

## Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 2, 3 & 4 August 2016

Site visit made on 3 August 2016

**by Kevin Gleeson BA MCD MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 08 September 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/W/16/3143092**

**Land at Attleborough Road, Great Ellingham, Norfolk.**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr. Nigel Painter of Orbit Homes (2020) Ltd against the decision of Breckland Council.
  - The application Ref 3PL/2014/0683/F, dated 30 June 2014 was refused by notice dated 27 July 2015.
  - The development proposed is described as an application for full planning permission for residential development of 39 dwellings comprising 25 four-bedroom houses, 6 three-bedroom houses and 8 two-bedroom houses together with associated access, parking, landscaping and open space.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for residential development of 39 two-storey dwellings comprising 8 two-bedroom houses, 4 three-bedroom houses and 27 four-bedroom houses including the provision of 15 affordable homes; access via a new estate road onto Attleborough Road (B1077) and two secondary accesses on Hingham Road together with public open space in the south eastern corner of the site, at Attleborough Road, Great Ellingham, Norfolk in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 3PL/2014/0683/F, dated 30 June 2014 subject to the conditions in the schedule at the end of the decision.

### Application for Costs

2. At the inquiry an application for costs was made by the appellant against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### Procedural Matters

3. The planning application was amended prior to the Council's decision. I have used the revised description of development agreed by the main parties in my formal decision.
  4. A signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking (UU) in accordance with Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 was submitted by the appellant during the inquiry. This contains a number of obligations in respect of recreation and open space and to make contributions to education, libraries and community works. I return to these matters later in my decision.
-

## **Main Issues**

5. In the light of the submissions made at the inquiry I have modified my initial main issues which I now consider to be:
  - a) The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
  - b) Whether the proposal would provide a suitable site for housing having regard to the principles of sustainable development and policies for the supply of housing.

## **Reasons**

### *Character and Appearance*

6. The Development Plan comprises the Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies, 2009 (the Core Strategy) and the Site Specific Policies and Proposals Development Plan Document, 2012 (the DPD). Core Strategy Policy CP11 states that the countryside will be protected for its own intrinsic beauty and rural character and that the design of new development should be sympathetic to landscape character, informed by the Council's Landscape Character Assessments (LCA).
7. Core Strategy Policy DC16 promotes the highest standards of design and states that all proposals should preserve and enhance the existing character of an area. It goes on to state that particular regard should be paid to reinforcing locally distinctive patterns of development and landscape. Policy DC2 establishes the principles of new housing development.
8. The proposal also falls to be considered in the context of paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to protect and enhance valued landscapes and paragraph 58 which aims to ensure that new development responds to local character and identity.
9. Great Ellingham is within the Wayland Plateau landscape character area which is categorised by a productive and managed arable landscape with small blocks of woodland, big skies and open views. The LCA recognises the need to maintain the predominantly open visual character and open skylines.
10. The landscape to the north of Great Ellingham is characterised by gently undulating, arable farmland and scattered villages connected by a network of rural lanes. It has a medium to large scale rectilinear field pattern. The open rural landscape includes scattered woodlands, hedgerows and hedgerow trees which provide some degree of containment.
11. The appeal site has limited landscape value and only contributes in a limited way to the setting of the village, with the proposed development being adjacent to the existing development boundary on two sides and partially on a third side. The site is arable farmland but is not of any particular landscape, heritage or biodiversity value. The impact on the character of the surrounding landscape would be limited and as demonstrated by Mr Self the proposed location is the least sensitive landscape area in the vicinity of Great Ellingham.
12. The proposed development would transform the site, resulting in its character changing from fringe farmland to residential development and associated open space, giving it and the immediate locality an urban character. However, the

proposed development will not encroach significantly on the wider landscape to the north and the adverse impact on landscape character would be limited, by virtue of the appeal site being well related to the existing development of the village.

