



## Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 4 September 2019

Site visit made on 4 September 2019

**by M Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2019

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/W/19/3222428**

**Land at Tappers Farm, Oxford Road, Bodicote OX15 4BN**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Hollins Strategic Land LLP against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
  - The application Ref 18/00792/OUT, dated 4 May 2018, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2018.
  - The development proposed is an outline application (all matters reserved except for access) for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 52 no. dwellings, with associated works and provision of open space.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an outline application (all matters reserved except for access) for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 46 no. dwellings, with associated works and provision of open space at Land at Tappers Farm, Oxford Road, Bodicote OX15 4BN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/00792/OUT, dated 4 May 2018, subject to the following conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

### Procedural Matters

2. The application was submitted in outline. The application form indicates that approval was sought only for the matter of access. I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. During the course of the application, the number of units proposed was reduced from 52 dwellings as set out in the planning application form, to 46 dwellings. It was agreed at the hearing that the description should reflect this reduction in numbers, as such I have included this in the decision above.
4. The appellant submitted a draft agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) at the hearing. At that time a number of amendments were being made and the agreement was unsigned. I agreed to allow 7 days for the submission of a signed and completed agreement, which has now been received. I have taken this agreement and the obligations therein into account when making my decision.
5. Prior to the hearing the Council highlighted that a number of the notification letters sent to interested parties did not contain the details of the date of the

hearing. At the start of the hearing I asked for the parties' views on this matter. The Council duly informed me that the correct details were sent with the notification letters and that it was only a saved office copy that lacked the details. The Council confirmed that the correct notification had therefore taken place. I was satisfied that interested parties had been notified and I proceeded with the hearing on this basis.

6. Since the close of the hearing the appellant has drawn my attention to a recent appeal decision. The Council has had the opportunity to comment on this decision. I am satisfied no prejudice has been caused and, as such, I have taken it into account when making my decision.

### **Main Issues**

7. The main issues raised in this case are:
  - i) whether the development is acceptable in principle;
  - ii) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and
  - iii) whether the scheme makes adequate contribution towards the provision of infrastructure.

### **Reasons**

#### *Principle of development*

8. The development plan for the area consists of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031, Part 1 (the CLP 2011) and the saved policies of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 (the CLP 1996). At the hearing, the Council agreed that only the policies referred to in the decision notice were being relied on, namely Policies Villages 2 (PV2) and ESD15 of the CLP 2011 and Policies C15 and C33 of the CLP 1996.
9. The spatial strategy as set out in the CLP 2011 directs most growth to locations within or immediately adjoining Banbury and Bicester. Growth within the remainder of the district is limited and directed towards the larger villages. It was acknowledged by the Council that the appeal scheme would not affect its overall housing strategy.
10. PV2 identifies that 750 homes will be delivered at Category A villages, of which Bodicote is one of twenty-three, as defined in Policy Villages 1 (PV1). It was highlighted at the hearing that Policy Villages 2 contains no requirements in respect of the distribution of housing across the Category A villages, as well as no timeframe or trajectory for their delivery. Both main parties agreed that the 750-figure provided in the policy is not a ceiling or limit. It is also noteworthy that the policy requires the delivery of 750 units, not just a requirement to grant planning permission for this number.
11. My attention has been drawn to a previous appeal decision in the district<sup>1</sup> in which the Inspector noted that it would require a "material exceedance" of the 750-figure in order to conclude that there would be any conflict with PV2. The Council stated that if this appeal were allowed, it would not trigger a material increase over 750 dwellings. Furthermore, the figure refers to dwellings delivered, not consented, of which according to the Council there are 271. There are also a further 425 under construction. Since March 2014, there has

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/C3105/W/17/3188671, decision date 18 September 2018

