



---

## Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 9 January 2018 and closed on 19 January 2018

Site visit made on 10 January 2018

**by G D Jones BSc(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 06 March 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/W/17/3185918**

**Land south of Dereham Road, Mattishall**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Gladman Developments Ltd against the decision of Breckland District Council.
  - The application Ref 3PL/2015/0498/O, dated 24 April 2015, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2017.
  - The development proposed is the erection of up to 50 residential dwellings with associated infrastructure.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for the erection of up to 50 residential dwellings with associated infrastructure at land south of Dereham Road, Mattishall in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3PL/2015/0498/O, dated 24 April 2015, subject to the conditions contained within the Schedule at the end of this decision.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is for outline planning permission with access only to be determined at this stage and with appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved for future approval. Whilst not formally part of the scheme, I have treated the submitted details relating to these reserved matters as a guide as to how the site might be developed.
3. I adjourned the hearing on 9 January 2018 on the basis that the main parties had reached verbal agreement during the course of the hearing regarding the detail of trigger points associated with proposed planning obligations, which had previously not been agreed. In doing so and with the agreement of the main parties, I allowed the appellant until 19 January 2018 to prepare and submit a revised legal agreement to reflect the newly found common ground. I subsequently received a Unilateral Undertaking, dated 18 January 2018, made under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the UU), which I have taken into account in the determination of the appeal. I then closed the hearing in writing on 19 January 2018.
4. Since the appeal planning application was determined by the Council the Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan was made on 2 November 2017 (the MNP) such that it now forms part of the development plan for the area. At the hearing the Council confirmed that in its view the appeal scheme also conflicts with

Policies ENV2 (important views and vistas), ENV5 (distinct villages) and HOU1 (size of individual developments) of the MNP.

## **Background**

### *Site and Context*

5. During the planning application process the site was reduced in size from 4ha to 3.2ha to take account of identified flood risk to the western end of the original site. The appeal site, as revised, comprises agricultural land located on the western edge of the village of Mattishall. It is bounded to the north by Dereham Road, which is fronted by residential development immediately opposite the site; to the east by residential properties in the form of fairly recently constructed dwellings to the Dereham Road frontage and the older farm house and barn conversion to their south; to the west by the remainder of the field parcel, with Old Hall Road beyond; and to the south by open countryside. Much of the perimeter of the site is lined by mature hedgerows and hedgerow trees, particularly to Deneham Road to the north and to the east, while the western boundary is more open.
6. The site is located roughly 0.8 miles from the range of services found towards the centre of the village, which include a primary school, post office, shops and hot food takeaway, a pub and doctor's surgery. Mattishall is located approximately 6km east of Dereham and 18km west of Norwich and the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) states that the bus links to both are good. Although adjacent to it, the site is located beyond the settlement boundary of Mattishall as identified in the development plan.
7. There was a previous planning application for development at a larger site, that included the current appeal site, which was refused by the Council and was subsequently the subject of an appeal (the previous appeal)<sup>1</sup>. The previous appeal site appears to correspond with the 4ha site which was initially proposed under the current appeal planning application. The previous appeal scheme was for the development of up to 90 dwelling houses.
8. Mattishall is identified in the development plan as a Local Service Centre Village where the strategy is defined to be primarily around service protection and enhancement and development to meet local needs.

### *Planning Policy & Housing Land Supply Context*

9. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) outlines a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which it indicates has three dimensions – economic, social and environmental. Paragraph 14 sets out how this presumption is to be applied and indicates, among other things, that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
10. In respect to housing delivery, the Framework requires the Council to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework. Applications for housing should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeal Ref. APP/F2605/W/15/3027972, dated 31 March 2016

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. The main parties agree that, for the purposes of this appeal at least, there is not a Framework compliant supply of housing land. The SoCG indicates that the Council can demonstrate no more than 4.6 years' supply of housing land<sup>2</sup>.

