



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 4-6 October 2016

Site visit made on 6 October 2016

by John L Gray DipArch MSc Registered Architect

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

Decision date: 08 November 2016

Appeal Ref. APP/L3625/W/15/3141260

Land at 17 The Close, Horley, Surrey, RH6 9EB

- 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 Amtrose Limited against the decision of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application, ref. 14/01075/OUT, dated 26 May 2014, was refused by notice dated 3 July 2015.
 - The development proposed is 46 residential units with associated access and public open land.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for residential development of up to 46 dwellings on land at 17 The Close, Horley, Surrey, RH6 9EB, in accordance with the terms of the application, ref. 14/01075/OUT, dated 26 May 2014, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule attached to this decision.

Procedural matters

2. The appellant sought to rephrase the application description to read "up to 46" units. The reason for that was because right of access to part of the site had yet to be secured and, if it were not, the development could be restricted to 28 dwellings. In any event, the amendment offers an element of flexibility without introducing any material implications and may be accepted.
3. The application was made in outline but access was not reserved for future consideration. Put very simply, the access would be between nos. 15 and 17, at the head of The Close. Originally, no amendment of the existing road layout, a 'roundabout' enabling turning at the head of the cul-de-sac, was proposed (dwg. TSP/AMT/P2529/13/A). An amendment to the head of the cul-de-sac was subsequently proposed (dwg. TSP/AMT/P2529/14/D), though with no change to the principle of access between nos. 15 and 17. The Council was content that this amendment be accepted in determination of the appeal. In practice, it does not constitute an amendment to the application itself, although it may affect judgement on the first main issue below.

Main Issues

4. There are three main issues in the appeal. The first is whether the proposed access to the appeal site would appear cramped, contrary to the character of the area, or would cause unacceptable noise and disturbance for the occupiers
-

of existing dwellings. The second is whether development on the appeal site would intrude unacceptably into the rural surrounds of Horley or the open setting of Gatwick Airport. The third is whether there is an adequate supply of housing land in Reigate & Banstead Borough.

Reasons

First main issue – the effect of the proposed access

5. Reasons for refusal nos. 2 and 3 relate to the proposed access – no. 2 to it appearing cramped and contrived and harmful to the character of the area and no. 3 to the traffic using it causing harmful disturbance and loss of residential amenity. Although these are different matters, they flow from the nature of the access and may be treated as a single issue. They may also be affected by the amended access proposal, which appears more sensible in highways terms and may bring improvements in relation to both appearance and disturbance.
6. The gap between no. 17's single-storey flank wall and no. 15's front wall is just over 13.0m; the distance from the 2-storey flank wall is about 16.0m. In general housing layout terms, that is not unduly narrow. The proposed access road would have a double bend as it passed from The Close between the two houses into the appeal site; its 4.8m width in both The Close and the proposed development would widen to 6.3m within the double bend. No. 15's front garden would be reduced to about 4.0m from the back-of-footway opposite its easterly corner, would remain at about 9.0m opposite its northerly corner and there would be a minimum 5.5m hardstanding in front of its replacement garage. None of that need give cause for concern as being sub-standard.
7. The indicative carriageway would pass about 1.2m from the westerly corner of no. 17; that seems rather close but there are no windows facing the cul-de-sac in the single-storey offshoot. The area at the corner of the house and along the flank wall would be landscaped; moreover, there seems no reason why the footway on the north-east side of the access road, shown on the illustrative plan as starting midway along the flank wall, should not start until opposite the southerly corner of the house, taking pedestrians further away from the window in the flank wall and leaving a landscaped area between it and the road (increasing from 1.2m to almost 5.0m wide). None of that can be said to be harmfully sub-standard.
8. Taking a longer view from The Close, the road would take a double bend to its right and pass through the relatively narrow gap between nos. 15 and 17 into the proposed development. Visually, that gap would be further narrowed by the indicative siting of the new house adjacent to no. 15, shown as just 2.0m or so from the carriageway edge. There need be no problem with that siting so far as its occupiers are concerned; indeed, privacy might even be considered improved because potential views into the house would be more restricted. Also, in urban design terms, a narrowing can often be a positive contribution, bringing variety to the street scene and only hinting at, rather than showing, what lies beyond the pinch point. That mechanism could be introduced here without any harm to the general character of this residential area.
9. Accordingly, while the precise details of the proposed access road and its landscaping may be controlled by a planning condition, there is no reason why the principle of taking access as proposed should have any unacceptable effect on the existing residential character of The Close.

