall take place between 1 March and 31 August inclusive in any year, unless a detailed survey has first been carried out to check for nesting birds. Where nests are found in any building, hedgerow, tree, scrub or other habitat to be removed (or, in the case of buildings, converted or demolished), a 4-metre exclusion zone shall be maintained around the nest until breeding has been completed. Completion of nesting shall be confirmed by a suitably qualified person, and a report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any works are carried out within the exclusion zone.
- 10) Any soil or soil-forming materials brought to the site for use in soft landscaping shall be tested for contamination and suitability for use in accordance with the current version of Developing Land within Cheshire East Council – A Guide to Submitting Planning Applications, Land Contamination (unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority). Prior to the occupation of the development, evidence of testing and verification information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 11) Prior to the use of any building materials on site, a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy for the dwelling hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The strategy shall include details of measures to enhance the biodiversity value of the development, including:

- i. the provision of features for nesting birds (such as house sparrows and swifts) and roosting bats appropriate to a single dwelling;
- ii. the provision of a gap within any garden boundary fencing to facilitate the movement of hedgehogs;
- iii. details of native species planting; and
- iv. Any bird or bat boxes approved as part of the strategy shall be installed prior to the first occupation of the dwelling

All biodiversity enhancement measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter be permanently retained and maintained.

- 12) No development above ground level shall take place until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
- 13) Prior to the occupation of the development, a detailed landscaping scheme for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The submitted landscaping scheme shall include the following details:

- i. details of hard landscaping works;
- ii. details of boundary treatments;
- iii. planting plans and written specifications, including cultivation and other operations associated with the establishment of trees, shrubs, hedges and grass;
- iv. schedules of planting specifying species, plant sizes, quantities and densities;
- v. details of screening for bin and cycle storage within the car port area; and
- vi. details of the main roof area; and
- vii. an implementation programme setting out the timing of the landscaping works.

The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the scheme and approved timetable and shall thereafter be retained and maintained.

- 14) The approved landscaping scheme shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the following requirements:
- i. All hard and soft landscaping works shall be completed in full accordance with the approved scheme during the first planting season following the completion of the development, or otherwise in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in Condition 13.
 - ii. All trees, shrubs and hedge plants supplied shall comply with the requirements of British Standard 3936 – Specification for Nursery Stock, and all pre-planting site preparation, planting and post-planting maintenance works shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 4428:1989 – Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations (excluding hard surfaces).
 - iii. All new tree planting shall be positioned in accordance with the requirements of Table A.1 of BS 5837:2012 – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction: Recommendations.
 - iv. Any tree, shrub or hedge which is planted as part of the approved landscaping scheme and which, within five years of planting, is removed, dies, becomes severely damaged or becomes seriously diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with a specimen of similar size and species to that originally approved.
- 15) Prior to its installation, details of any external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 16) 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 Classes A to F of Part 1 of Schedule 2, nor any development permitted by Classes A and B of Part 2 of Schedule 2, shall be undertaken without the prior grant of planning permission, pursuant to an application made to the Local Planning Authority in that regard.

End of Schedule