11. The evidence also refers to the Written Ministerial Statement on Neighbourhood Planning of 12 December 2016 (the WMS). Among other things, it states that relevant policies for the supply of housing in a neighbourhood plan should not be deemed to be 'out-of-date' under para 49 of the Framework where three criteria apply. However, not all three criteria do apply in this case because the MNP does not allocate sites for housing.
12. In respect to neighbourhood planning the Framework adds that communities are given direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and deliver the sustainable development they need. It also states that where a planning application conflicts with a neighbourhood plan that has been brought into force, permission should not normally be granted.
13. Consistent with the Framework, the WMS also states that the Government confirms that where a planning application conflicts with a neighbourhood plan, planning permission should not normally be granted, yet communities who have been proactive and worked hard to bring forward such a plan are often frustrated that it is being undermined because their local planning authorities cannot demonstrate a five-year land supply of deliverable housing sites.
14. Although weighty material considerations, neither the Framework nor the WMS change the statutory status of the development plan. The development plan for this area includes the Breckland Council Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2001-2026 Adopted December 2009 (the DPD) and the MNP. The refusal reason cites development plan policy conflict in respect to Policy CP 11 of the DPD only. Nonetheless, it is common ground between the main parties that the appeal scheme would also conflict with DPD Policy CP 14. As outlined above, the Council now also cites conflict with MNP Policies ENV2, ENV5 and HOU1.
15. DPD Policy CP 11 seeks to protect and enhance the landscape of the District for its own intrinsic beauty and for other benefits including the rural character. Policy CP 14 of the DPD indicates that in villages not identified for a specific level of growth in the identified settlement hierarchy, residential development will generally only be permitted where suitable sites are available within defined settlement boundaries.
16. Policies ENV2 and ENV5 of the MNP seek to protect the countryside and the character and appearance of the village and the land around. Policy ENV2 makes particular reference to three vistas / views including when approaching Mattishall along Dereham Road from the west in the vicinity of the appeal site. MNP Policy HOU1 states that the neighbourhood area will deliver a minimum of 141 dwellings in the period up to 2036. It adds that proposals for new dwellings within or adjacent to the village will be supported subject to four criteria including that they are of a scale that is appropriate to the size of the

---

<sup>2</sup> This is the Council's preferred position based on the application of a Liverpool type methodology whereas the appellant's preferred position is based on a Sedgefield type methodology which equates to a 4.0 years' housing land supply. I have used this 4.6 years figure simply as a benchmark for the purposes of making my decision as it represents what might be described as the best case scenario from the Council's perspective.

village and its rural setting, they create an attractive and well-landscaped interface with the surrounding countryside where appropriate, and their design and layout has regard to their immediate surroundings.

## **Main Issues**

17. The main issues are:

- The effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area; and
- Whether any development plan conflict and harm arising, is outweighed by any other considerations including that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a Framework compliant supply of housing land.

## **Reasons**

### *Character and Appearance*

18. As identified by the previous appeal Inspector, the appeal site has the character and appearance of open countryside and is part of a wider expanse of similar land extending south. Whilst enclosed by hedgerows to the front and partially by further hedgerows and trees along other boundaries, the open, rural character of the site is a significant feature of this part of the village's setting and is particularly evident in approaching the site along Dereham Road to the west. The significance of this latter point is expressly recognised in Policy ENV2 of the MNP.
19. The current appeal site stands on part of the previous appeal site, albeit that it has a smaller area. Up to 50 homes are now proposed compared to 90 homes as proposed under the previous appeal scheme. The density of the proposed development would be approximately 16 dwellings per hectare (dph) across the whole site, with a density of some 24 dph across the built part of the site. This contrasts with the proposed density of some 34 dph of the previous appeal scheme.
20. In similar terms to the previous appeal, the illustrative details that support the appeal application indicate significant areas of planting and other open space around much of its perimeters, such that the immediate impact upon the physical, landscape character of the site itself would be modest. Nonetheless, a hard built frontage, contrasting with the open existing countryside, would be created along Dereham Road, in a similar – albeit less extensive – manner to that which the previous Inspector found in that case.
21. Notwithstanding the current scheme's relative reduction in density, in extent of development and in site area, visual effects with regard to specific views and upon wider visual amenity would remain and these would be comparable to those identified by the previous Inspector. In particular, as he stated, the existing contribution of the appeal site as part of an open, rural setting to the village and to the surrounding character would be lost, and despite proposed landscaping, the scheme would have the inherent character and appearance of built form. The illustrative material also still suggests that this would remain apparent along boundaries to the site, with development likely to be evident above boundary landscaping and in filtered views and gaps through it.
22. Consequently, notwithstanding its reduced scale and density, the current proposal would continue to lead to a harmful loss of open countryside contrary

