



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 26 - 28 April 2016

Site visit made on 28 April 2016

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 June 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/W/15/3133674 **Land north of High Street, Blunsdon**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Linden Limited against Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref S/14/1304, is dated 18 July 2014.
 - The development proposed is the erection of up to 69 no. dwellings with associated car parking, landscaping and public open space.
-

Procedural matters

1. I note the reasons for refusal submitted with the Council's Statement. While this is not the application decision as jurisdiction over that was taken away when the appeal was lodged, I have treated it as the decision the Council would have made, had it been empowered to do so.
 2. Although the description reads as a development "of up to 69 no. dwellings", as this is a detailed application for planning permission I have dealt with it on the basis of being for the erection of 69 no. dwellings.
 3. A signed and dated S106 Planning Obligation was submitted by the appellant. This covers an off-site major open space and outdoor sports contribution, a transport contribution, an allotment contribution, provision of affordable housing units and provision of public open space. I return to these matters below.
 4. It was confirmed at the Inquiry that the Council is no longer pursuing its refusal reasons 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 in respect of its sustainable development strategy, affordable housing, archaeology, vehicular access, parking and infrastructure provision as set out in the reasons submitted with its Statement of Case. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
 5. The appellant submitted revised drawings 14311 – SKC001 Rev L, 100 rev F (P2) and JBA 14/101. These set out amendments in respect of the visibility plays within and at the site entrance, an increase in the length of the driveways at plots 54 and 55 to improve access within the development and a landscape masterplan. As these revisions address concerns raised by the Council, I consider that dealing with the appeal on the basis of the revised drawings would not prejudice the interests of any party.
-

6. The parties agreed that the correct address for the appeal site is "land north of Ermin Street, Blunsdon, Swindon". I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
7. I heard that the emerging Blunsdon Neighbourhood Plan is at an early stage of drafting with no formal documents having been produced for public consultation. The parties agreed that it should be afforded little weight and from my assessment, I have no reason to disagree. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
8. The appellant's witnesses; Mr A Pollard BA(Hons), MTP, MRTPI Director, Turley Economics and Mr S Taylor, Director Urban Design, Turley, were not called.

Decision

9. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of 69 no. dwellings with associated car parking, landscaping and public open space at land north of Ermin Street, Blunsdon, Swindon in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S/14/1304, dated 18 July 2014, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Main Issues

10. I consider the main issues to be whether this would be a suitable location for the proposed development having regard to national and development plan policies in respect of sustainable development and the delivery of new housing, and whether the proposal would provide a high standard of design and landscaping.

Reasons

Suitable location for housing and housing land supply

11. The appeal site extends to around 3 hectares and adjoins the settlement of Broad Blunsdon which lies to the east. From what I observed it is a vacant area of grassland. To the west is Ermin Street from which the appeal site is separated by a landscaped bund, while to the south is High Street. Existing housing stretches in a ribbon along Ermin Street and further housing developments have been granted planning permission between Ermin Street and the recently built A419. This busy trunk road sits in a cutting and separates Blunsdon from the northern outskirts of Swindon.
12. The development plan includes the adopted Swindon Local Plan 2026 (LP). LP Policy SD2 establishes a hierarchy for development in the Borough and seeks to limit the number of additional dwellings in the Borough's villages (with development concentrated within Swindon). In addition, the policy establishes settlement boundaries and I heard that this proposal would not be contained within the defined settlement boundary for Blunsdon as shown on the LP Policies Map.
13. It is common ground that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land for the purposes of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 47. In a recent appeal decision in the Borough ref. APP/U3935/W/15/3035660 the supply was estimated at 4.6 years. In such circumstances, NPPF paragraph 49 directs that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date. It was agreed that LP Policy SD2 is such a policy insofar as it refers to a settlement boundary for Blunsdon.