13. Distant views of the site from the north-east are seen in the context of surrounding housing. There is some limited visibility of the site when travelling south along Hingham Road and Deopham Road. When viewed from within the landscape to the north, including as I did during my visit, I find that the number of views of the site from public vantage points is limited.
14. Where the site is seen, the proposed development would appear contained by the existing development framework of the village. Due to the screening effect of nearby development the visual impact of the proposed development would be largely confined to the immediate vicinity of the site and would not extend into the wider landscape. In the immediate locality the scheme would be seen alongside neighbouring development and against a backdrop of buildings.
15. Open views to the north would be lost although there would remain some opportunities for open long distance views across the field to the east of the appeal site. From the south and the west the proposed development would be very apparent to pedestrians using existing footpaths and residents of Hingham Road in particular as the open countryside would be replaced by built development.
16. The proposed development would reflect the village's established pattern of development and would be reasonably well integrated into the village with proposed housing and open space fronting Attleborough Road and housing fronting Hingham Road. Existing development to the south of Attleborough Road turns its back to the village whereas the proposed development would present a layout which would be orientated toward the existing settlement edge. Moreover, the softening of the harsh edge to the village through the introduction of landscaping and the proposed area of public open space on the frontage to Attleborough Road would encourage biodiversity and constitute enhancement rather than simply mitigation.
17. In design terms the two storey houses would be of a density, form and appearance which would not be out of character with neighbouring development, a matter on which the main parties agreed. The proposals would therefore accord with policies DC2 and DC16 of the Core Strategy and paragraph 58 of the Framework.
18. I recognise that the landscape has value for local people. However I regard it as open agricultural land of no special value and therefore I would not accept it as being a valued landscape in the terms of paragraph 109 of the Framework which requires the protection and enhancement of valued landscapes. As Mr Self identified, a valued landscape should comprise matters above the ordinary. On this basis I find no conflict with paragraph 109.
19. I also take account of the fact that although the Council challenged the appellant's landscape and visual impact assessment it did not produce its own and therefore I give limited weight to the Council's evidence. In addition I give greater weight to the evidence of a chartered landscape architect in respect of landscape and visual matters than the informed opinions of a generalist planner.

20. The scale and nature of the proposed development would result in the sense of openness being reduced and some views into open countryside being lost. However, with screening and landscape enhancement these effects would be largely confined to the immediate vicinity of the site with no significant intrusion into open countryside. Nevertheless, I find that the landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development would be no greater than moderate adverse.
21. I therefore find that the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area would result in minor conflict with Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy but no conflict with the Framework.

*Suitability of the Site for Housing*

22. Policy SS1 of the Core Strategy establishes a spatial strategy and identifies Great Ellingham as a Service Centre Village. Service Centre Villages are recognised as containing adequate services and facilities to meet the day to day requirements of their existing residents. Provision for housing is made through Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy.
23. The appeal site lies outside of, but adjacent to, the defined settlement boundary for Great Ellingham as defined on the Proposals Map adopted through the DPD. Core Strategy Policy CP14 aims to direct new housing to locations within defined settlement boundaries in order to maintain a sustainable pattern of development and to protect the form and character of settlements.
24. At the heart of national policy, as stated in paragraph 14 of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Notwithstanding that presumption, paragraph 2 of the Framework reiterates the statutory position that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
25. Paragraph 49 of the Framework states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It goes on to state that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.
26. The Council's Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement, 2015, presents two housing supply positions demonstrating either a 3.72 year supply or a 4.54 year supply with both applying a 20% buffer. Whilst the Council indicated progress towards bringing forward deliverable housing sites, at present it cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land in accordance with Footnote 11 of the Framework. This requires sites to be available now, to offer a suitable location for development now, to offer a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable.
27. Whilst the Council has indicated that there is an improvement in the position with regard to housing delivery, based on the evidence I heard, there is considerable uncertainty about the delivery of housing in Thetford because of the early need for infrastructure and therefore this also weighs in favour of the appeal scheme which is available and deliverable.
28. The main parties agreed that relevant policies for the supply of housing were SS1, CP1 and CP14 and that none of these were up-to-date. I also find that

the first part of Policy DC2 regarding development boundaries to be a policy for the supply of housing as it specifies a location for new housing.