to the existing character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings. It would, again, introduce built form outside the defined settlement boundary, albeit at the village fringe, which would be mitigated to an extent by the proposed landscaping, but the appeal site is still part of a wider pattern of open countryside and contributes to the distinctiveness of the setting accordingly.

23. For these reasons, therefore, the appeal development would be harmful to the character and appearance of area. Consequently, it would conflict, in these respects, with Policy CP 11 of the DPD and Policies ENV2, ENV5 and HOU1 of the MNP.

#### *Planning Balance*

24. Regarding the weight carried by the relevant policies of the development plan, as the previous appeal Inspector identified, DPD Policy CP 11 is not entirely consistent with the Framework such that its weight is affected. It seeks, in part, to protect the landscape of the District for the sake of its own intrinsic beauty. This reflects the fact that it was formulated before the publication of the Framework when national policy was that the countryside should be protected for its own sake. That is no longer the case and as such, in the light of Framework para 215, I accord Policy CP 11 significantly reduced weight.
25. Settlement boundaries in the District appear to have been drawn not only to protect the countywide but also to accommodate the District's housing requirements as set out in the development plan. DPD Policy CP 14 is therefore linked to the housing policy requirement which is now out of date due, at least, to the current absence of a Framework compliant housing land supply. On this basis and again in light of Framework para 215, Policy CP 14 also currently carries significantly reduced weight.
26. In contrast, the MNP has only recently been made such that its policies, including Policies ENV2, ENV5 and HOU1, must accord with the Framework. On that basis they carry full weight.
27. Through the Neighbourhood planning process the local community have gone to considerable lengths to plan for Mattishall's needs including in respect to housing. Nonetheless, the Council's evidence is that it can currently demonstrate only a 4.6 years' supply of housing land for the District at large. This is a substantial shortfall. While the appeal development would provide only a modest contribution to bridging that shortfall, it would be significant given the social-ills associated with housing need and the government's objective to boost significantly the supply of housing.
28. Need for housing is also expressly acknowledged in MNP Policy HOU1 which states a minimum of 141 dwellings will be delivered in the neighbourhood area in the period up to 2036. While the evidence indicates that there has already been significant progress made to that end both in terms of planning and delivery, this is a minimum amount of additional homes rather than a cap on further development. The MNP does not allocate sites for housing, such that the criteria of the WMS are not triggered, and there is now a substantial shortfall in housing delivery in the wider District.
29. It is suggested that confidence in the planning process, particularly in Neighbourhood planning, could be undermined if the appeal were to succeed.

However, although there is conflict with the MNP, it is reasonably discrete in terms of the Policies affected and the associated harm that would arise from the appeal development. Consequently, the integrity of the MNP would remain intact if planning permission were to be allowed, particularly in the current housing land supply circumstances. On this basis, any potential negative effect that allowing the appeal would have on confidence in the planning process, including Neighbourhood planning, carries only limited weight.

