



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2018

**by R W Allen B.Sc PGDip MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 16<sup>th</sup> March 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/W/17/3179191**

**East End Farm, South East of Wallingford Road**

- 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 Rob O'Carroll (Bellway Homes (Thames Valley) and Archstone Cholsey Ltd) against the decision of South Oxfordshire District Council.
  - The application Ref P16/S3607/FUL, dated 28 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2017.
  - The development proposed is the erection of 68 residential dwellings (67 net) including affordable housing provision, access, parking, open space and landscaping following demolition of existing buildings at the site including one dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of 68 residential dwellings (67 net) including affordable housing provision, access, parking, open space and landscaping following demolition of existing buildings at the site including one dwelling at East End Farm, South East of Wallingford Road in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: P16/S3607/FUL, dated 28 October 2016, subject to the conditions set out at the end of this decision.

### Preliminary Matter

2. The Council states that it is no longer defending its third reason for refusal, and following the submission of a signed Legal Agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, it is also no longer defending its fourth reason for refusal. However, they remain main issues because third parties continue to cite these as matters of concerns, but given the obvious overlap between the two I shall treat them as a single matter.

### Main Issues

3. Therefore the main issues are:
  - Whether or not the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of listed buildings;
  - The effect of the proposed development on highway safety; and
  - The effect of the proposed development on local schools, and whether it would make adequate provision for local infrastructure and services.

## Reasons

### *Policy context*

4. The development plan for the area comprises the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) and the South Oxfordshire Local Plan (Local Plan) 2011. A third party organisation entitled "Stop Unwanted Development Cholsey" (SUDC) states that the Council is in the process of producing a new Local Plan, and a neighbourhood plan (NP) for Cholsey is also currently being prepared. Policies from both are cited in its representation.
5. Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises on weight to be apportioned to emerging plans. No party states that the emerging development plans have been subjected to external examination; and the Council does not seek to introduce any such policies as part of its case. Given the appellant's uncontested assertion that outstanding concerns with the content of the NP remain, I must conclude that the emerging development plans are at their infancy stages of adoption, and accordingly I attach little weight to them in my decision.
6. The main parties agree that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing, but in any event the Council does not cite conflict with housing policies in its objection to the scheme. Both parties agree that the so-called tilted balance set out in paragraph 14 of the Framework is engaged. I return to this matter later in my decision.

### *Whether preserve or enhance the character or appearance of listed buildings*

7. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard should be given to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings. This means that considerable weight and importance must be given to any harm caused to the designated heritage assets in the planning balance, and this includes any harm to the setting of listed buildings.
8. Paragraph 132 of the Framework says great weight should be given to heritage assets' conservation. Core Strategy policy CSEN3 states that the district's designated historic heritage assets will be conserved and enhanced for their historic significance and their important contribution to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place. Local Plan policy CON5 states that proposals for development which would adversely affect the setting of a listed building will be refused. While the appellant cites wording differences and inconsistencies between these policies and the Framework's approach to conserving heritage assets, I nevertheless find them broadly in alignment.
9. The Council is only concerned with the effect of the proposed development on the setting of Duxford; a Grade II listed building also known as No 34 Wallingford Road. SUDC extends this concern to The Willows (No 42 Wallingford Road), also a Grade II listed building, and No 40 Wallingford Road (No 40), which the parties agree is a non-designated heritage asset.
10. The listing description describes Duxford as being of late seventeenth century construction with a flint base, large timber framing with rendered infill, old plain-tile roof and brick end stack to its right. It also notes the closed timber framed porch on the property's frontage together with a nineteenth century single-storey addition. The Willows is described as dating from the late

seventeenth century with early eighteenth and nineteenth century alterations comprising painted brick; old plain-tile roof; brick stacks and irregular fenestration.

