



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 6 April 2016

Site visit made on 6 April 2016

by **P N Jarratt BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 06 May 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/W/15/3141276

Land off Townsend Road, Shrivenham, Oxfordshire, SN6 8HR

- 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 Gladman Developments Ltd against the decision of Vale of White Horse District Council.
 - The application Ref P15/V0663/O, dated 20 March 2015, was refused by notice dated 5 November 2015.
 - The development proposed is an outline application for residential development of up to 119 dwellings, landscaping, public open space and associated works, with all matters except access reserved.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for residential development of up to 119 dwellings, landscaping, public open space and associated works, with all matters except access reserved at land off Townsend Road, Shrivenham, Oxfordshire, SN6 8HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P15/V0663/O, dated 20 March 2015, subject to the conditions attached to the annex to this decision.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal application was submitted in outline with all matters (layout, appearance, scale and landscaping) reserved for future consideration, except access.
 3. The appellant submitted two executed planning obligations, firstly in favour of the Vale of White Horse District Council (the Council) dealing with recreation provision, waste collection and monitoring costs; and secondly, in favour of Oxfordshire County Council relating to travel and highways, education and monitoring costs.
 4. The application had been recommended for approval in the officer's report to the committee. The report's author was also the Council's expert witness at the hearing and presented the Council's case opposing the scheme. However he was able to distinguish between the Council's case and his own professional opinion.
 5. An application has been submitted by the appellant for up to 99 dwellings on the same site as this appeal but this has yet to be determined.
-

The site and main issues

6. The appeal site is in open countryside adjacent to the western built-up edge of Shrivenham about 950m from the village centre along Townsend Road. It is bounded by Rhymes House to the north, Swanhill Farm to the west and Swanhill Farm House and Townsend Road to the south from which a new vehicular and pedestrian access is proposed. The site falls about 10m from the north east part of the site. Access to Rhymes House crosses the site, to the east of which is a paddock and to the west, land under cultivation for crops. Boundaries of the site are predominantly defined by existing trees and hedgerows.
7. The main issues in this appeal are, firstly, the cumulative impact of housing permissions; secondly, the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the open countryside and the setting of Shrivenham; thirdly, whether the loss of agricultural land would be significant; and, fourthly, the effect of the proposed development on community infrastructure.

Reasons

Cumulative impact of housing permissions

8. It is common ground that the Council does not have a five year supply of deliverable housing land and that the adopted policies relevant to the supply of housing (Policies GS1, GS2 and H11) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 (adopted 2006) are out of date. The current land supply amounts to about 4.2 years, compared to 3.1 years in 2014. The Council considers that the contribution that the appeal site would make would only be marginal in that the shortfall would still exist.
9. The Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 Strategic Sites and Policies has been examined but not yet adopted. The inspector's report is anticipated in May 2016. Shrivenham is identified as a Local Service Centre within the third category of settlements in terms of sustainability and a strategic housing site for about 500 dwellings at Highworth Road in Shrivenham is included in the plan. The Council has resolved to grant permission for a scheme of about 240 dwellings on the southern part of the strategic site which also includes the provision of land for primary school facilities. There is a current application for 260 dwellings on the remainder of the strategic site that awaits determination. Notwithstanding this, no prematurity arguments in respect of the appeal site have been advanced by the Council.
10. The Parish Council recognises that growth is necessary and supports the allocation of strategic sites. However the Parish Council is concerned about the cumulative impact that current or prospective housing permissions would have, particularly in the short term. The number of dwellings would almost double since the 2011 census. The Parish Council has confirmed that the Neighbourhood Plan is at an early stage and points out that any benefits of permitting the appeal in advance of a proper consideration of the Neighbourhood Plan would be minimal, particularly as Shrivenham has several years of housing supply. The effects of such growth would include an increased parking demand in the village centre where there is little space to expand; pressure on the doctor's surgery; and, potential social issues as incomers seek to integrate into the village. Additionally, attention was drawn to the major

expansion of Swindon which could extend to within a mile of Shrivenham's boundary.