29. On this basis, the proposed development should be considered in the context of the second bullet point of part two of paragraph 14 of the Framework. This states that where relevant policies are out-of-date planning permission should be granted unless any adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole unless specific policies indicate that development should be restricted. In this case there are no specific policies which would restrict development.
30. The scheme would make an important contribution to the supply of housing to which I attach significant weight. It would also provide a policy compliant 40% level of affordable housing within a layout which is also policy compliant in terms of type and mix. It would therefore conform with paragraph 54 of the Framework which requires local planning authorities to respond to local circumstances and for housing to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing, in rural areas.
31. The reasoned justification to Policy CP 1 identifies the provision of affordable housing as the Council's top priority and therefore a policy compliant scheme should be given very significant weight particularly in the context of the recent lack of provision of affordable housing in Great Ellingham.
32. As a designated Local Service Centre the main parties agree that the village contains a level of services and facilities that can support local needs. These include a general store / post office, a primary school, playing field, a village hall, a public house and two churches. As such the village is a settlement which contains an element of sustainable services with the potential for development to meet local needs.
33. Paragraph 17 of the Framework states that planning should actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and should focus development in locations which are, or can be made sustainable. The level of local service provision together with limited public transport services and a lack of dedicated cycling routes in Great Ellingham would mean that future residents of the development would be largely dependent on the private car for journeys to access higher order services in nearby Attleborough. Consequently, the proposal would result in some conflict with the objective of the Framework to minimise the need to travel and maximise the opportunities for sustainable transport. Nevertheless, the harm to sustainability would be limited and would be offset to a degree by the presence of some local services in the village which reduce the need to travel.
34. Providing enhanced accessibility to public transport by providing improved pedestrian routes along the northern side of Attleborough Road as far as the existing bus shelter, also marginally adds to public transport connectivity.
35. Moreover, in accordance with paragraph 55 of the Framework the proposed development would be consistent with the principles of sustainable development in a rural area as it would provide rural housing within close proximity of services within the village where it will maintain or enhance the vitality of the village.

36. The previous decisions of the Parish Council indicate that it had accepted the need for housing development in the village. It had supported residential development in locations which it considered to be appropriate, whilst opposing the appeal scheme. Such considerations also support the position that the settlement boundary is not effective and that Great Ellingham is, at least in the view of the Parish Council, a sustainable location.
37. The proposed development would conflict with Policy CP14 by virtue of being outside of the settlement boundary. However, Policy SS1 contains no absolute preclusion to development in Great Ellingham, Policy CP1 directs growth to sustainable locations, which would not preclude the proposed development and any conflict with Policy DC2 would only be in respect of the development boundary.
38. Taking account of the purposes of policies SS1, CP1, CP14 and DC2 which are to protect the countryside surrounding villages and focus development in sustainable locations I find that as the development would be an extension to an existing settlement which I have concluded to be a sustainable location for development, these policies relevant to the supply of housing cannot be held to be up to date by virtue of paragraph 49 of the Framework and should only be afforded limited weight.
39. With regard to the emerging Local Plan and its evidence base I find that as the Strategic Housing Market Assessment has not been tested at examination I attached limited weight, in accordance with paragraph 216 of the Framework, to its conclusions. Similarly, the work of the Breckland Local Plan Working Group has not been tested and therefore I do not attach any weight to their considerations of potential housing sites in the village.
40. On the basis of paragraph 7 of the Framework it is necessary to assess whether the proposed development would address the economic, social and environmental roles of sustainable development. The proposed development would contribute to the economic role as house building promotes economic growth through construction activity and future occupiers of houses would provide custom for existing shops and services.
41. The social role of sustainable development is referenced in the Framework with regard to widening the choice of high quality homes and ensuring that sufficient housing, including affordable housing is provided to meet the needs of present and future generations. On the basis of the shortfall in housing supply generally, as identified above and in particular the shortage of affordable housing across the district and within Great Ellingham there would be considerable benefit arising from the scheme. This would be in line with paragraph 47 of the Framework which identifies the need to boost significantly the supply of housing.
42. With regard to the environmental role of sustainable development I find that the proposed development, secured by a number of conditions, would comply with wider objectives of the Framework including the requirement for good design and conserving and enhancing the natural environment. It would involve the development of a site which is not subject to any specific environmental constraints and has the potential to bring about a net increase in biodiversity. Given the current need for additional housing in the district, some loss of undeveloped countryside is inevitable and would result in a small measure of harm. The development of the appeal site, being on the edge of a