10. Reason for refusal no. 3 refers to traffic on the proposed access road causing harmful disturbance and general loss of residential amenity – for the occupiers of nos. 15 and 17 in particular but also of nos. 18 and 19. It does not specifically mention noise, although the appellant responded to the reason for refusal with evidence on noise levels. The Council accepted that the amended access proposal, which would avoid traffic to the proposed development having to negotiate the roundabout at the head of the cul-de-sac, would, in its opinion, remove any harmful impact for the occupiers of nos. 18 and 19.
11. The indicative line of the access road as now proposed should be better than the original proposal in highways terms because it would avoid the need for vehicles to manoeuvre around the roundabout at the head of the cul-de-sac. That ought to reduce the possibility of unacceptable noise or disturbance because vehicles entering or leaving the proposed development would be able to travel smoothly rather than having to engage lower gears; but, because of the speed bumps in The Close as well as the alignment of the road, vehicles would still travel at fairly low speeds (something which may or may not be assisted by a further speed bump just within the development). That is what prompts the Council's conclusion that, with the access as now proposed, there would be no harmful disturbance for those living in nos. 18 and 19. It also highlights that the Council's concern is not about the amount of traffic generated by the proposed development but about it having to pass close to nos. 15 and 17.
12. The appellant addressed the likely effect of vehicles on the access road both as an average noise level over one hour (the peak hour) and as individual events. It is better, given that the Council's concern is disturbance, to consider the latter. The Transport Assessment estimates the maximum additional traffic generated in The Close would be fewer than 30 vehicles in both the morning and evening peak hours; it would be substantially less at other times of day. There might be a more traffic than now at the head of the cul-de-sac but, in absolute terms, it would still be very little. A single vehicle travelling at 20mph is said to produce a noise level of around 60dB_{L_{Aeq,event}} with a duration of about 12 seconds at a point 2.0m from the vehicle. Both the noise level and the duration would be very much less within nos. 15 and 17; the noise would be noticeable, if at all, only in the rooms facing the road and would last only 2 or 3 seconds for each vehicle. Taken overall, there would be no significant disturbance problem.
13. To sum up on this issue, the indicative access now proposed should be better than the original proposal in highways terms, should give a more natural appearance, with the road leading through into the proposed development rather than having a somewhat contrived arrangement off the roundabout at the head of the cul-de-sac; and, because of its smoother passage along the road, traffic generated by the development should not cause undue disturbance for those living in nos. 15 and 17, or any other dwelling in The Close.
14. The reasons for refusal refer to Policy Ho9 saved from the 2005 Local Plan, Policy CS10 in the adopted Core Strategy and the Reigate & Banstead Local Distinctiveness Design Guide 2004. In Ho9, the relevant criteria are (iii), to reinforce local distinctiveness, and (iv), to protect the character of the surrounding area; there is no reason why either should be contravened, subject to detailed design. CS10 deals with sustainable development but it is unclear that any specific criterion might apply to reason for refusal no. 2. Similarly, The Planning and Design Principles in the Design Guide give general

guidance on residential design but it is unclear that any specific aspect might be contravened by the appeal proposal.