11. Shrivenham is an attractive settlement with a historic centre. It has also had a considerable number of housing estates developed over the years and these appear to be well integrated into the built fabric of the settlement. Whilst the village may be under considerable housing pressure at present, and the anticipated level of development may appear to be relatively rapid, the settlement has been identified as a sustainable local service centre suitable for strategic levels of housing growth. There may be additional pressures arising through the development of the site but no evidence has been presented to suggest that additional impacts on local infrastructure and services would be at an unacceptable level, when taking into account the educational, highway and other improvements provided for as part of this development and discussed later in this decision.
12. A five-year supply has not been demonstrated, and I have regard to the advice in paragraphs 14 and 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Although the shortfall is not as great as in 2014, the current appeal proposals would make a contribution to housing land supply, which the Framework seeks to boost significantly and, notwithstanding the number of planned or committed housing, I conclude on this issue that the proposal would not have a significant adverse cumulative effect on social and community infrastructure.

Impact on the Countryside

13. The appeal site does not form part of any national landscape, heritage or open space designations but it is part of the wider Lowland Vale landscape. No public rights of way cross the site.
14. The location of Rhymes House and nearby sporadic commercial and other development is set within an open countryside context, albeit in the transitional zone on the settlement edge of Shrivenham. The development of the site would extend the boundary of the village beyond its existing built up limits into this transitional zone.
15. The loss of two mature trees to provide access to the site would open up views from Townsend Road. Whilst this would change the setting of this entry point to Shrivenham and have an impact on the open nature of the countryside, this would not be significant in the longer term as the development matures.
16. The proposal would inevitably change the character of the site from open fields to one that is developed and some visual and landscape harm would result. Whilst retained boundary trees and hedgerows will mitigate the visual impact of the development to some extent, it will not be until the proposed landscape planting has matured and become fully established that the development would be visually integrated with the village. However in the longer term, the effect of this would be no more harmful than the appearance of the current edge of the village represented by the dwellings on Greycourt Road. These dwellings appear on the skyline when viewing the site from Townsend Road to the south. The sloping nature of the site would mean that the proposed new dwellings would be set below the skyline development.

17. The site is within a Lowland Vale between the North Wessex Downs AONB and the North Vale Corallian Ridge. Policy NE9 states that 'Development in the Lowland Vale will not be permitted if it would have an adverse effect on the landscape, particularly on the long open views within or across the area. The appellant argues that Policy NE9 is inconsistent with the Framework as the policy does not allow any adverse impact to be weighed against the benefits of a scheme. However, this view overlooks the core planning principle of the Framework which recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, with which Policy NE9 is consistent. Whilst the site is not part of a 'valued' landscape in the context of paragraph 109 of the Framework, this does not mean that the Lowland Vale landscape is not valued for its own distinctive quality by local people. Additionally, determining whether a proposal has an adverse effect is a matter of judgement. The policy forms part of the adopted development plan and will be weighed in the balance with other material considerations, including the Framework.
18. The appellant's appraisal of the impact of the development and the submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) indicates that the appeal site has the capacity to accommodate the proposals without significant adverse effect upon the quality and character of the wider Lowland Vale and the approach to Shrivenham. However, the Council disagrees with some of the conclusions drawn on the impact of the proposed development from certain viewpoints in respect of the degree of the magnitude of change, the sensitivity of particular receptors and the significance of the effect.
19. Whilst there will be a perceptible degree of change arising from the proposals, they will be seen in the context of the settlement edge of Shrivenham. From my inspection of the site and surroundings from many viewpoints, I consider that the proposed development would not be visually significant in long or medium distance views. The development of the site will only become apparent in a localised context but any localised harm arising would be of a temporary nature as the landscaping proposals mature and soften the edges of a new development.
20. Policies DC1 and DC6 seek high quality design and the provision of landscaping respectively but as the appeal proposal is in outline, these policies have limited application. I note that the illustrative layout and the green infrastructure plan set out indicative proposals for substantial planting.
21. I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would not conflict with Local Plan Policies DC1, DC6 and with the Framework, and the degree of conflict with Policy NE9 would be limited.