30. Accordingly, notwithstanding the positive planning undertaken in Mattishall Parish, the contribution to the District's market housing supply offered by the proposal carries significant weight in its favour under the social dimension of sustainable development as a public benefit. As part of the scheme up to 20 affordable homes would be delivered on-site and this additionally weighs significantly in favour of the appeal proposal.
31. The appeal development would offer a number of other potential benefits. Given the site's location on the western fringes of Mattishall, the proposed homes would be in a reasonably sustainable location such that residents would have access to a good range of facilities, services and transport options, albeit that the site is over 800m from most of these facilities. I also recognise that residents of the development are very likely to have to travel away from the village for employment and to access higher level education and wider facilities. On balance these considerations also weigh in favour of the appeal scheme, albeit to a limited extent.
32. In terms of the economic role, the development would contribute towards economic growth during the construction phase. The additional population would be likely to assist the local economy and help support the sustainability of facilities in the area. This latter point would also support to the social dimension of sustainable development.
33. Regarding the environmental dimension, concerns have been raised, including by those who spoke at the hearing, in respect to drainage and flood risk. However, having regard to the wider evidence I see no reason why the development could not be adequately mitigated in that regard subject to the imposition of controls that could be secured via planning condition. Nonetheless, as outlined above, there would be net harm to the character and appearance of area to an extent that carries significant weight against the appeal scheme.
34. I note the evidence regarding potential benefits resulting from other matters that would be secured via the UU and conditions, as outlined a little later in my decision. I recognise that at least some of these may be of some benefit to the wider community. However, as they are primarily intended to respond to needs arising from the proposed development, any such benefit attracts limited weight.
35. In summary, applying the Framework para 14 balancing exercise, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan including with policies of the recently made MNP, which involved considerable community investment, and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. However, in the current circumstances these important considerations, along with the other factors identified that have been said to weigh against the development, do not collectively significantly and demonstrably outweigh the matters outlined above that are in its favour, particularly the delivery of housing. Overall, therefore,

the appeal proposals would represent sustainable development in the terms of the Framework.

### **Other Matters**

36. As outlined above, the UU was submitted during the appeal process. In the event that planning permission were to be granted and implemented the UU would secure the provision of on-site affordable housing at a rate of 40%, open space and allotments along with provisions for their future management, new footpath links and off-site planting; and contributions in respect to library services, primary education and the maintenance of the proposed footpath links. Both the Council and Norfolk County Council have produced comprehensive statements that address the application of statutory requirements to the planning obligations within the UU and also set out the relevant planning policy support/justification (the Planning Obligations Submissions).
37. I have considered the UU in light of Regulation 122 of The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended) and government policy/guidance on the use of planning obligations. Having done so, I am satisfied that the obligations therein would be required by and accord with the Policies set out in the Planning Obligations Submissions. Overall, I am satisfied that all of those obligations are directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related to it and necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms.
38. In addition to the foregoing matters, concern has been expressed, including by those who spoke at the hearing, in respect to several considerations. These include the development's effect on highway safety, vehicle movements and congestion, on wildlife and biodiversity, and on archaeology; the loss of agricultural land; that Mattishall is a Service Centre Village and not allocated for significant growth; there are substantial strong and wider-spread objections locally to the current and past related proposals; the proposal is contrary to the Localism Act and MNP, including wider policies to those cited by the Council; the site is outside the settlement boundary and has also been removed as a preferred site from the emerging Local Plan; the conduct and motives of the appellant, including the introduction of amendments to the scheme and the consistency of material; the area is well on its way to delivering the amount of housing planned for in the MNP even though the end of the plan period is many years away; and the scheme remains too high density.
39. Other issues raised include that there are said to be significant infrastructure issues locally, including in relation to highways, foul / surface water drainage, health and education; the development is not sustainable nor in the right location and would encourage car use; the housing, including the affordable housing, is not needed; development of such a large size would be at odds with MNP, out of keeping with the identity of the village and be detrimental to the quality of life within it, having an urbanising effect; residents of the site would not be part of the village; property values would be effected; there is little employment in Mattishall and the site is too far removed from the limited services available in the village; other 'better' housing sites are available or are likely to become available in future; light pollution; viability may diminish the proposed affordable housing provision in the longer term; and the previous application has been refused and turned down on appeal.

40. These matters are largely identified and considered within the Council officer's report on the appeal development. They were also before the Council when it prepared its evidence and when it submitted its case at the hearing. Other than as set out above, the Council did not conclude that they would amount to reasons to justify withholding planning permission. Subject to the identified obligations of the UU and the imposition of planning conditions, nothing I read, saw or heard during the appeal process prompts me to disagree with the Council's conclusions in these respects, or to alter the outcome of the balancing exercise as outlined above.