11. The front entrances of all the above-mentioned properties are accessed from, and face towards Wallingford Road. However, both The Willows and No 40 are largely concealed from view by road frontage development and I was unable to see the facades with any degree of clarity. I was able to observe Duxford from the street and I appreciated the architectural qualities and features, and I am satisfied that this façade clearly reads as the principle elevation of the building.
12. The Council and SUDC state that, for Duxford and The Willows, this was not always the case. Prior to the mid-nineteenth century, Wallingford Road did not exist. Instead, access to the properties would have originally been taken from a road or track to the south of these properties, which the Council says was called East Street. Both dwellings would once have had their principal elevations on their southern façades where they would have fronted onto this road as well as the wider open countryside beyond, which includes the appeal site. I am told that historically, the appeal site may once have formed part of the landholding of Duxford. Accordingly, it is suggested that the appeal site and the heritage assets are linked and that it significantly and positively contributes to their setting.
13. I appreciate that the heritage assets would likely have been experienced very differently when the original road was there, and it is arguable that the appeal site and wider countryside may indeed have once contributed to their setting. However and as evidenced by the submitted maps, the immediate area has fundamentally changed since this time through a considerable growth in residential development, particularly Rothwells Close. This has resulted in the appeal site being largely enclosed from public view by built form, and I observed no appreciation or understanding of any bygone relationship between it and the heritage assets.
14. There is now no trace of this original road; the Council states that it was in essence replaced by Wallingford Road. This has had an effect on both Duxford and The Willows, which have evidently been adapted by repositioning their front facades to face Wallingford Road. As a consequence, the attractive rear facades of the all three heritage assets and their rear gardens merely adjoin and border the appeal site much in the same way as those dwellings in Rothwells Close.
15. In my view, the evolution and change to the surrounding area has had a significant bearing on the setting of the heritage assets. It would in my judgement be wholly incorrect and misleading to base the historic setting as contributing significantly to the significance of the heritage assets today, as I am being invited to do. I do not find any obvious current relationship exists between the appeal site and the heritage assets when experienced from the appeal site itself or the wider area, and it does not meaningfully contribute to the setting of the heritage assets.
16. I note the local topography and that the appeal site is slightly higher than the listed buildings. However, I am satisfied on the evidence before me and from my observations that the proposed properties would be appropriate in size and be positioned at sufficient distance not to harmfully protrude over or dwarf the dwellings, with each heritage asset retaining its distinguished and appreciable

qualities when viewed from public vantage points. Because of my findings above, I do not consider that the introduction or reinforcement of appropriate landscaping along Duxford's or other property's boundaries undermines heritage significance; the appropriateness of such landscaping can be controlled by planning condition(s).

17. Taking these matters into consideration, I find that that the appeal site makes little contribution to the setting of the heritage assets, and the proposed development would not significantly harm their character and appearance. Their significance as heritage assets would thus be preserved. The proposal would accord with Core Strategy policy CSEN3 and Local Plan policy CON5, and with the relevant part of the Framework, details of which I have set out above.

*Effect on highway safety*

18. Local Plan policy T1 states that proposals for all types of development will, where appropriate, provide for safe and convenient access to the highway network and be served by an adequate road network which can accommodate traffic without creating traffic hazards. Notwithstanding the reason for refusal, the Council now accepts that sufficient distance would exist between the proposed access and the curve in Wallingford Road which lies close to the junction with Rothwells Close, that there would not be any significant safety concerns. On the evidence before me and from my observations at my site visit, I have no reason to disagree.
19. The crux of the matter concerns the proximity and distance between the proposed junction and Goldfinch Lane, which the appellant states, not disputed by any party, would be 17m apart. Both the Council and SUDC consider this would be insufficient; the Council stating that it should be 30m to reflect the advice in a document entitled the "Oxfordshire Residential Road Design Guide". The appellant states that this version of the document is out-of-date having been updated in 2015. Neither version of the documents has been advanced in full and I am not in a position to draw any conclusive view as to which is correct. However, given that Local Plan policy T1 requires an assessment of the evidence rather than reliance upon any rudimentary and standardised set distance, I afford the '30m rule' with little weight in my decision.
20. Setting this aside, the Council advances harm would occur by the inability for larger vehicles to manoeuvre from Wallingford Road into either Goldfinch Lane or the proposed development at a simultaneous point as another vehicle doing the opposite. I find it highly unlikely that these circumstances would arise with any degree of regularity or frequency to endanger the safety of the highway, or moreover that the drivers of such vehicles would not have the common sense to take preventative action should it arise. In any event, the County Council as the Highway Authority do not raise this as an issue, and on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree.
21. I have noted the representations from SUDC in respect to the perceived inadequacy of the appellant's Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA), noting in particular its concerns over pedestrian crossing points and what it says is the promotion of undesirable and unsafe desire lines. I do not agree, and it is not obvious why such persons would not use safer crossing point options, even if these are deemed to be slightly less convenient. In any event, both the Council and the Highway Authority found no concerns with the safety audit and on the evidence before me I have no reason to find otherwise. I am satisfied