settlement and not being in a prominent location would result in the harm to the environment being limited.

43. The Council referred me to an appeal decision<sup>1</sup> relating to Bozeat, a village near to Wellingborough. Whilst recognising that there may be some similarities, without knowing more detail about the case I consider this to be of very limited relevance to this appeal. In any case, I have reached my own conclusions on the appeal proposal on the basis of the evidence before me.

### **Other Matters**

44. Concern was expressed by many residents in writing and by Mr Betts and others at the inquiry that the proposal would result in a danger to highway users. I recognise that viewing the appeal site and the surrounding area during the summer school holidays does not represent the highway conditions which occur at other times of the year as demonstrated by Mr Betts. However, the access arrangements and off-site highway works proposed would be in accordance with the relevant technical standards, including parking requirements and have been accepted without objection from the highway authority. In the absence of substantive evidence to the contrary, I have no reason to disagree with that view.
45. Representations from neighbours indicated that the proposed development would adversely affect their living conditions in respect of privacy and overlooking. From my observations during my visit, based on the distances between the proposed development and existing properties I find that there would be no adverse effects.
46. The loss of high quality Grade 2 agricultural land was also identified as a harmful effect of the scheme by a number of local residents. As the amount of land to be lost would not be great and Natural England, as the statutory body responsible for land quality issues did not object to the proposal, I consider that there would be harm but it would be limited.

### *Conditions*

47. The SoCG confirmed that there was agreement between the main parties about the list of conditions which were included in that document. These were discussed at the inquiry and I have also had regard to the conditions in the light of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
48. In order to encourage the early delivery of the proposed housing the main parties agreed that the period for implementation should be two years rather than the standard three years and this is appropriate (Condition 1). I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty (2) and a condition to address the appearance of the development and its surroundings (3). The main parties agree that matters relating to affordable housing can be addressed through a condition rather than as a planning obligation because the appellant is a registered social provider. Such an approach would be consistent with the advice in PPG and it is necessary to apply a condition requiring a scheme for the provision of affordable housing in order to comply with the terms of the development plan (4).

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/H2835/A/14/2212956

49. I also attach conditions to address the potential archaeological interest in the site (5), to ensure a satisfactory means of managing surface water drainage and prevent an increased risk of flooding (6) and to ensure that landscaping provides an appropriate setting for the proposed development (7). Conditions to address the ecological interests of the site (8) and to minimise light pollution (9) are necessary in the interests of the wider environment. Light pollution was identified as a major concern in a number of representations including by the Parish Council.
50. I have also imposed conditions to ensure a satisfactory standard of highway design and construction (10) and maintenance (17), in the interests of highway safety (13, 15 and 16) and in respect of other highway and infrastructure works to ensure the development of the site to a satisfactory standard (11 and 12). A condition is also necessary in order to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents during construction (14). Finally, it is necessary to impose a condition for the provision of fire hydrants to ensure adequate water infrastructure provision is made for the local fire service.