- been a delivery rate of 54 dwellings per year from PV2, which would result in the delivery of 750 homes by 2028, three years before the end of the plan period (2011-2031). This however assumes that the delivery of housing will continue at this rate and that all permissions that have been granted will not only be implemented but completed.
12. The appellant has suggested that a 10% lapse rate for sites should be applied in recognition that not all sites granted planning permission will necessarily come forward. The Council disagree with this point and contend that it is likely that all sites will be delivered. Whilst I acknowledge that the delivery rate has increased in recent years, this will undoubtedly fluctuate from year to year, as evidenced by the fact that the Council state that in 2014/15 only two homes were delivered. There is also reference to the Council's Annual Monitoring Report (2018) identifying that permission for 33 dwellings had either lapsed or not been issued, suggestive of some permitted schemes not being delivered.
  13. In my view, it is not realistic to expect that all dwellings that have the benefit of planning permission will, in fact, be delivered. I acknowledge the Council's opinion that there should not be a lapse rate applied, given that when undertaking reviews of permissions they liaise directly with developers and agents, the submission of applications to discharge planning conditions can be taken as an indication of intent to implement a permission and there is a good record of delivery. However, this does not account for any circumstances where a development may not come forward. As such, I do not consider it realistic to expect a 100% delivery rate for the permitted dwellings.
  14. Even if all sites were delivered, and as I state above, I am not convinced that they will be, it is accepted by the Council that the grant of permission for an additional 46 dwellings would not lead to a material increase over the figure expected by PV2.
  15. I note that reference is made to Bodicote having been subject to permissions for a number of developments which would deliver 99 new dwellings. However, there is no reference in PV2 to any distribution of new dwellings across the twenty-three Category A villages. Furthermore, given the close proximity of Bodicote and the appeal site to Banbury, together with good accessibility to larger settlements and the services that are within Bodicote itself, the site would be one of the most accessible locations, with access to services, for new residential development, which is reflected in its categorisation in PV1 as a Category A or "Service" village.
  16. The Council also has concern that allowing the appeal scheme would restrict the potential for a more even spread of housing across all of the Category A villages. However, PV2 does not require any spatial distribution. Moreover, the development is near to one of the main settlements, Banbury, which provides for access to a good range of services and with access to a range of transport modes.
  17. The appellant has drawn my attention to a recent appeal decision<sup>2</sup> in the district which allowed up to 84 dwellings under PV2. Notwithstanding the stance taken at the hearing, the Council now consider that this permitted scheme together with the appeal scheme would result in a material increase over the 750-dwelling delivery target. However, the Council are including 31

---

<sup>2</sup> APP/C3105/W/19/3228169, decision date 9 September 2019

dwellings for which there is a resolution to grant permission. Whilst this matter is noted, these are not schemes for which planning permission currently exists and until such time that a decision is issued on them, it is open to the Council to consider any subsequent change in circumstances that may occur.

18. The grant of permission for these 84 dwellings adds to the number of dwellings above 750 which have permission, but the number of dwellings that have currently been delivered falls far short of this figure (271 as referred to above). There will undoubtedly be a point where there will be a situation that will result in the material increase over the 750 dwellings figure and at that time there will be some planning harm arising from the figure being exceeded, for example harm to the overall locational strategy of new housing in the district. There is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that this is the case in this appeal. Clearly, when considering any subsequent schemes however, this matter will need to be carefully scrutinised.
19. However, at this time, no evidence of such harm has been presented and, in my view, the allowing of this appeal for 46 dwellings would not harm the overall strategy of the development plan which is to concentrate housing development in and around Banbury and Bicester. This is particularly so given the specific circumstances of this site, including its close proximity to Banbury.
20. The Council contended that both policies PV1 and PV2 should be considered together. However, I find nothing to suggest that this is the case, and both appear to be discrete policies against which development proposals can be assessed. In any event, it is conflict with PV2 that the Council allege, and it is this matter which I have considered. There is no mention of conflict with PV1 in the Council's reason for refusal.
21. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the scheme would not result in a material increase over the target of delivering 750 dwellings and thus the principle of development is acceptable on this site in accordance with Policy PV2 of the CLP 2011.

#### *Character and appearance*

22. The site lies to the northern fringe of Bodicote and currently comprises of a grassed field with a number of buildings associated with a farm shop which operates at the site, together with associated external storage, with an area of caravan storage also. The site also contains several mature trees which are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Access to the site is gained from the adjacent White Post Road.
23. The site is enclosed along Oxford Road to the east by hedging which contains a number of trees. This boundary effectively screens the site from the majority of views from Oxford Road. To the north, along White Post Road, the site is enclosed by a mixture of hedging and post and rail fencing. There are however clear views into the site from this road where it appears as a field surrounded by existing development, particularly the existing farm shop buildings and the school located to the east. To its southern extremity, the site borders existing residential development, comprised of two-storey dwellings.
24. The Council contend that the site comprises the last undeveloped gap which provides separation between Bodicote and Banbury and as such is an important green space preventing the coalescence of these two settlements. It was also