14. However, I consider that Policy SD2 taken as a whole, seeks to constrain the scale of development by protecting and enhancing the distinctive character and features of the Borough's villages. As such, it is a relevant policy for the supply of housing and in the light of the recent judgements in the cases of *Suffolk Coastal District Council & Hopkins Homes Ltd & Sec of State for Communities & Local Govt.*; *Richborough Estates Partnership LLP & Cheshire East Borough Council & Sec of State for Communities & Local Govt.*, Court of Appeal, C1/2015 0583 & C1/2015/0894 [2016] EWCA 168 and *Stratford on Avon District Council & Sec of State for Communities & Local Govt.* & (1) *J S Bloor (Twekesbury) Limited* (2) *Hallam Land Management Limited* (3) *Rase (Residents Against Shottery Expansion) CO/12539/2012 [2013] EWHC 2074 (Admin)* it cannot be considered to be up-to-date.
15. Therefore, although the proposal would conflict with LP Policy SD2 and the policy objectives that seek to direct development to Swindon and those villages considered to be the most accessible with the largest range of facilities, the weight to be given to this harm is reduced by the relevant policy not being up-to-date by virtue of the lack of a 5 year housing land supply. In my judgement, as a policy within a recently adopted LP that sets out a strategy for sustainable development, I consider SD2 attracts moderate weight.
16. The inability of the Council to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land is a matter to which I attach substantial weight in my consideration of this appeal. Furthermore, the appellant argued that the proposal would bring about a range of benefits that would weigh in its favour. These are boosting the supply of housing in a Borough where there is a lack of a 5 year housing land supply, delivering affordable housing and making contributions to open space, allotments, transport and outdoor sports. These are matters to which I return to below in the context of the balance to be conducted under NPPF paragraph 14.

Design and landscaping

17. Proposed is the erection of 69 no. dwellings comprising a mix of houses and flats, ranging in size from 1 to 4 bedrooms. The layout would include a landscaped linear strip along the boundary with Ermin Street that would include an open space play area. Access would be taken from High Street.
18. It is common ground that the proposal would not impact significantly on either the Mid Vale Landscape Character Area (within which it would be situated) or the wider landscape setting of Blunsdon village. From my assessment, I have no reason to disagree. Concerns were raised however, that the proposal would lead to Blunsdon coalescing with Swindon thereby detracting from its identity as a distinctive rural village. It was further argued that the proposal would fail to deliver a high quality design.
19. With regard to the former, I observed that Blunsdon is separated from the northern part of Swindon by the A419. This recently built stretch of road takes traffic away from Ermin Street and sits in a dip as it passes between Blunsdon and Swindon. As such I did not get the impression that the 2 are in danger of coalescing or that Blunsdon has in any way been subsumed by Swindon when the residential developments recently granted planning permission between Ermin Street and the A419 are taken into account.

20. Rather the perception, in my judgement, is that Blunsdon is and would remain physically separated from Swindon by the A419. Moreover, given the level of the road when travelling south, it is not until visual receptors emerge from the cutting that any sense is gained of being on the edge of Swindon. Similarly when travelling north, on emerging from the cutting the perception is one of having left the urban area of Swindon. From my observations, I did not gain an impression when travelling on the A419 in both directions that the proposal (which would not be seen from the A419 within the cutting) would lead to the village losing its distinctiveness. Indeed, from the appeal site looking west and from the nearby built up edge of Swindon looking east given the topography and the landscaped bund, there would be no perception of the proposal leading to continuous built development between Blunsdon and Swindon.
21. In this regard, I agree with the findings of the appellant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which concluded that as the site is constrained by boundary vegetation, its visual envelope is very limited which would give the development a low impact. Mitigating factors such as the retained boundary vegetation and enhanced landscaping within the development would serve to break up its scale and mass such that the change to the existing landscape resource would be limited, and the residual effect would be negligible. In this regard the proposal would not conflict with LP Policy EN5.
22. With regard to the scale of the proposal, the parties disagreed as to the percentage increase to the village that would result with the Council arguing that the proposal would increase the number of dwellings by around 34% and the appellant 10%. I consider that the quantum and layout of the housing would be proportionate with the size of the village and the peripheral location, having a density of around 23 DPH. That is a modest figure and in terms of the design and layout of the proposal, given the topography and existing and proposed landscaping features, it would not be disproportionate to the character and size of the village.
23. In my judgement, the layout and provision of landscaping and open space (which could be secured through conditions and the Planning Obligation were planning permission to be granted) would create a development that would politely integrate itself with its surroundings. The proposed mix of hard and soft landscaping design features would provide visual interest and articulation to the layout, and afford reasonable access from within the development to the open spaces.
24. In respect of specific layout concerns, I consider that the garden areas and outlook for plots 61 and 62 would be acceptable for flatted units within a development of this density and the garden arrangement of plots 21 to 24 would be typical of being located close to a sylvan boundary. Accordingly, the proposal would not conflict with LP Policy DE1.