with the appellant's explanation that a Stage 2 RSA is unnecessary for the appeal and it would follow at the detailed design stage.

22. I have also noted the accident record data for Wallingford Road as reported by the appellant, which is not disputed by any party. While any road traffic accident whatever the consequences is regretful, I do not find that the quantum of accidents suggests the local highway network is dangerous. I do however accept the plausibility of residents' concerns in respect to the frequency of speeding cars. However, the proposed development would introduce traffic calming measures along this stretch of Wallingford Road, secured by the legal agreement. I am satisfied that this would have an overall benefit and improve road safety. The Council accepts the proposed visibility splays would be sufficient for egressing vehicles from the proposed development, and that sufficient parking would be provided to cater for the quantum of development proposed. I have no reason to disagree.
23. Irrespective of previous comments made during the application stage, both the Council and the Highway Authority found no concerns with the submitted transport assessment (TA) when determining the scheme. In the absence of comparable evidence which disputes the findings in the TA, I do not find the proposed development would cause a severe impact on highway safety on Wallingford Road. I therefore find the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the local highway network. I find no conflict with Local Plan policy T1, details of which I have set out above. It would also accord with the relevant parts of the Framework.

*Effect on local schools and adequacy of provision for local infrastructure and services*

24. Core Strategy policy CSI1 states that new development must be served and supported by appropriate on- and off-site infrastructure and services, and that planning permission will only be granted when infrastructure and services to meet the needs of the new development will be provided.
25. SUDC and other local residents cite concerns with the capacity of local schools to cater for the additional need generated by the proposed development. However, this is likely to be the case with any new residential scheme and I do not find this should automatically prevent new development. Both main parties agree that the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging tariff applies here; and the proposed development will be required to make financial payments to improve capacity and facilities of local schools to cater for the additional demand. I therefore find no reason on the evidence before me why the proposed development could not be adequately accommodated.
26. The Council seeks financial contributions towards improving the bus service route between Benson, Wallingford and Cholsey; for the provision of wheelie bins; street nameplates; and the monitoring of a travel plan specifically and the legal agreement as a whole. The Council also seeks a 40% total provision of affordable housing which equates to 27 units, which aligns with the requirements set out in Core Strategy policy CSH3. All are provided for in the Legal Agreement before me, together with requirements for traffic calming measures in the form of speed cushions along Wallingford Road and bus stop infrastructure secured through a s278 Agreement.



27. Paragraph 204 of the Framework says requests for planning obligations must meet three tests, which are: (i) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (ii) directly related to the development; and (iii) fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the development. Paragraph 50 of the Framework states that development should provide a wider choice of housing. The appellant has not advanced any objections to the content of the obligation. In light of the evidence before me, including the responses from the Council, I am satisfied that obligation, as well as the contributions made through CIL, would be consistent with the tests of Framework and would comply with Core Strategy policies CSI1 and CSH3. I am also satisfied for the same reasons that they would meet the provisions contained within the CIL Regulations 2010 in respect of pooled contributions.