- stated at the hearing that when leaving Banbury and entering Bodicote, there is the feel of leaving the larger settlement and entering a village. However, in my view, this overstates the importance of the site, as a whole, as a separating feature. I observed there to be development on the other side of Oxford Road, extending northwards, which stretches beyond the appeal site. This existing development already diminishes the distinction between Bodicote and Banbury and the introduction of development on the appeal site would not materially worsen this.
25. There is an area of vegetation between the northern extremity of the site and the Bankside flyover at the southern edge of Banbury which provides a much stronger visual break between the settlements. This would be unaffected by the proposal. Moreover, the existing development that lines Oxford Road does not, in my view, result in a village feel or appearance to the area. Whilst I acknowledge that the whole of the eastern boundary of the site currently comprises hedging, it is located near to existing built development and is not reflective of a rural countryside location. Furthermore, the indicative layout submitted, shows that dwellings would be set off the eastern boundary, with the provision of a green corridor which would limit the visibility of dwellings from Oxford Road. As a consequence, the introduction of built development within the appeal site would not have an unacceptably urbanising effect.
26. The Council also refer to the area surrounding the site having a spacious and open feel. However, there is built development to the immediate south of the site, as well as to the east. This significantly limits any sense of spaciousness. Whilst a school lies to the west, with its associated playing fields, this does little to create a sense of spaciousness. I appreciate that the majority of the site is currently not covered by built development, however the proposed residential development would not be out of character with its context of nearby development.
27. Additionally, the indicative layout submitted with the application shows that proposed dwellings would not extend into the northern part of the site, which would be left open as amenity open space. This would re-enforce the visual break provided by the existing landscaping I refer to above and ensure that from viewpoints in close proximity to the site along White Post Road, an open aspect is retained to an acceptable degree, with buildings set back within the site. It would also provide a "green link" with the mature trees and landscaping to the west of the site, along Salt Way. Thus, a distinction between the two settlements would be maintained.
28. The matter of access is for determination at this stage and the submitted details show the creation of a new vehicular access to the east of the existing. Whilst it is likely that this will be a more formal and well-defined feature at this location, given the context of the site, in particular the appearance of the formal and engineered slip road onto Oxford Road and the Bankside flyover, this would not be unduly prominent or appear as a discordant element. The Council also express concern in respect of the prominence of the development in views from Sycamore Drive to the north west. However, these would not be close up views and where the development may be visible, it would be in the context of the amenity open space to the north and set back into the site. As such, I consider that any visual effect in this regard would be acceptable.

29. The mature trees within the site are the subject of a TPO and whilst there is no immediate concern over the removal of these trees, the matter of the future maintenance of the trees was raised at the hearing. In this respect, I note that the indicative layout of the site takes into account the existing trees and positions buildings around them. As such, whilst I appreciate that these details are indicative only, I have no substantive evidence before me to persuade me that the scheme would have an adverse effect on the future health of the protected trees, particularly in light of the matters of layout and landscaping being for future consideration.
30. Accordingly, I find that the scheme would not harm the character or appearance of the area and as such there would be no conflict with Policies Villages 2 and ESD15 of the CLP 2011 and Policies C15 and C22 of the CLP 1996. Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that significant adverse landscape impacts are avoided, that new development reinforces local distinctiveness, that the coalescence of settlements is resisted and that important undeveloped gaps are preserved.

### *Infrastructure*

31. The appellant provided a draft planning obligation by deed of agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), section 11 of the Local Government Act 1972 and section 1 of the Localism Act 2011. Subsequent to the hearing, the appellant has now provided a signed and completed agreement.
32. The agreement contains obligations following discussions with the Council, since the application was refused. Prior to the hearing, a table was provided outlining all of the requirements that the Council sought to be secured by way of the legal agreement. These include:
- Affordable housing
  - Open space and landscaping
  - Off-site sports and Community facilities
  - Primary medical care
  - Public transport services
  - Primary school provision
  - Refuse Disposal
  - Transportation and Highways
33. The submitted details outline the basis on which the contributions are sought, with reference to development plan policies and the adopted Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2018). At the hearing, the appellant raised concern in respect of two of the required contributions as set out: Primary Medical Care (PMC) and Refuse Disposal (RD).
34. In respect of PMC, I note that the NHS Oxfordshire Commissioning Group highlights that North Oxfordshire, particularly the Banbury area, is mostly at capacity in terms of PMC and that housing growth will require additional or expanded infrastructure to be provided. I consider this to be reasonable, given the proximity of the site to Banbury where there is an identified shortfall in service provision. In regard to RD, the appellant initially had concerns that there was insufficient justification for a contribution in this respect, highlighting that facilities were ordinarily funded through Council Tax income. The Council clarified that the contribution would be towards bin provision for new dwellings, which is not funded by Council Tax. Following this, the appellant was satisfied