Sustainable development

25. Having established that LP Policy SD2 is not an up-to-date policy, the presumption in favour of sustainable development in NPPF paragraph 14 is engaged. The NPPF confirms that there are 3 dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. In terms of the economic role, the proposal would provide construction work, deliver a New Homes Bonus and bring new inhabitants to the village, which would support the local facilities. The provision of affordable housing would improve the tenure mix

and provide an opportunity for younger members of this village community to take their first steps on the housing ladder. All of these matters assist in the performance of a social role by supporting the village community.

26. In terms of the environmental role, Blunsdon and nearby Ermin Street have public transport links and the village includes a range of services such as a shop, a primary school, a pub, a village hall and a church. Furthermore, the scheme would provide an area of public open space that could be secured through the Planning Obligation, were planning permission to be granted. Against this background, I am satisfied that the proposal, in its totality, would amount to sustainable development.

Other matters

27. The appeal scheme would meet the general requirements of LP Policy HA2 for 30% provision of affordable housing. This would result in a greater range of housing on offer, and a more mixed community, in line with policy objectives in the NPPF. This would be secured through the submitted Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
28. This would also provide a financial contribution in respect of major off-site open space, outdoor sports, allotments and transport improvements as well as providing and managing an on-site open space. I am satisfied that these contributions and the provision of affordable housing units are necessary to make the development acceptable. They are directly related to the development and reasonably related in scale and kind. As such the Planning Obligation passes the tests set out in the NPPF and satisfies the requirements of regulation 122 of *The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010*. I can therefore give it considerable weight.
29. Local residents raised concerns regarding highway safety and the capacity of local schools and doctors/dental surgeries. In terms of highway safety, I am satisfied that the submitted Transport Statement shows that the level of traffic that would be generated could be accommodated on the local network and the agreed highways contributions, secured through the Planning Obligation, would enable the impact to be mitigated satisfactorily. Subject to conditions including those related to a Road safety Audit which could be attached to any grant of planning permission, I consider that the proposal would not compromise highway safety. With regard to local schools and medical facilities, I have no evidence to enable me to conclude that these services could not cope with a development of the scale proposed.
30. The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings, the impact on ecological interests and flooding and drainage were considered by the Council and I heard that the proposal would be unlikely to have any significant adverse impact in respect of these matters. From my assessment, subject to the suggested conditions which could be attached to any grant of planning permission, I have no reason to disagree.

Planning balance

31. I have concluded that the proposal would conflict with LP Policy SD2 but as this is not an up-to-date policy for the purposes of NPPF paragraph 49, I give it moderate weight. I have considered the 3 dimensions of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF and I have found that the proposal would

be in conformity. The NPPF paragraph 14 states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. In circumstances where relevant policies are out of date, this means granting planning permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

32. This proposal would help to meet the acknowledged shortfall in housing land supply within the Borough in line with the NPPF which aims to boost significantly the supply of housing. This is a material consideration to which I attribute substantial weight. In addition, I have concluded that the proposal would contribute to tenure choice by providing market and affordable housing and make provision for public open space and play area. These matters also weigh substantially in favour of the proposal.