### **Conditions and Conclusion**

41. The Council submitted a schedule of suggested conditions prior to the hearing and a revised set following the hearing, the latter of which was in response to discussions during the hearing. I have considered all of these suggested conditions in the light of government guidance on the use of conditions in planning permissions and made amendments accordingly.
42. In order to provide certainty, particularly in respect to the matters that are not reserved for future consideration, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in general conformity with the illustrative layout plan would be necessary. A condition requiring adequate remediation of any contamination affecting the site would be necessary to safeguard the health and well-being of future occupiers. Conditions to secure the installation of sustainable drainage as part of the development and foul water drainage would be necessary in the interests of flood prevention, to provide appropriate/adequate facilities and to protect the environment.
43. Conditions to provide additional control over the detail of reserved matters, to secure the proposed access and highway improvement works and to manage traffic speeds would be necessary in the interests of highway safety. For that reason and to protect the living conditions of local residents, a condition would be necessary to control matters during the construction phase of the development. A condition would be necessary to ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined/recorded. The approval and implementation of a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants would also be necessary in the interests of occupants' safety.
44. I conclude, for the reasons outlined above, that the proposed development is sustainable development for which there is a presumption in favour and, therefore, that the appeal should be allowed subject to the identified conditions.

*G D Jones*

INSPECTOR

## **APPEARANCES**

### **FOR THE APPELLANTS:**

|                |                                         |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------|
| John MacKenzie | Planning - Gladman Developments Limited |
| Keith Nye      | Landscape - FPCR                        |

### **FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:**

|                                  |                                        |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Simon Wood BA(Hons)<br>BTP MRTPI | Planning – Breckland District Council  |
| Peter Coe BA DipLA<br>CMCI       | Landscape – Breckland District Council |

### **INTERESTED PERSONS:**

|                    |                                 |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| John Rockliff      | Mattishall Parish Council       |
| Cllr Bill Borrett  | County Councillor               |
| Cllr Paul Claussen | District Councillor             |
| Anna Loake         | Mattishall Matters action group |
| John Gogle         | Local resident / farmer         |
| Prof Robert Eady   | Local resident                  |
| Rita Cooper        | Local resident                  |
| Nicky Gandy        | Parish Plan Working Group       |
| Pauline Cox        | Local resident                  |
| Richard Stephenson | Local resident                  |
| Mr Osborne         | Local resident                  |

## **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED WHILE THE HEARING SAT**

- 1 Draft suggested conditions
- 2 Extract of Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document December 2009 – Policy DC 2 (Principles of New Housing Development)
- 3 Note prepared by Karl Patterson, Housing Development Officer, Breckland District Council regarding potential planning obligation affordable housing delivery triggers
- 4 Colour 'S106 Legal Plan' and 'Offsite Planting' plan

## **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE HEARING SAT**

- 1 Final suggested conditions
- 2 Unilateral Undertaking made under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, dated 18 January 2018

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS FOR APPEAL REF APP/F2605/W/17/3185918:

- 1) Application for approval of reserved matters shall be made not later than the expiration of two years from the date of this permission, and the development shall be begun within one year of the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval at different dates, the final approval of the last such matters to be approved.
- 2) No development whatsoever shall take place until the plans and descriptions giving details of the reserved matters referred to in Condition 1 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these plans and descriptions shall provide details of the appearance, layout, scale and landscaping of the development (including an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan, and an updated ecological assessment). The reserved matters shall be in general conformity with the Development Framework Plan drawing Ref. G.0228\_02R.
- 3) The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the application form and the following approved drawings: Ref. G.0228\_20B and Ref. 4746/25/06.
- 4) No development shall take place until a Land Contamination investigation has been carried out. A protocol for the investigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) before commencement of the investigation. A completed report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA prior to the commencement of any investigation. The report shall assess potential risks to humans and property, including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland, service lines and pipes, adjoining land, ground and surface water, ecological systems, archaeological sites and ancient monuments, and the investigation shall be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's "Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11", or any subsequent version or additional regulatory guidance.