that the RD contribution was justified based on the SPD. I have no reason to disagree.

35. Having reviewed the details of the contributions, they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development as well as fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
36. Accordingly, the scheme would comply with Policies INF1, BSC3, BSC7, BSC10, BSC11, BSC12 and SLE4 of the CLP 2011. Together, and amongst other things, the policies seek to ensure development provides a proportion of affordable housing, that education needs are met, that schemes make adequate open space, outdoor sport, recreation and community facility provision, that infrastructure is provided to meet the District's growth and that the transport impacts of development are mitigated.

### **Other Matters**

37. Interested parties have raised concerns in respect of the effect of the development on wildlife in the area, as well as on highway safety, in particular the effect of additional traffic and potential conflict with traffic in association with the adjacent school. However, I note that the Council do not object to the proposal on the basis of these matters. Furthermore, I have no substantive evidence to show that there would be any detriment in respect of these matters. As such, they have little bearing on my decision.
38. There has also been concern in respect of the effect on infrastructure in the area. The contributions secured by the legal agreement are intended to mitigate the effects of the proposal on such matters and as such the scheme would not result in any harm in this regard.
39. I note that concern has been expressed by interested parties in respect of the proximity of proposed dwellings to existing ones. However, the matter of the layout of the site is for later determination. There is also reference to the loss of the existing farm shop, as well as the use of the grassed area for events. The Council have raised no objection on this basis and in the absence of a policy basis for protecting these existing uses I find that I have no reason to find differently.
40. There was reference to the ability of the Council to demonstrate a three and five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. As I have found above that the scheme accords with an up-to-date development plan, this is not a matter which I need to consider further.

### **Conditions**

41. A list of draft conditions was provided prior to the hearing and as set out in the Statement of Common Ground; these were agreed by both main parties. Nonetheless, there was a discussion on these suggested conditions at the hearing. I have considered the conditions in light of the advice of the Planning Practice Guidance and the six tests.
42. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the submission and timing of reserved matter applications and the commencement of development. A condition is also required to ensure compliance with the submitted plans, but only in respect of access, as this is not a reserved matter.

43. Given the proximity of the site to Oxford Road, I have imposed a condition requiring details of measures to ensure that the living conditions of residents will not be adversely impacted on by noise. A condition is also imposed in respect of biodiversity enhancements, as required by Policy ESD10 of the CLP2011, as well as requiring that the development incorporate the recommendations of the Habitat Survey Report. In order to protect retained trees a condition in respect of an Arboricultural Method Statement is required.
44. In order to ensure the development does not adversely affect the natural environment and or the living conditions of nearby residents, I have included a condition requiring the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan. In order to ensure that any contamination of the site is satisfactorily dealt with, conditions are required in respect of site investigation and any necessary remediation, together with measures to deal with unsuspected contamination.
45. I have included a condition in respect of the construction details of the vehicular access, in the interests of highway safety. Similarly, a condition is required stopping up the existing vehicular access. In order to ensure the potential for buried remains within the site is properly addressed a condition is included requiring a written scheme of archaeological investigation. So that there is no conflict between residential properties and the existing farm shop, a condition is included requiring the demolition of all existing buildings prior to the occupation of any dwelling.
46. In the interests of sustainable transport and to ensure the site is accessible by a range of transport modes, conditions are included requiring travel plan statements and travel information packs to be provided to occupiers, as well as ducting to allow for the installation of electric charging points. I have also included a condition preventing occupation of any dwelling until necessary upgrades to the wastewater, surface water and water supply infrastructure have been completed. To facilitate communications infrastructure, a condition is necessary in respect of high-speed broadband facilities.
47. In the interests of biodiversity, I have imposed a condition requiring full details of external lighting to be submitted with the reserved matters application in respect of layout. Also, in this regard I have included a condition preventing site clearance or demolition of buildings during the bird nesting season.
48. A condition is recommended in respect of the reserved matters reflecting the principles set out in the submitted parameters plan, landscape strategy plan and indicative species list. However, only the matter of access is for determination at this stage and it has not been evidenced that the illustrative details submitted would be the only satisfactory way to develop the site. As such, I do not consider this condition is necessary.
49. To safeguard landscaping that contributes to biodiversity, a condition is recommended requiring a landscape and ecological management plan. However, as landscaping is a reserved matter it is not necessary to impose such a condition at this stage. Similarly, it is not necessary to impose a condition securing the implementation of landscaping or the retention of trees and hedgerows, as these are matters that should properly be dealt with under future reserved matters.