Second main issue – the rural surrounds of Horley and the setting of Gatwick Airport

15. Saved Local Plan Policies Hr36 and Hr37 place the appeal site respectively within the Rural Surrounds of Horley and the open setting of Gatwick Airport. Hr36 resists development that is not for a use related to agriculture, forestry or outdoor sports and recreation. The Local Plan is out-of-date, having been for the period up to 2005. That is not necessarily critical in itself – but Hr36 is clearly inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Hr37, on the other hand, may be regarded as seeking to protect a strategic gap, to prevent the coalescence of Horley with Gatwick Airport rather than restricting housing development.
16. For housing, the adopted Core Strategy is based upon an ‘urban area first’ approach. Policy CS6 puts “Countryside beyond the Green Belt adjoining the urban area of Horley” as the first priority for sustainable urban extensions (SUEs) beyond the urban areas. Policy CS8 indicates that these may amount to “up to 200” dwellings. The emerging Development Management Plan (DMP), still at an early stage of preparation (and not referred to in reason for refusal no. 1), excludes the appeal site from potential development in accordance with Policy CS6 but includes as Proposal SHE4 land abutting it to the north.
17. The emerging DMP also includes two other proposals of relevance to this appeal. A large area of land to the west of Balcombe Road is proposed as an employment development site under Proposal HOR9, notwithstanding that it is within both the Rural Surrounds of Horley and the open setting of Gatwick Airport. And Proposal HOR10 “presents an opportunity” to consider designation as Green Belt of those parts of the Rural Surrounds of Horley not required to deliver the development needs in the Core Strategy. Nothing is said in the Core Strategy about the open setting of Gatwick Airport and the only reference in the DMP is in relation to HOR9, where one of the “Key constraints” to the Proposal is that the site is within the Gatwick Open Setting designation in the 2005 Local Plan.
18. On the face of it, there is merit in maintaining some form of separation between Horley and Gatwick Airport. That may, however, be something more readily seen on a map than on the ground, where the position is much less clear. The M23 spur, which is on a high embankment and bridges over Balcombe Road, provides the clearest visual and physical separation between Horley and the Airport. The embankment planting, certainly on its north side, permits only glimpses to the north of Horley and its rural surrounds. The defined boundary of Horley does not extend as far as the M23 but, in effect, development on the east side of Balcombe Road appears to do that, either through roadside buildings or signposted entrances to development set back within densely wooded grounds. In fact, it is this woodland, rather than an absence of development, which provides a big part of the visual separation between the built-up area of Horley and the M23, and Gatwick Airport beyond. To the east of that, and east of The Close, is a landscape of fields with fairly dense boundaries of hedges and hedgerow trees. Similarly, to the west of Balcombe Road, the land is relatively open and appears agricultural in character. Visually, it is these areas, rather more than the woodland, that provide the Rural Surrounds of Horley.

19. The appeal site, though it is part of the countryside, is difficult to discern from the public footpaths along the north side of the M23 and running north-south just one field to its east. There are glimpses from the latter of the roofs of 15 and 17 The Close. Similarly, if the appeal site were developed, one would expect to see glimpses of the new houses over the hedges and between the trees, any landscaping reinforcement notwithstanding. The built-up area of Horley would clearly extend further into the countryside; that, though, would not necessarily be harmful.
20. Land abutting the northern boundary of the appeal site is earmarked for housing in the DMP as one of the SUEs around Horley; and land north of that is presently being developed for housing. Thus, the built-up area has already been extended eastwards at least as far as the eastern boundary of the appeal site. Also, the southern boundary of the appeal site is more or less an extension eastwards of the existing built-up area boundary. Accordingly, development on the appeal site would not appear in any way as a significant intrusion of the built-up area into open countryside.
21. There are, therefore, various strands to be taken into account in concluding on this issue. The Policies cited in the reason for refusal are saved from the 2005 Local Plan and do not feature, at least in the same terms, in the adopted Core Strategy or the emerging DMP. Proposal HOR9 in the DMP would see the loss of a very significant area of land in what is presently both the Rural Surrounds of Horley and the open setting of Gatwick Airport and Proposal SHE4 would see housing immediately north of the appeal site, within what is presently part of the Rural Surrounds. Proposal HOR10, on the other hand, could see that part of the Rural Surrounds not proposed for development becoming Green Belt. On the ground, visual separation on the east side of Balcombe Road is achieved not by the absence of development but by the woodland within the substantial curtilages of a small number of buildings. The appeal site is at the urban edge and, given existing housing to the east and proposed housing immediately north, its development would not amount to a visual intrusion into the countryside.
22. Overall, therefore, the merit of maintaining the separation of Horley and Gatwick Airport on a plan may be looked at rather differently on the ground. Development on the appeal site would neither undermine to any material extent what is sought by saved Local Plan Policies Hr36 and Hr37 nor, in this context, contravene the policies of the adopted Core Strategy.