### **Other Matters**

28. Concerns have been raised in respect of the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupiers of properties in Rothwells Close, whose gardens face the appeal site. However, the submitted plans indicate that only the side elevations of plots 63 and 39 would be positioned relatively close to the boundary with three properties in Rothwells Close. I am satisfied that an adequate and satisfactory separation distance would be retained between the dwellings, and that whilst outlook may change, there would be no material harm to privacy or outlook for the existing occupiers. In any event, the Council has not raised this as an issue, and I have no reason to disagree. I am also satisfied that other dwellings are either sufficiently distant, or aligned away from the appeal site such that no significant harm would occur to the living conditions of the occupiers of these properties.
29. Concerns have also been raised as to the effect of the proposed development on existing shops or services, and the capacity of sewerage and water pressure to meet additional dwellings. However, insufficient evidence is before me to suggest that the proposed development would place an undue burden on these services so I afford little weight to this in my decision. Whether the appeal site is or is not deemed to be previously developed land is not an issue raised by the Council, and it has little determinative effect on the outcome of the appeal.

### **Conditions**

30. The main parties agree that the list of conditions sent by email dated 28 February 2018 is the most up-to-date list, and only the need for suggested condition 23 remains a disputed matter. I have considered these against paragraph 206 of the Framework, and made changes necessary to comply with those requirements.
31. I have specified the approved plans so as to provide clarity and certainty as to the scheme approved. Conditions requiring the submission of materials, landscaping, tree planting and tree protection measures and the management and maintenance of the proposed public open spaces on site are necessary to ensure the appearance of the development would be satisfactory. Conditions to investigate the land for potential contamination is necessary to ensure the ground conditions are safe for future residential occupation. Conditions in respect to reptile mitigation and biodiversity enhancement are necessary to ensure the development does not harm and promotes on-site wildlife. A condition requiring details of sustainable surface water drainage is necessary to ensure the site is sustainably drained.

32. I have imposed the recommended highway related conditions to ensure that the proposed dwellings would be served by safe and accessible roads and would cater for sufficient quantum of off-road parking. A construction and traffic management plan is necessary to ensure the development is constructed in a manner that it would not cause significant harm to the highway network or the living conditions of surrounding residents, and I find this single condition can deal with several separately suggested conditions. A travel plan condition is necessary in the interests of promoting sustainable forms of travel. An archaeological condition is necessary to ensure that any archaeological remains found are appropriately and accurately recorded.
33. Little evidence is before me to suggest that the location of the proposed development sits within or close to a noisy environment or that future residents would be particularly vulnerable to a noise source. As such, I am not persuaded that a specific condition requiring a scheme for protecting the dwellings from the external noise environment has been adequately justified. For similar reasons and as I have alluded to above, I find little evidence before me which sets out any water capacity issues or effects on existing infrastructure to justify the need for such a condition. A foul drainage condition is unnecessary as this is controllable under other legislation.
34. I concur with the appellant that the inclusion of an approved plans condition renders a further condition requiring the junction spacing to be at least 15m as unnecessary. But in any event, the suggested condition as worded is not sufficiently clear as it would potentially allow the junction spacing to be 15m only, and thus conflict with the approved plan. I have subsequently deleted the suggested condition.

### **Planning Balance and Conclusion**

35. The main parties agree that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land. Paragraph 49 of the Framework states that housing policies should not be considered up-to-date if a five year supply of housing cannot be demonstrated. Paragraph 14 of the Framework is thus engaged. This states that a presumption in favour of sustainable development exists and should be seen as a golden thread running through decision-taking. Where relevant policies for the supply of housing 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 taken as a whole.
36. I find that the proposed development would have considerable social and economic benefits in providing new dwellings to meet the needs of present and future generations, and could provide local construction employment opportunities and support accessible local services. The proposed development would also make worthwhile contributions to the supply of housing and more particularly, towards affordable housing and help increase the five year supply figure. I find the proposed traffic calming measures I have identified above would amount to a considerable benefit all road users. Notwithstanding the comments from the Council and SUDC, I do not underplay these benefits particularly in the absence of a five-year housing supply, and I attach substantial weight to them.
37. For the reasons given above, I conclude the proposed development would not harm the setting of the identified designated and non-designated heritage

assets, and would thus preserve their significance. There would also be no significant harm caused to the operation of the local highway network or upon highway safety, or upon local services, facilities and infrastructure.