50. Conditions have been recommended in respect of the construction of internal roads and footways, vehicular parking areas and manoeuvring areas and provision of cycle parking facilities. Whilst access is for determination at this stage, this refers only to the means of access to the site. As such, these matters can be dealt with satisfactorily under a subsequent reserved matters application in respect of layout.

### **Conclusion**

51. I have found that the scheme would not result in a material increase over the target of delivering 750 dwellings and therefore would not conflict with Policy PV2 of the CLP 2011. I have also found that the scheme would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, a completed legal agreement has been submitted securing the necessary contributions. The scheme therefore complies with the development plan.

52. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Martin Allen*

INSPECTOR

## **APPEARANCES**

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Sarah Reid, of Counsel

instructed by Hollins Strategic Land  
LLP

Stephen Harries BSc (Hons), MRTPI

Director, Emery Planning

Nigel Evers, CMLI

Director, Viridian Landscape Planning

### FOR CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL:

Linda Griffiths

Principal Planning Officer, Cherwell  
District Council

Yuen Wong

Principal Planning Policy Officer,  
Cherwell District Council

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Cllr Mrs Heath

Councillor, Cherwell District Council,  
Adderbury, Bloxham and Bodicote  
Ward

Zzazz Foreman

Bodicote Parish Council

Eileen Meadows

Local Resident

Matthew Case

Oxfordshire County Council

## **DOCUMENTS**

- 1 Draft Section 106 Planning Agreement
- 2 Drawing Number IL1002 Rev C – Parameters Plan Final
- 3 Letter from Bovis Homes dated 29<sup>th</sup> August 2019
- 4 Letter from Emanuel Land & Real Estate dated 18<sup>th</sup> June 2018
- 5 Letter from the Land Team UK dated 6<sup>th</sup> June 2018
- 6 Extract of appellants closing submissions made at Inquiry in respect of Appeal ref APP/C3105/W/17/3188671
- 7 Addendum to CIL table

## Schedule of Conditions

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "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 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall commence not later than 2 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 following approved plan: Drawing number 1608/01 (Proposed Site Access Arrangements White Post Road), dated April 2018.
- 5) The first reserved matters application shall be accompanied by a specialist acoustic consultant's report demonstrating that internal noise levels in habitable rooms within the dwellings and external noise levels for outdoor areas (including domestic gardens and recreation areas) will not exceed the criteria specified in the British Standard BS8233:2014 'Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings'. Where mitigation measures are required in order to achieve these standards, full details, to include any acoustic barriers, planting, glazing and ventilation requirements as necessary, shall also be included. The approved mitigation measures shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the affected dwellings and the first use of the outdoor areas. The measures shall be retained as approved at all times.
- 6) The first reserved matters application shall be accompanied by a method statement for protecting and enhancing biodiversity on the site, to include all details of proposed bat and bird boxes and all integrated features within buildings, together with timings for their installation. The method statement shall also include details in respect of the implementation of the recommendations as set out in Section 6 – Conclusions and Recommendations of the "Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report", prepared by REC, dated April 2018. The biodiversity protection and enhancement measures shall be carried out and retained in accordance with the approved details.
- 7) As part of the reserved matters application in respect of layout, a surface water drainage scheme for the site shall be submitted. The scheme shall be based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development. The scheme shall also include:
  - Discharge Rates
  - Discharge Volumes
  - SUDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) (the suds features mentioned within Section 5.3 of the Flood Risk Assessment)
  - Maintenance and management of SUDs
  - Infiltration tests to be undertaken in accordance with BRE365 – Soakaway Design
  - Detailed drainage layout with pipe numbers
  - Network drainage calculations

- Phasing plans
- Flood routes in exceedance (to include provision of a flood exceedance route plan).