Conclusions

33. When assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole, I conclude that the adverse impacts of allowing the development do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Accordingly, on balance, the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

34. The parties suggested several conditions that were discussed at the Inquiry. I have considered all of the conditions and where necessary amended the wording in the interests of clarity and in the light of the tests and advice within the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance. It is necessary to impose conditions setting out time limits for development and to relate development to the submitted plans as this provides certainty, along with a condition requiring the submission of a drainage strategy to ensure there is sufficient capacity to cope with the development.
35. It is also necessary to attach conditions in respect of materials and levels, given the variation in the levels on the site, in the interests of visual amenity. In addition, a tree protection condition is necessary to ensure that adequate protection is afforded to the trees on the site, while conditions to secure the implementation of an approved landscaping scheme and public open space and play area are also required in the interests of visual and recreational amenity.
36. A condition is necessary in order that the recommendations and mitigation measures contained within the Habitat Survey are carried out in the interests of the ecological enhancement of the site along with a condition to secure a Construction Management Plan in the interest of amenity and highway safety. Furthermore, as part of the package of transport measures, it is necessary to require by conditions a Road Safety Audit, works on the highway, road and footpath works within the site, visibility within the site, cycle storage, entrance gates, driveway gradient and a Residential Travel Plan. These measures are to be submitted for the approval of the Council prior to development commencing, in the interests of highway safety, to ensure that highway infrastructure is constructed satisfactorily and to secure a sustainable development.
37. In addition, conditions are necessary in respect of refuse storage, the use of the garages, the size of the garages, garage doors and external lighting details in the interests of visual amenity, highway safety and to ensure satisfactory

provision is made for the parking of vehicles. I also agree with the Council that it is necessary to require by condition, a remediation strategy in the event of contamination being found at the site, to ensure it is suitably assessed and remediated.

38. Further conditions are necessary in respect of construction hours, surface water drainage and flood risk assessment in the interests of residential amenity and water and pollution management, while to ensure a satisfactory appearance, it is also necessary to ensure that boundary treatments are approved.
39. Finally, I consider that conditions are not necessary in respect of plots 21 to 24, and 61 and 62 for the reasons set out above, nor is a condition necessary in respect of the open space and play area as these matters are covered by the Planning Obligation.

Richard McCoy

INSPECTOR

Richborough Estates

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr T Jones of Counsel

He called

Mr D Dewart BSc(Hons), Planning Manager
DipTP, MRTPI

Ms R Adams BA, BTP, Principal Planning Officer
MRTPI

Mr P Garitsis BAS, Urban Designer/Masterplanner
MCPUD

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr C Young

He called

Mr P Lawson MRTPI Office Director, Turley

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mrs M Penny

Ward Councillor

Mr I Jankinson

Chair of Blunsden St Andrew Parish Council

Mr G McCallion

Local resident

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Council's letters of notification of the Inquiry
- 2 Extract from Swindon Residential Design Guide
- 3 Rebuttal Proof of Evidence of Peter Lawson
- 4 Swindon Borough Council v Sec of State for Communities and Local Govt CO/920/2016 High Court Judgement refusing permission for a quashing
- 5 Mr Jankinson's evidence
- 6 Signed and dated Planning Obligation
- 7 Amendment to the Statement of Common Ground
- 8 Suffolk Coastal District Council & Hopkins Homes Ltd & Sec of State for Communities & Local Govt; Richborough Estates Partnership LLP & Cheshire East Borough Council & Sec of State for Communities & Local Govt, Court of Appeal, C1/2015 0583 & C1/2015/0894 [2016] EWCA Civ 168
- 9 Site visit itinerary
- 10 Stratford on Avon District Council & Sec of State for Communities & Local Govt & (1) J S Bloor (Twekesbury) Limited (2) Hallam Land Management Limited (3) Rase (Residents Against Shottery Expansion) CO/12539/2012 [2013] EWHC 2074 (Admin)
- 11 Appeal Decision APP/K2420/A/13/2202989
- 12 Appeal Decision APP/P1133/A/11/2158146
- 13 Additional conditions