#### *Planning Obligations*

51. The appellant has undertaken to contribute £124,305 for the provision of educational needs arising from the proposed development and £2,340 in respect of a library contribution. On the basis of the County Council's submissions I am satisfied that the contributions are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to the development and therefore consistent with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended). The contributions are also in line with pooling restrictions as set out in Regulation 123.
52. The UU also makes provision for open space. The local planning authority confirmed at the inquiry that the provision was in line with development plan policy and met the tests set in Regulations 122 and 123 of the CIL Regulations. The UU also makes provision for a community works contribution which would provide funding for the refurbishment of Great Ellingham Village Hall. I was told that this offer was made in lieu of a contribution which would normally be expected for children's space equipment but as the recreation ground adjoining the village hall already has adequate play provision the contribution to the village hall refurbishment was made instead. In the absence of details of the policy requirement for this contribution I cannot be certain that it meets the tests of Regulations 122 and 123 and therefore I am not able to take it into account as a basis for granting planning permission in these terms.

#### **Conclusion**

53. In addressing the presumption in favour of sustainable development paragraph 14 of the Framework states that where relevant policies of the development plan are out of date permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole or specific policies in the Framework indicating that development should be restricted.
54. The Framework states that the three dimensions of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependent. In respect of the planning balance which the Framework requires the adverse

impacts of the proposed development can be identified as no more than moderate harm in terms of landscape and visual effects and limited harm in terms of sustainability. Although the appeal site is outside of the defined settlement boundary, because policies SS1, CP1, CP14 and DC2 are policies relevant to the supply of housing and the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land these policies must be considered out of date. It follows therefore that they may be afforded only limited weight. I also attach limited weight to the harm arising from the loss of agricultural land.

55. The benefits of the scheme include the potential of the scheme to meet the housing need in the area to which I attach significant weight. The provision of 40% of the total net dwellings as affordable dwellings which is policy compliant in terms of amount and tenure carries very significant weight in favour of the proposal. Other benefits of the scheme to which I attach limited weight are as a result of construction activities, biodiversity, the provision of public open space and the increased use of local services. Financial contributions to community infrastructure are essentially provided as mitigation. I therefore find that there are no adverse impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. The proposals may therefore be considered sustainable development, for which the Framework presumes in favour of.
56. For these reasons set out above, and having taken into account all matters presented in evidence and raised at the inquiry, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

*Kevin Gleeson*

INSPECTOR



7. Great Ellingham Key Service Indicators, submitted by the Appellant.
8. Unilateral Undertaking dated 27 July 2016 submitted by the Appellant.
9. Statement of Five Year Housing Land Supply, Published July 2016, submitted by the Council.
10. Opening Submissions on behalf of the Appellant.
11. Opening Statement on behalf of the LPA.
12. Opening Statement of the Parish Council.
13. Application for Costs on behalf of the Appellant.
14. Principal Statement of Objections, submitted by the Parish Council.
15. Summary Proof of Evidence of Erica Whettingsteel, submitted by the Appellant.
16. Plan Showing Preferred and Alternative Sites Considered by the Breckland Local Plan Working Group, submitted by the Parish Council.
17. Email dated 2 March 2016 regarding Sewerage Scheme for Great Ellingham, submitted by the Parish Council.
18. Plan Showing Great Ellingham: Residential Land Representations Considered by the Breckland Local Plan Working Group, submitted by the Parish Council.
19. Response by the LPA to an Application for a Full Award of Costs by the Appellant.
20. Closing Statement by the LPA.
21. Closing Submissions on behalf of the Appellant.

## **SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of two years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:  
LLC978-100K; LLC978-503F; LLC978-121C; 13182 SK 201 P3;  
13182 SK 200 P1; LLC978 201-220; and LLC978-110 Rev C.
3. Notwithstanding condition 2, no development shall take place until details, including samples, of the materials used in the construction of the external walls and roof(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be in accordance with the approved details.
4. No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision of affordable housing as part of the development shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The affordable housing shall thereafter be provided and retained on the site in accordance with the approved scheme and the timescales contained therein and shall meet the definition of affordable housing in Annex 2: Glossary of the Framework or any future guidance that replaces it.
  - i. the numbers, type, size, tenure and location on the site of the affordable housing provision to be made which shall consist of not less than 40% of the total dwellings to be provided on site;
  - ii. the timing of the construction of the affordable housing and its phasing in relation to the occupancy of the market housing;
  - iii. the arrangements for the transfer of the affordable housing to an affordable housing provider (for a consideration at a level without the need for funding provided by the local planning authority or the Homes and Communities Agency or any successor body and on terms securing the provisions of the approved scheme) or the management of the affordable housing (as appropriate);
  - iv. the arrangements to ensure that such provision is and remains affordable for both first and subsequent occupiers of the affordable housing in perpetuity, and
  - v. the occupancy criteria to be used for determining the identity of occupiers of the affordable housing [including where required the option for the local planning authority to nominate those occupiers and give preference to those with a local connection] and the means by which such occupancy criteria shall be enforced.
5. No development shall take place until:
  - A) an archaeological written scheme of investigation has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and
    - 1) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording,
    - 2) The programme for post investigation assessment,