Agricultural Land Quality

22. The site comprises both grade 2 (31% in area) and grade 3 (67% in area) agricultural land which are categorised as 'very good' and 'good to moderate' respectively but is a relatively small area.
23. Paragraph 112 of the Framework refers to the best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV) and that where significant development is necessary, poorer quality land should be used in preference of higher quality land.
24. The Council has sought to permit and allocate sites on the edge of Shrivenham on the poorer quality grade 3 agricultural land, and does not consider that the

benefits of the proposed development are anything other than general and could be achieved elsewhere. Whilst this may be the case, in considering the emerging strategic housing allocations, a significant number of sites have been allocated by the Council despite the potential loss of BMV land.

25. The loss of such land is inevitable in providing for housing on the edge of settlements serving a large rural area and needs to be considered in the planning balance.
26. I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would lead to the loss of the BMV land. However, I do not consider that the development is 'significant' in the context of paragraph 112 when account is taken of the threshold for consultation with Natural England is 20 hectares of BMV land proposed for development.

Effect on Community Infrastructure

27. Two executed planning obligations have been submitted by the appellant. The first is in favour of the District Council dealing with recreation provision, waste collection and monitoring costs. The secondly is in favour of Oxfordshire County Council relating to travel and highways, education and monitoring costs.
28. The highways contribution of £554,973.62 is towards the cost of a new strategic access improvement from the A420 to the Highworth Road. Provision is also made for a Traffic Regulation Order contribution of £4,000 as a consequence of highways works on Townsend Road associated with the development; a bus shelter contribution of £14,000; a bus service contribution of £1,000 per dwelling; and a Travel Plan contribution of £1240 towards the costs of monitoring the operation of the Travel Plan.
29. It is clear that the development would lead to a need to increase permanent capacity at Shrivenham CoE Primary School and at Faringdon Community College for secondary education. There is little scope for extending the primary school at its present site in the village centre but a new site has been identified as part of the scheme for the southern part of the strategic housing site which is subject to a resolution for approval.
30. The education contributions are for both primary and secondary education. The appellant accepts that the secondary education amount is based on a Department for Education Multiplier but the primary education amount requested by the County Council is challenged by both the appellant and the District Council. Originally the County Council requested a contribution of £25,683 per pupil place and later reduced this to a figure of £20,000 per pupil place but without explanation of how the figure was arrived at, other than Mr Pope on behalf of the County Council stating at the hearing that the figure is an interim temporary measure pending further review. The District Council in their officer report on the application reviewed the figures to establish a CIL compliant figure, which was at £16,634.67 per place, although the Council's position at the hearing is now to support the County Council.
31. The appellant on the other hand has arrived at a figure of £13,434 using DfE cost multiplier figures regionally adjusted for Oxfordshire.
32. The raft of figures under discussion is not helpful. It is necessary that obligations relate directly to the proposed development, are necessary to make

it acceptable and are of an appropriate scale and so comply with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations. In terms of the primary education contribution I believe the figure of £16,634.67 per pupil is appropriate in scale on the basis of the analysis of costs undertaken by the Council's Case Officer and the obligation should reflect this as the basis of the appropriate contribution that is compliant with the CIL Regulations.