38. In applying the so-called tilted balancing exercise required by bullet point 4(1) of paragraph 14 of the Framework, I find that the absence of any significant environmental harm I have identified would not be capable of significantly and demonstrably outweighing the benefits of the scheme. I find the proposal would amount to sustainable development in accordance with the Framework when taken as a whole, and that a presumption lies in its favour. There would be no conflict with the development plan taken as a whole.

39. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*R Allen*

INSPECTOR

Richborough Estates



## Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 41-15 Sheet 1, 41-15 Sheet 2, 41-15 Sheet 3, 41-15 Sheet 4, 41-15 Sheet 5, 41-15 Sheet 6, WB03190-123, WB03190-120, WB03190-121, EDP2771-16c, 031604-BEL-TV-06, WB03190-510A, 031604-PER01, 031604-SH01, 031604-B1-E1, 031604-B1-E2, 031604-20-E1, 031604-20-E2, 031604-20-E3, 031604-30-E2, 031604-30-E3, 031604-H222-E1, 031604-H222-E2, 031604-H323-E1, 031604-H323-E2, 031604-H324-E1, 031604-H324-E2, 031604-H422-E1, 031604-H422-E2, 031604-H424-E1, 031604-H424-E2, 031604-H431-E1, 031604-H432-E1, 031604-B1-P2, 031604-20-P1, 031604-20-P2, 031604-20-P3, 031604-30-P2, 031604-30-P3, 031604-H222-P1, 031604-H222-P2, 031604-H323-P1, 031604-H324-P1, 031604-H422-P1, 031604-H422-P2, 031604-H424-P1, 031604-H424-P2, 031604-H431-P1, 031604-H432-P1, WB03190-505A, 031604-GAR01, 031604-GAR05, 031604-GAR06, 031604-GAR07, 031604-GAR02, 031604-GAR03, 031604-GAR04, 031604-B1-P1, 031604-30+-E1, 031604-30+-P1, 031604-H433-E2, 031604-H433-P1 A, 031604-SS01 A, 031604-SS02 A, 031604-SS03 A, EDP 2771/15 c, EDP 2771/19 d, WB03190-111 B, WB03190-115 B, WB03190-116 B, WB03190-122 A, WB03190-124 A, WB03190-501 B, WB03190-530 C, WB03190-53 A, WB03190-C-102 Rev C, WB03190-C-110 Rev C, WB03190-C-200 Rev D, WB03190-C-500 Rev C, WB03190-C-531 Rev D, WB03190-C-532 Rev D, 031604-BEL-TV-07 Rev A, 031604-H242-E1 Rev A, 031604-CP01, 031604-SUB01 Rev A, 031604-H242-P2, 031604-IS01 Rev B, 031604-CPER01, 031604-BEL-TV-01 Rev C, 031604-BEL-TV-03 Rev B, 031604-BEL-TV-04 Rev C, and 031604-BEL-TV-02 Rev C, except as controlled or modified by conditions of this permission.
- 3) With the exception of demolition, site clearance and site preparation works, no development shall take place until a schedule of all materials to be used in the external construction and finishes of the development hereby permitted has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Development shall be carried out in accordance with those approved details.
- 4) With the exception of demolition, site clearance and site preparation works, no development shall take place until a scheme for the landscaping of the site, including the planting of live trees and details of tree pits and shrubs, the treatment of the access road and hard standings, the provision of boundary fencing and screen walling and provision of open space has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The scheme shall be implemented as approved prior to first occupation or in the first practicable planting season after first occupation of the approved development and thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved scheme. In the event of any of the trees or shrubs so planted dying or being seriously damaged or destroyed within five years of the completion of the development, a new tree or shrub or equivalent number of trees or shrubs, as the case may be, of a species first approved by the Local Planning Authority, shall