- 3) Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording,
- 4) Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation,
- 5) Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation, and
- 6) Nomination of a competent person or persons/organization to undertake the works set out within the written scheme of investigation.

B) No development shall take place other than in accordance with the written scheme of investigation approved under Part (A).

C) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the archaeological written scheme of investigation approved under Part (A) and the provision to be made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

6. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (ref 131382, dated June 2014), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Infiltration systems shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality. The scheme shall include a restriction in run-off and provide for surface water storage on site, as outline in the FRA. The agreed scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the first occupation of the development.
7. Prior to the commencement of the development, a scheme of landscaping which shall take account of any existing trees or hedges on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out during the planting season November/March immediately following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner, or within such longer period as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 (five) years from the completion of the landscaping scheme die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced during the next planting season with others of the same size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.
8. Prior to the commencement of the development, a scheme of ecological mitigation measures and biodiversity enhancements (as outlined in Section 5.3 and 5.4 of the submitted Ecological Survey (Norfolk Wildlife Service Ltd, dated May 2014) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of the development, or such longer period as may be agreed.
9. No external lighting shall be erected unless full details have first been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The

details shall include a lighting plan indicating luminance levels both on the site and beyond, and a schedule of equipment including mounting heights. Such lighting shall be kept to the minimum necessary for the purposes of security and site safety and shall prevent upward and outward light radiation. The lighting shall be implemented, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

10. No works in relation to the construction of the primary access shall commence until such time as detailed plans of the roads, footways, cycleways, foul and surface water drainage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. All construction works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
11. No works shall be carried out on roads, footways, cycleways, foul and surface water sewers otherwise than in accordance with the specifications of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.
12. Before any dwelling is first occupied the roads, footways and cycleways shall be constructed to binder course surfacing level from the dwelling to the adjoining County road in accordance with the details to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.
13. Prior to the first occupation of the dwellings on plots 1, 2, 3, 31, 32 and 33, visibility splays measuring 2.4 x 59 metres in both directions shall be provided to each access where it meets the highway, and such splays shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstructions exceeding 0.225 metre above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.
14. 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 Statement shall provide for:
  - i. access and parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
  - ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials;
  - iii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
  - iv. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
  - v. wheel washing facilities;
  - vi. measures to control the emission of noise, dust and dirt during construction;
  - vii. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from construction works; and
  - viii. the hours of working on any phase or part of the development during the construction period.

The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

15. Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings, no works shall commence on site until a detailed scheme for the off-site highway

improvement works as indicated on drawings numbers 13182 SK 200 P1 and 13182 SK 201 P3 and including the pedestrian footway improvements on Hingham Road and Attleborough Road, a pedestrian crossing refuge on Attleborough Road and part-time 20 mph signs, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

16. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the off-site highway improvement works referred to in condition 15 shall be completed in full in accordance with the approved scheme.
17. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of the arrangements for the future management and maintenance of the proposed road within the development shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The roads shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as an agreement has been entered into under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a Private Management and Maintenance Company has been established.
18. Prior to the first occupation of the development, a scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for the provision of fire hydrants (served by mains water supply) serving the development. No dwelling shall be occupied until the hydrant(s) have been provided in accordance with the scheme as approved.