33. The appellant agrees with contributions to the District Council of £5,953 for outdoor tennis provision; £16,900 for a multi-use games area; £18,495 for football pitches; £11,497 for a recreation ground pavilion; £2,210 for a trim trail and £22,360 to the village hall. However a sum of £60,549 for new changing facilities at Faringdon Leisure Centre and £170 per dwelling for waste collection and waste bins is contested by the appellant.
34. The Council considers that the development would place increased pressure on the Faringdon Leisure Centre where there is a need for new changing facilities and a costed project has been prepared. The appellant believes that there is existing capacity at the Leisure Centre based on the Council's 2014 draft Sports and Leisure Facilities Strategy and also there are facilities at other leisure centres in the area. It appears that the Council is seeking a qualitative improvement of facilities and such provision would not be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
35. The Council is seeking £170 per dwelling for the provision of 4 refuse bins and food storage containers. The appellant considers that it fails to comply with CIL Regulation 122 as it is not deemed necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. I agree with this view.
36. The appellant also contests the County Council's request of £3,750 for monitoring and administration and the District Council's request of £3,170 for s106 monitoring. The appellant makes reference to recent case law¹ in which similar arguments were made by the County Council for the payment of a monitoring fee. Paragraph 45 of that judgement makes it clear that there is nothing in the wording of the Act, the CIL Regulations, the Framework or the Guidance which suggests that authorities could or should claim administration and monitoring fees as part of planning obligations. I have had regard to other appeal decisions brought to my attention but see no reason to go against that judgement in respect of the monitoring fees requested by both Councils.
37. The County Council drew attention to paragraph 11 of the obligation, which is a unilateral undertaking, seeking to bind the County Council. As the County Council is not a signatory to the obligation, I cannot see how such a clause can be enforced. Similarly, Schedule 12 of the undertaking in favour of the District Council appears to require actions of the Council, but this cannot be binding on a party who is not a signatory. The County Council raised other matters, such as reference to the 'promoter', and for draft heads of terms of s38 and s278 agreements under the Highways Act to be included in the obligation. However, I am not convinced by such arguments. It is for the appellant to determine the contents of a unilateral undertaking and for the decision maker to ensure that it satisfies the statutory framework. Accordingly it is not necessary for me to consider these matters further which are not necessary to make the proposed development acceptable.

¹ Oxfordshire CC v SSCLG [2015] EWHC 186

38. I am satisfied that the various contributions relate directly to the proposed development, are necessary to make it acceptable and are of an appropriate scale and so comply with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations, and that the pooling limit is not exceeded, subject to the primary education contribution being £16,634.67 per pupil and with the exclusion of the sum of £60,549 for new changing facilities at Faringdon Leisure Centre, the sum of £170 per dwelling for waste collection and waste bins; the sum of £3,750 for the County Council's monitoring and administration costs and the sum £3,170 for the District Council's 106 monitoring costs. I have attached no weight to the exclusions in reaching a decision on this appeal.
39. In conclusion on this issue, the executed obligations submitted by the appellant would overcome concerns regarding the impact of the development on community infrastructure. Similarly, the concerns expressed by a local resident in respect of the impact of the proposed development on sewerage capacity can be satisfactorily dealt with through an appropriate condition.

Conditions

40. I have had regard to the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) in considering appropriate conditions. Conditions 1 and 2 have shorter time frames than normal as the development is seeking to address the shortage in the 5 year supply of housing land. Condition 3 defines the permission in the interests of the proper planning of the area. Conditions 4, 5, 6, 10, 18 and 19 are necessary in the interests of visual and residential amenities.
41. Whilst the Council would prefer for affordable housing to be a matter for a planning obligation as they consider that it would provide greater certainty in terms of the registered housing provider, this is a matter that can be covered by condition. Condition 7 is therefore necessary to ensure that a proportion of the dwellings are affordable and continue to be so in the future.
42. As there is potential that archaeological assets exist on the site, condition 8 requires a programme of archaeological work to be undertaken. Condition 9 is intended to promote biodiversity locally.
43. Condition 11 seeks to encourage the use of sustainable transport and conditions 15, 16 and 17 are required in the interests of highway safety. At the hearing the County Council argued that the matters covered by these conditions should have been incorporated in the planning obligation but this would be unnecessary.
44. Conditions 12, 13 and 14 relate to surface water drainage, foul drainage and water supply for the development. The appellant considers that as the provision of the sewerage system is the responsibility of a statutory undertaker who is able to impose charges to fund improvements, a condition relating to foul drainage is unnecessary. However the PPG at 34-020-2014-03-06 points out that the timescales for works carried out by a sewerage company do not always fit in with development needs. Essential infrastructure such as sewerage needs to be in place prior to the occupation of the development and I consider the imposition of condition 13 to be reasonable and necessary.
45. Similarly, the appellant considers that the provision of the water supply for the scheme is a matter for the Building Regulations. Whilst it is normally unnecessary for water supply to be a matter for planning applications as stated

in PPG 34-016-2014-03-06, there are exceptions. Due to the size of the scheme and the comments of the water company, such a condition is necessary.