- be planted and properly maintained in a position or positions first approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing.
- 5) The tree protection details as shown on the approved plan EDP2771/15C shall be put in place prior to any on site works including demolition and thereafter retained in situ for the duration of development.
  - 6) With the exception of demolition, site clearance and site preparation works, no development shall take place until details of the provision and for the management and maintenance of the communal open spaces on the site has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Development shall be carried out in accordance with those approved details.
  - 7) No development shall take place until a phased risk assessment shall be carried out by a competent person. Each phase shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Phase 1 shall incorporate a desk study and site walk over to identify all potential contaminative uses on site, and to inform the conceptual site model. If potential contamination is identified in Phase 1 then a Phase 2 investigation shall be undertaken. Phase 2 shall include a comprehensive intrusive investigation in order to characterise the type, nature and extent of contamination present, the risks to receptors and if significant contamination is identified to inform the remediation strategy. Phase 3 requires that a remediation strategy be submitted the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing to ensure the site will be rendered suitable for its proposed use.
  - 8) The development shall not be occupied until any previously approved remediation strategy has been carried out in full and a validation report confirming completion of these works has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing.
  - 9) No development shall take until a method statement for reptile mitigation and translocation has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Such details shall include the identification of, habitat creation within, and management over a 20-year period of receptor sites; arrangements for aftercare and post translocation monitoring for a two-year period. The translocation and long term maintenance of the receptor areas shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.
  - 10) No development shall take until a biodiversity enhancement strategy, demonstrating how the development can achieve a no net loss of biodiversity compared to the biodiversity value of the site has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The biodiversity enhancement measures shall be carried out and retained in accordance with the approved details.
  - 11) With the exception of demolition, site clearance and site preparation works, no development shall commence until a sustainable urban drainage system based on the recommendations set out in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment dated October 2016 has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved measures.

- 12) With the exception of demolition, site clearance and site preparation works, no development shall commence until full construction and geometry details of vehicular access to the site has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The access shall be provided prior to the occupation or use of the new development.
- 13) Prior to the use of the new vehicular access, visibility splays shall be provided in both directions measuring 2.4 metres by 43 metres. Such splays shall be designed to ensure there is no obstruction to vision above 0.9 metre in height relative to the centre line of the adjacent carriageway over the whole of each visibility splay area. Thereafter, the visibility splays shall be permanently maintained free from obstruction to vision.
- 14) No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until the roads serving it have been constructed (apart from the surface course and kerbing) in accordance with the specification in Oxfordshire County Council's Residential Road Design Guide and been subject to a Road Safety Audit.
- 15) No dwelling shall be occupied until the parking spaces associated with that particular property as identified on approved plan 031604-BEL-TV-02 Rev C has been constructed, laid out, surfaced, drained and completed to be compliant with SUDS principles. Such parking shall be retained unobstructed except for the parking of vehicles associated with the development at all times.
- 16) The garage accommodation hereby approved shall be retained as such and shall not be adapted for living purposes without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.
- 17) No development shall take place until a construction and traffic management plan (CTMP) has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The CTMP should include: Full details for the management of and operating times of construction traffic and delivery vehicles; operative and visitor parking; construction hours; dust suppression measures; wheel washing facilities; signage; the location of site offices and material storage; waste disposal and details of communication with local residents. The CTMP shall be adhered to through the construction of the development hereby approved.
- 18) Prior to first occupation of any part of the development hereby approved, a travel information pack shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The first residents of each dwelling shall be provided with a copy of the approved travel information pack.
- 19) No development shall take place until an archaeological written scheme of investigation, prepared by an appropriately qualified person has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Details should also include a programme of archaeological mitigation and recording, a timetable for the completion of the works, and a programme for the submission of a final report on any findings. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.