The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

- 8) The reserved matters application in respect of layout shall include full details of all external lighting, including predicted lux levels and light spill and details showing that lighting avoids vegetation and site boundaries. The lighting shall at all times accord with the approved details.
- 9) No development, other than demolition, shall commence before an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The AMS shall include protective fencing specifications and details of construction methods close to retained trees and hedges; and shall be undertaken in accordance with BS: 5837:2012 (including all subsequent revisions). Thereafter, the development shall at all times be carried out in accordance with the approved AMS.
- 10) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall include details of:
- i) Construction traffic management measures;
  - ii) Measures to ensure construction works do not adversely affect biodiversity and protect habitats and species of biodiversity importance;
  - iii) Measures to ensure construction works do not adversely affect nearby residential properties, including any details of consultation and communication with local residents.

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

- 11) No development shall commence until an assessment of the risks posed by any contamination shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This assessment must be undertaken by a suitably qualified contaminated land practitioner, in accordance with British Standard BS 10175: Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of Practice and the Environment Agency's Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination (CLR 11) (or equivalent British Standard and Model Procedures if replaced), and shall assess any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The assessment shall include:
- i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
  - ii) the potential risks to:
    - human health;
    - property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes;
    - adjoining land;
    - ground waters and surface waters;
    - ecological systems; and
    - archaeological sites and ancient monuments.

- 12) No development shall take place where (following the risk assessment required by Condition 10) land affected by contamination is found which poses risks identified as unacceptable in the risk assessment, until a detailed remediation scheme shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an appraisal of remediation options, identification of the preferred option(s), the proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, and a description and programme of the works to be undertaken including the verification plan. The remediation scheme shall be sufficiently detailed and thorough to ensure that upon completion the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to its intended use. The approved remediation scheme shall be carried out and upon completion a verification report by a suitably qualified contaminated land practitioner shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the development is occupied.
- 13) No development shall take place, other than demolition, before full details of the means of access between the land and the highway, including layout, construction, materials, surfacing, drainage and vision splays have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The means of access shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any dwelling and thereafter retained as approved.
- 14) No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include
  - i) the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;
  - ii) the programme for post investigation assessment;
  - iii) the provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;
  - iv) the provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
  - v) the provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
  - vi) the nomination of a competent person or persons/organization to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.
- 15) Prior to the occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, all existing buildings as shown on Drawing Number S18-225 (Topographical Land Survey) shall be demolished and the resultant debris and materials removed from the site.
- 16) No dwelling shall be occupied before a Travel Plan Statement and Travel Information Pack have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved documents shall be provided to each dwelling on its first occupation.
- 17) No dwelling shall be occupied until a system of ducting to allow for future installation of electrical vehicles charging infrastructure has been provided to serve that dwelling.

- 18) No dwelling shall be occupied until written confirmation has been provided that either:
- i) all wastewater network, surface water network and water network upgrades required to accommodate the development have been completed, or
  - ii) a housing and infrastructure phasing plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, allowing properties to be occupied on a phased basis.

Where a housing and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed, no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the approved details.

- 19) No dwellings shall be occupied until it has been provided with service connections capable of supporting the provision of high-speed broadband to serve that dwelling.
- 20) Any contamination that is found during the course of construction of the approved development that was not previously identified shall be reported immediately to the local planning authority. Development on the part of the site affected shall be suspended and a risk assessment carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Where unacceptable risks are found remediation and verification schemes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These approved schemes shall be carried out before the development is resumed or continued.
- 21) Prior to the first use of the access hereby approved, the existing access onto White Post Road shall be permanently stopped up by means of the installation of a verge and full-height kerb and shall not be used for any vehicular traffic whatsoever.
- 22) Any vegetation clearance and all works to demolish existing buildings shall take place outside of the bird nesting period (1 March to 31 August inclusive), unless a check for breeding birds has been undertaken by a suitably qualified surveyor within 24 hours of work commencing. If a nest (or a nest in construction) is found, a stand-off area should be maintained until the young have fledged.