Third main issue – housing need and housing land supply

23. Having found no material harm in the context of the first two main issues that could lead to dismissal of the appeal, the question to be asked before considering this third main issue is whether the proposed development would be sustainable. And, since the Council accepted that it would be, and I have no reason to disagree, that is not a question that needs to be deliberated in this decision. It is, however, necessary to consider what impact the proposed development would have on the adopted housing strategy.
24. Policy CS6 in the adopted Core Strategy gives priority to the allocation and delivery of land within the urban areas of the Borough. Beyond that, it gives priority to "Countryside beyond the Green Belt adjoining the urban area of Horley". Policy CS13 plans for the delivery of at least 6,900 homes in the period 2012-2027, at least 5,800 of those being in the existing urban areas. That amply illustrates the 'urban area first' approach. Policy CS8 identifies that

- up to 200 dwellings may be delivered on urban extension sites adjoining the urban area of Horley. Also, if one adds up the individual figures in Policy CS8, one comes to a total of 6,900 dwellings only if one assumes maximum figures from provision the SUEs. Policy CS10 deals with sustainable development and "along with policy CS6, will guide the allocation of sites through the DMP".
25. The Core Strategy Inspector's conclusions on the question of housing need and capacity, put very simply, were that the full objectively assessed need (FOAN) in the Borough amounted to an average of 600-640dpa, compared with the proposed delivery of 460dpa, but that environmental and other constraints across the Borough meant it was not possible to meet that shortfall, over 2,000 dwellings, without conflict with the other aims of the NPPF. Thus, while the figure of 460dpa was found sound and is the figure in the adopted Core Strategy, it will fall significantly short of meeting the FOAN. The Council met its duty to co-operate with neighbouring authorities but all declined to take any of Reigate & Banstead's unmet need because they were facing similar strong development pressures of their own.
 26. It flows logically from this that, where an opportunity of providing additional housing presents itself, and there would be no material harm arising therefrom, it should be grasped. Put another way, the Council can demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land to meet the adopted Core Strategy requirement, or very close to it if accepting the appellant's views on lead-in and delivery times – but meeting the Core Strategy requirement will leave a shortfall of housing at the end of the Plan period compared with the FOAN. The appeal proposal represents sustainable development and would help diminish that shortfall. On that basis, it is not necessary to dwell on the differences of opinion expressed at the inquiry on the deliverability of various sites.
 27. The Core Strategy Inspector found various factors militating against a yield higher than 200 dwellings on the land around the south side of Horley – flood risk, noise from Gatwick Airport, the strategic gap separating Horley from the Airport and the possible impact on progress in North-East and North-West Horley of another major release of land in the south. There is no objection in relation to flood risk or noise from the Airport and the conclusion above on the second main issue is that there would be no material harm to the Rural Surrounds of Horley or the open setting of Gatwick Airport.
 28. The remaining question, therefore, is whether development of the appeal site in the relatively near future would prejudice the Council's very clear 'urban area first' strategy for the delivery of housing. There are two reasons why it would not.
 29. Firstly, the Core Strategy envisages up to 200 dwellings as SUEs around Horley. The DMP identifies three potential sites delivering a total of about 185 dwellings. While the phrase "up to" means that the figure of 200 is not expected to be exceeded, for the reasons expressed by the Core Strategy Inspector it must nevertheless be seen as a sound guide to what would prove acceptable under the Core Strategy. It may therefore be a question of what the impact of about 31 dwellings, not 46, would be. And whether 31 or 46, that must first be seen in the context of 5,800 dwellings in the urban areas over the Plan period. Even at 46 dwellings, however, development on the appeal site would represent significantly less than 1% of the anticipated amount of urban housing development. It is very difficult to see how that very small proportion could prejudice the overall strategy in any significant way.