PLANS

- 1 Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 Broad Blunsdon Inset Policies Map
- 2 Approved layout for Hills Homes Ltd development (S/13/1223)

3 Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 Policies Map

CONDITIONS SCHEDULE

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents: 1166 100 rev F (P2) (planning layout); drawing number: 1166 102 (site location plan); drawing number: 1166 110 rev C (external works layout); drawing number: JBA 14/101 (landscape masterplan); drawing number: 14311-SKC001 rev L (highway constraints); drawing number: 14311-C002 rev M (preliminary drainage strategy); drawing number: 14311-SKC002 rev E (engineering appraisal); drawing number: JBA 14-101 TS02 rev A (tree protection plan); drawing number 1166 56 (garages); House Type drawing pack July 2015; drawing number 1166 HT-K2-N1-1 rev B; drawing number 1166 HT-K2-N1-2 rev B; drawing number 1166 HT-K2-N1-3 rev B; Design and Access Statement March 2016; Planning Statement July 2014; Transport Assessment July 2014; Travel Plan Statement July 2014; Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy R/C14311/001.09 Issue 9 July 2016; Phase 1 Habitat Survey April 2014; Archaeological Assessment April 2014; Archaeological Evaluation March 2016; Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement March 2016 ref JBA 14/101-AR02 rev A; Statement of Community Involvement June 2014; Utilities Report ref 4987 rev A June 2014.
- 3) Development shall not commence until a drainage strategy detailing any on and or off site drainage works, has been submitted to and approved by, the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed.
- 4) Prior to the commencement of works on site in connection with the development hereby permitted, representative samples of all external facing and roofing materials to be used in the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.
- 5) Prior to the commencement of works on site in connection with the development hereby permitted, a levels plan (or plans) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For clarity the plan shall include details of existing and proposed ground levels across the site, proposed finished floor levels of all dwellings and garages, and existing and proposed sections through the site from north to south and east to west. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) Prior to the commencement of works on site in connection with the development hereby permitted, the trees shown for retention on the

approved plan shall have first been protected by the erection of a temporary protective fence which shall be of and maintained to a standard compliant with BSI 5837:2005. Details of the proposed position of the fencing shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with the approved details. The fencing shall remain until such time as, approval for removal, has been confirmed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- 7) Notwithstanding the details listed under condition 2, prior to the commencement of works on site in connection with the development hereby permitted, a scheme of landscaping to include details of hard surfacing, street furniture, planting schedule, time table of works, ecological enhancement measures and management plan shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the positions, species and crown spread of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, detailing those to be retained, together with measures for their protection during development. The approved scheme shall be implemented as per the approved timetable. Any tree or shrub planted in accordance with the scheme which is removed, dies or becomes diseased within a period of 5 years from first being planted, shall be replaced by one of a similar size and the same species.
- 8) The ecological enhancement measures as identified in approved document Phase 1 Habitat Survey April 2014, including any further surveys as identified, shall be implemented/carried out on the site.
- 9) No site development works, or use by site traffic, shall take place until a scheme for the provision of the following has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - a temporary access,
 - routes to and from the site for construction vehicles,
 - parking, turning, loading, unloading, and storage areas for site operatives and construction traffic,
 - on-site wheel cleaning facilities,
 - method statement for the control of noise, dust, smoke vibration, fumes and debris during construction, to be used for the duration of site works.

Construction and site works shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details for the duration of the works.