Should Land Contamination Remediation Works be identified as necessary, contamination of soil or ground water be discovered or suspected following commencement of the development, no development or further development shall take place until a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use has been submitted to and approved by the LPA. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved remediation scheme unless otherwise approved in writing by the LPA. The remediation scheme shall include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures and any necessary long term maintenance and monitoring programme.

- 5) Prior to commencement of development, in accordance with the submitted Enzygo Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Ref. SHF.1132.066.HY.R.001.B and drawing Ref. SHF.1132.066.HY.D.008, a detailed scheme of surface water drainage incorporating the following measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development. The scheme shall address the following matters:

- i. Surface water runoff rates from the developed site shall be attenuated to 5 l/s as stated within section 5.9.14 of the FRA;
  - ii. Provision of surface water attenuation storage in flood free land, sized and designed to accommodate the volume of water generated in all rainfall events up to and including the critical storm duration for the 1 in 100 year return period, including allowances for climate change, flood event. A minimum storage volume of 804m<sup>3</sup> shall be provided in line with section 5.9.14 of the submitted FRA;
  - iii. Detailed designs, modelling calculations and plans of the drainage conveyance network in the:
    - 1 in 30 year critical rainfall event to show no above ground flooding on any part of the site; and
    - 1 in 100 year critical rainfall plus climate change event to show, if any, the depth, volume and storage location of any above ground flooding from the drainage network ensuring that flooding does not occur in any part of a building or any utility plant susceptible to water (e.g. pumping station or electricity substation) within the development;
  - iv. The design of the attenuation basin shall incorporate an emergency spillway and any drainage structures shall include appropriate freeboard allowances. Plans shall be submitted to show the routes for the management of exceedance surface water flow routes that minimise the risk to people and property during rainfall events in excess of 1 in 100 year return period. This shall include surface water which may enter the site from elsewhere;
  - v. Finished ground floor levels of properties shall be a minimum of 300mm above expected flood levels of all sources of flooding;
  - vi. Details of how all surface water management features to be designed in accordance with The SuDS Manual (CIRIA C753, 2015), including appropriate treatment stages for water quality prior to discharge;
  - vii. A maintenance and management plan detailing the activities required and details of who shall adopt and maintain all the surface water drainage features for the lifetime of the development; and
  - viii. A maintenance and management plan for the existing ordinary watercourses (and any structures such as culverts), sewers and surface water management systems within and adjacent to the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to ensure that during the construction phase of the development flood risk is not increased onsite or elsewhere.
- 6) Prior to the commencement of any works above slab level precise details of the means of foul water disposal shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 7) As part of the reserved matters application(s) full details (in the form of scaled plans and / or written specifications) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to illustrate the following:
- i. Roads and footway;
  - ii. Visibility splays;
  - iii. Internal access arrangements;
  - iv. Loading and turning areas; and

v. Garages.

- 8) The driveway length in front of any garages within the site developed under the terms of this planning permission shall be at least 6.0m as measured from the garage door(s) to the highway boundary.
- 9) Development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme detailing provision for on-site parking for construction workers for the duration of the construction period, construction traffic management and access, and wheel cleaning facilities has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented throughout the construction period in accordance with the approved details.
- 10) Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings, no works shall commence on-site until a detailed scheme for the proposed off-site highway improvement works, including the site access, as indicated on the approved plans has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and no dwelling shall be occupied until the site access to Dereham Road and the off-site highways works have been fully completed.
- 11) No works shall commence on the site until a scheme for the management of traffic speeds to the west of Old Hall Road, to include a timetable for its implementation, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme, including its implementation timetable.
- 12) No development, including demolition, shall take place within the application site until the applicant or their agent or successor in title has:
  - i. Caused to be implemented a programme of archaeological evaluation in accordance with a first written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; and next
  - ii. Submitted the results of the archaeological evaluation to the Local Planning Authority; and next
  - iii. Secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological mitigation in accordance with a second written scheme of investigation which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 13) Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants, including an implementation timetable, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme, including the implementation timetable.