30. Secondly is the question of timing in relation to other proposed development in and around Horley. The Core Strategy looks not just to the vast majority of housing development taking place in the urban areas but also to it occurring earlier in the Plan period, with SUEs coming later – they would only come forward earlier in the Plan period if identified urban opportunities failed to do so. If this appeal were allowed, development on the appeal site would not be delayed until later in the Plan period – it would be deliverable within five years. Policy CS8 allocates “at least” 2,440 dwellings to the urban areas in Area 2b, including 1,570 in the Horley North-West Sector, plus up to 200 in SUEs. The 2,440 dwellings mean about 162dpa or 813 in the 5-year period; 46 dwellings amounts to not much more than three months of that supply requirement. That number of houses might delay the ‘urban area first’ strategy to a small extent – or it might not, depending on market demand and the ability to bring forward urban sites – but it does not significantly prejudice it.
31. Accordingly, the conclusions on this third main issue are these. There is, in terms of the adopted Core Strategy, a 5-year supply of housing land - or at least very close to it. The appeal proposal represents sustainable development and, in line with the NPPF, may be allowed even if there is an adequate supply of housing land. The FOAN is greater than is provided for in the Core Strategy, which weighs further in favour of allowing the appeal. The Core Strategy has a very clear ‘urban area first’ housing strategy in which sites outside urban areas should come forward only later in the Plan period; the appeal proposal would be deliverable within five years but, even limiting an assessment to the urban provision in Area 2b, it would amount to less than four months’ supply, which is certainly not enough to prejudice the strategy. Technically, the proposal conflicts with Core Strategy Policies CS6, CD8 and CS13 but, given the above conclusions, there is no reasonable basis to dismiss the appeal in terms of housing need and land supply.

Obligation and conditions

32. The obligation is straightforward; it need provide only for affordable housing, there being a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Scheme in place. That provision is policy-compliant but no more, meaning that it does not weigh significantly in the balance in favour of the proposal.
33. The Council’s Statement of Case had appended to it eight suggested conditions, which were discussed and considered further at the inquiry. They cover reserved matters, the application plan, off-site highways requirements, surface water drainage, flood risk mitigation, a programme of archaeological investigation, tree protection and levels. All of these are not only reasonable but also necessary to achieve an acceptable standard of development, though their construction or wording may be varied in the interests of precision or clarity or in line with model conditions.
34. In addition, and while not discussed at the inquiry, a condition to secure a construction method statement is reasonable and also necessary in the interests of the amenities of those living in The Close.

Overall conclusion

35. On the first main issue, the proposed access need not appear cramped and would not give rise to unacceptable noise and disturbance for residents in The Close, particularly those living in nos. 15 and 17; there is thus no conflict with saved Local Plan Policy Ho9. On the second main issue, the proposed development would extend the built-up area into countryside but not in such a

way as to undermine saved Local Plan Policies Hr36 and Hr37 or, in this context, adopted Core Strategy Policies CS6 and CS13. On the third main issue, the proposal represents sustainable development and there is nothing in relation to Core Strategy Policies CS6, CS8 and CS13 that could prejudice the 'urban areas first' housing strategy. I have considered all other matters raised at the inquiry or in written representation but found nothing that could outweigh these conclusions. Accordingly, the appeal should be allowed.

John L Gray

Inspector

Richborough Estates

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

James Findlay QC	instructed by the Principal Solicitor to Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
He called	
Billy Clements BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI	Senior Policy Development Officer, Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
Andrew Benson BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI	Major Development Manager, Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.