- 10) Prior to the commencement of any works on site, a Combined Stage One/Two Road Safety Audit shall be carried out on the proposed layout, the details of which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 11) Notwithstanding the details listed under condition 2, prior to the commencement of any works on site, details of the proposed access into the site and the uncontrolled dropped kerb crossing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. As a first development operation, the vehicular access on to the High Street and the uncontrolled dropped crossing across High Street, and associated

engineering operations, shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

- 12) Prior to the commencement of any works on site, details of the proposed estate roads, turning spaces, footways, footpaths, verges, street lighting, sewers, drains, retaining walls, service routes, surface water outfall, vehicle overhang margins, embankments, accesses, carriageway gradients, driveway gradients, car parking and street furniture shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. For this purpose, plans and sections indicating, as appropriate, the design, layout, levels, gradients, materials, and method of construction shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. For the avoidance of doubt roads and footways which serve dwellings shall be constructed in such a manner as to ensure that prior to occupation each dwelling is served by a fully functional highway, the hard surfaces of which are constructed to at least base-course level.
- 13) The measures contained in paragraph 5.2 of the approved Travel Plan Statement shall be carried out as set out in the statement.
- 14) Before any dwelling is occupied, details of suitable waste storage/collection areas should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that allows for the convenient storage of waste and unrestricted access at all times. Such waste storage/collection areas shall be retained for so long as the use hereby authorised remains on site.
- 15) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the junction visibility splays and forward visibility, within the site, shown on the approved Highway Constraints drawing 14311-SKC0-01 revision L have been provided. The visibility splays shall thereafter be maintained free of obstruction at or above a height of 0.6 metres above the nearside carriageway level at all times.
- 16) Prior to first occupation bicycle storage conforming to the level and dimensions set out in Swindon Borough Councils Parking Standards, shall be completed in accordance with details and materials to be submitted to and approved by in writing by the Local Highway Authority, and shall be retained and maintained thereafter for the duration of use.
- 17) Any entrance gates erected shall be hung to open away from the highway only, and shall be set back a minimum distance of 5.0m from the back edge of the highway.
- 18) The gradient of the accesses shall not at any point be steeper than 12.5% (1 in 8) fall towards/8.5% (1 in 12) fall away from the highway, for a distance of 5.0m metres from its junction with the public highway.
- 19) The use of any garages hereby permitted shall be limited to the domestic and private needs of the occupier and shall not be used for any business or other purpose whatsoever.
- 20) Notwithstanding the details listed under condition 2, the minimum internal dimensions of individual parking spaces within all residential garages shall measure 3 metres in width by 6 metres in length with no

internal obstructions, in accordance with the Councils adopted parking standards. All garages shall thereafter be available at all times to give the opportunity for parking a vehicle.

- 21) Any garage doors shall be at least 6 metres from the highway boundary.
- 22) No external lighting shall be installed on the site unless in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 23) If, during development, contamination is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority, a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.
- 24) No construction work including site clearance and delivery of materials shall be carried out except between the hours of 08.00 to 18.00 Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturdays and at no times on Sundays or on Public or Bank Holidays.
- 25) Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, in accordance with the revised FRA ref. R/C14311/001.09 – Issue 9 and based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall include:
 - Detailed drainage plan showing the location of the proposed SUDs and drainage network;
 - Soakage tests in accordance with BRE365, to confirm soil infiltration rates;
 - Details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion;
 - Details of how the hierarchy approach has been provided through a range of SUDs techniques in accordance with best practice and NPPF including above ground storage utilising open space where technically possible;
 - Detailed drainage calculations for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event to demonstrate that all SUDs features and the drainage network can cater for the critical storm event for its lifetime;
 - The submission of evidence relating to accepted outfalls from the site, particularly from any third party network owners; and
 - Measures to treat surface water before discharging off site.

- 26) The development shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment, reference R/C14311/001.09 – Issue 9.
- 27) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of all boundary treatments shall be submitted to the LPA for approval in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Richborough Estates