46. I do not consider that it is necessary to impose a condition restricting building heights when matters of scale and appearance are reserved for future determination.

Conclusions and Planning Balance

47. I have concluded that the proposed development would not be visually significant in long or medium distance views but that it would be apparent in a localised context on the edge of the village. Any localised harm arising would be of a temporary nature as the proposed landscaping matures and softens the edges of a new development and I do not consider that any harm arising in the context of Policy NE9 would outweigh the benefits of the scheme. There would be a loss of BMV agricultural land but this would be balanced against the provision of new housing in an area where there is no five year supply of developable housing land. I consider that the cumulative effect of the proposed housing and the development of the strategic housing site in Shrivenham would not lead to any significant harm and that adequate provision can be made for community infrastructure.
48. The proposed development would fulfil the economic, social and environmental roles of sustainable development and the limited harm arising is insufficient to clearly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development.
49. In conclusion and having had regard to all relevant matters, I allow the appeal.

P N Jarratt

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

C Still MRICS	Planning Division Manager, Gladman Developments Ltd
A MacQuire CMLI	Aspect Landscape Planning

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Adrian Butler BA Hons MRTPI	Major Applications Officer
-----------------------------	----------------------------

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Cllr E Ware	Ward Member
Cllr S Day	Shrivenham Parish Council
A Pope	Development Funding Team, Oxfordshire CC
B Dimmock-Smith	Development Funding Team, Oxfordshire CC
A Wisdom	Senior Transport Planner, Oxfordshire CC
Simon Wellbeloved	Transport Engineer, Oxfordshire CC
Cllr Bartle	Parish Council Chairman
John Varney	Local resident
Mr and Mrs Morrison	Local residents
Mr Chaston	Local resident
Mr G Paignton	Local resident
Ms. A Brickell	Local resident
Mr Hewins	Local resident
Mr P Callaghan	Local resident
Mr J Gregory	Local resident

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Statement of Common Ground
- 2 Draft obligation to Oxfordshire County Council (appellant)
- 3 Agreed and disputed conditions (appellant)
- 4 Suffolk Coastal DC & Hopkins Homes v SSCLG [2016] EWCA Civ 168 (appellant)
- 5 Compliance of Planning Obligations Reg 123 CIL Regulations 2010 (OCC)
- 6 Appellant's response to contributions sought (appellant)
- 7 Draft obligation to Vale of White Horse District Council (appellant)
- 8 Response to draft obligation to Oxfordshire County Council (OCC)
- 9 APP/Q3115/A/14/2229389, Greenwood Avenue, Chinnor (OCC)
- 10 APP/Q3115/A/14/3001839, Crowall Road, Chinnor (OCC)
- 11 Site contributions trigger schedule (OCC)
- 12 Extract from PINS Procedural Guide; Planning Appeals paras N.6.8 and N.6.9
- 13 Executed obligation to Vale of White Horse District Council (appellant)
- 14 Executed obligation to Oxfordshire County Council (appellant)

Annex

Land off Townsend Road, Shrivenham, Oxfordshire, SN6 8HR

Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin prior to the expiration of one year from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.
- 2) Application for the approval in respect of all matters reserved in this permission (layout (including internal access arrangements), scale, appearance and landscaping) shall be made to the local planning authority within a period of 18 months from the date of this decision.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be limited to no more than 119 dwellings and carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 5310/ASP01 Rev A and C13376-001 Rev D.
- 4) The first reserved matters application shall include an Open Space Scheme showing all areas of open space to be provided within the site including public amenity open space and equipped children's play area (LEAP). The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the dwellings.
- 5) As part of the reserved matters, a landscape management plan, to include the timing of the implementation of the plan, long term design objectives, management responsibilities, maintenance schedules and procedures for the replacement of failed planting for all landscaped areas, other than private, domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the landscape management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) All existing trees and hedges shall be retained in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment and response dated July 2015. All trees and hedges on and immediately adjoining the site shall be protected from damage as a result of works on the site, to the satisfaction of the local planning authority in accordance with 'BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to Design, Demolition and Construction', for the duration of the works on site. In the event that trees or hedging become damaged or otherwise defective during such period or within five years following practical completion of the approved development, the local planning authority shall be notified as soon as reasonably practical and remedial action agreed and implemented. In the event that any tree or hedging dies or is removed without the prior consent of the local planning authority, it shall be replaced as soon as reasonably practical and, in any case, by not later than the end of the first available planting season, with trees of such size, species and in such number and positions as may be agreed by the local planning authority.
- 7) No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision of affordable housing as part of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The affordable housing shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme and shall meet the definition of affordable housing set out in the Glossary of the National Planning Policy Framework or any future guidance that replaces it. The scheme shall include:

- the numbers, type and location on the site of the affordable housing provision to be made which shall consist of not less than 40% of housing units; the units shall be distributed across the site with no more than 15 per cluster;
 - the tenure shall be split 75% affordable rented units and 25% intermediate tenure;
 - the timing of the construction of the affordable housing and its phasing in relation to the occupancy of the market housing. No more than 80% of the open market dwellings shall be occupied before 100% of the affordable housing is completed and available for occupation;
 - the arrangements for the transfer of the affordable housing to an affordable housing provider or the management of the affordable housing if no Registered Housing Provider is involved;
 - the arrangements to ensure that such provision is affordable for both first and subsequent occupiers of the affordable housing;
 - the occupancy criteria to be used for determining the identity of the occupiers of the affordable housing and the means by which such occupancy criteria shall be enforced.
- 8) No development or groundwork shall take place until a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 9) The approved development shall be implemented in accordance with the submitted enhancement recommendations of the Aerial Assessment of Trees for Bat Roosts. Any variation shall be agreed in writing in advance with the local planning authority'
- 10) Prior to the commencement of development, details of existing ground levels on the site and the proposed slab levels of the new dwellings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and development carried out in accordance with the approved slab levels.
- 11) Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling, a Travel Information Pack shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The first occupier of the dwelling shall be provided with a copy of the approved pack.
- 12) Prior to the commencement of development hereby permitted, a detailed scheme for the surface water drainage of the development and a timetable for its implementation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved surface water drainage scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 13) No dwelling shall be occupied until one of the recommended options set out in the submitted Thames Water Sewer Impact Study reference X4503-593 dated May 2015 has been implemented in accordance with the approved details or such alternative as first agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
- 14) No dwelling shall be occupied until 710 metres of 125mm diameter mains water pipe has been laid from the existing 6" diameter main at the junction

- of the B4000 and Townsend Road to the site or such alternative as first agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
- 15) No dwelling shall be occupied until the provision of the new access junction on Townsend Road and the pedestrian/cycle footways have been implemented in accordance with the approved details shown on the Site Access Arrangement (Drawing No. C13376-001 Rev D).
 - 16) Prior to the first occupation a scheme for the provision of street lighting on Townsend Road shall be implemented in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
 - 17) Prior to the first occupation the provision of an uncontrolled crossing point comprising a dropped kerb and tactile paving on Townsend Road to connect with the southwest bound bus stop shall be implemented in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
 - 18) Development shall not commence until a scheme for protecting the dwellings hereby permitted from noise from the A420 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include the details of any noise barrier, building insulation and alternative ventilation arrangements for the dwellings concerned. The scheme shall ensure that the internal noise levels from road traffic shall not exceed 35 dB LAeq, 0700-2300 hours in any habitable room or 30 dB LAeq 2300-0700 hours and 45 dB LAm_{ax} 2300-0700 hours inside any bedroom and that noise levels from any road traffic in any outdoor living area shall not exceed 55dB LAeq (1 hour) within the first 5 metres from the building façade to which the outdoor living area relates. No dwelling shall be occupied until the works to protect the dwelling concerned have been completed in accordance with the approved details.
 - 19) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i) the programme and phasing of works on site
 - ii) site offices and other temporary buildings
 - iii) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
 - iv) loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - v) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
 - vi) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
 - vii) wheel washing facilities
 - viii) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
 - ix) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
 - x) construction vehicle routing and access.