FOR THE APPELLANT

James Pereira QC	instructed by WS Planning & Architecture, Europe House, Bancroft Road, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 7RP.
He called	
Robert Petrow NCH NDH BA(Hons) DipLA(Hons) CMLI	Managing Director, Petrow Harley Limited, Landscape Architects, New Malden, Surrey
Mark Hewett	Senior Partner, Intelligent Land, Ferndown, Dorset
Brian Woods BA MRTPI	Managing Director, WS Planning & Architecture.

DOCUMENTS

Submitted at the inquiry

- 1 Extract from 2005 Local Plan Proposals Map.
- 2 Email dated 06.09.2016 from the Council's Head of Property to Messrs Benson and Clements.
- 3 Email dated 27.09.2016 from the Chairman of Reigate Business Guild to its members.
- 4 Note by Chris Turner of Admitt Acoustics, dated 30.09.2016, responding to points raised in evidence by the Council and pre-inquiry by the Inspector.
- 5 1. Appeal decision APP/H1840/W/15/3008340 (Drakes Broughton).
2. Appeal decision APP/P1425/W/15/3135335 (Wivelsfield).
- 6 Position Statement by the Council on affordable housing.
- 7 Signed Statement of Common Ground.
- 8 1 & 2. Website extracts relating to Saxley Court, Horley.
- 9 Drawing no. TSP/AMT/P2529/13/A (proposed highway improvements).
- 10 Extract from Crawley 2030 Local Plan Map.
- 11 Note from the Highway Authority dated 30.04.2015 recommending a condition should planning permission be granted.
- 12 1. Certified copy of section 106 agreement dated 02.07.2015 sealed by the Council (but, as one half of a counterpart agreement, not by the landowners).
2. Executed deed of variation to the above agreement.

Received after the inquiry

- 13 Letter dated 21.09.2016 to the Council objecting to the proposed business park to the west of Balcombe Road but referring to the appeal and copied to the Inspectorate.
- 14 Copy of section 106 obligation (Document 12.1 above) signed by the landowners.
- 15 NPPF Flood Risk Assessment, Version No. 8.0, by the Stilwell Partnership, dated December 2014 (Core Document 31 is Version 6.0).
- 16 Drainage Strategy, Version 6.0, by the Stilwell Partnership, dated December 2014 (Core Document 29 is Version 4.0).

Appeal Ref. APP/L3625/W/15/3141260
Land at 17 The Close, Horley, Surrey, RH6 9EB
Schedule of conditions attached to planning permission

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place. The development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted be begun take place not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: J001432/PL00.
- 5) No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work has been completed in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 6) No development shall take place until full details of existing and proposed ground levels and proposed finished floor levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.
- 7) The landscaping reserved matter referred to in condition no. 1 above shall include
 - i) both hard and soft landscape works, together with a programme of implementation and maintenance;
 - ii) indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land or along its boundaries identifying those to be retained and setting out detailed measures for their protection throughout the course of development, all broadly in accordance with the provisions of the Arboricultural Method Statement by David Archer Associates dated May 2014;
 - iii) details of the public open land to be provided, broadly as shown on illustrative layouts 664-L-01/A and 664-L-02/A, together with a management and maintenance plan which shall include any arrangements for adoption by a public authority.
- 8) No development shall take place until details of the access road between nos. 15 and 17 The Close, of the junction with the existing carriageway in The Close and of all improvement works to The Close itself, in general accordance with the details shown on drawings nos. TSP/AMT/P2529/13/A and TSP/AMT/P2529/14/D have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until these works have been completed in accordance with the approved details.
- 9) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, has been implemented in accordance with details first submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Those details shall include:

- i) information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
 - ii) a timetable for implementation; and
 - iii) a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development, including any arrangements for adoption by a public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.
- 10) No development shall take place until details of flood mitigation measures, broadly in accordance with the provisions of Flood Risk Assessment Version No. 8 by the Stilwell Partnership, dated December 2014, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the approved measures have been implemented.
- 11) 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 for the development and shall provide for:
- i) 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) wheel washing facilities;
 - v) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - vi) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
 - vii) delivery hours and construction working hours.

Richborough Estates