



## Appeal Decisions

Hearing Held on 21 August 2018

Site visit made on 21 August 2018

**by S M Holden BSc MSc CEng MICE TPP FCIHT MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 10<sup>th</sup> September 2018**

---

### **Appeal A Ref: APP/R3650/W/18/3193390**

#### **Land adjacent to Brockhurst Farm, Alfold Crossways**

- 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 Cove Construction Limited against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref WA/2017/0104, dated 13 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2017.
  - The development proposed is described as: "outline planning application for up to 45 dwellings, public open space, SuDS attenuation with all matters reserved except for access into the site".
- 

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/R3650/W/18/3201576**

#### **Land adjacent to Brockhurst Farm, Alfold Crossways**

- 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 Cove Construction Limited against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref WA/2017/1947, dated 5 October 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2018.
  - The development proposed is described as: "outline planning application for up to 25 dwellings, landscaping, open space, SuDS attenuation with all matters reserved except for access into the site".
- 

## **Decisions**

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for up to 23 dwellings, provision of public open space and SuDS attenuation with all matters reserved except access, in accordance with the application Ref WA/2017/1947, dated 5 October 2017, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule A.

## **Procedural and Preliminary Matters**

3. The applications were amended prior to their determination. The number of dwellings in Appeal A was reduced from 45 to 39 and in Appeal B from 25 to 23. The Council undertook additional consultation and determined the schemes on the basis of the revised plans. I have done the same.
4. Both applications were in outline form with only access to be determined at this stage. All other matters were reserved for future consideration. However,

masterplans showing how 39 or 23 dwellings could be accommodated on the site were submitted. I have had regard to these plans and other supporting information which described how this quantum of development could be accommodated on the site. However, other than in relation to the extent of the developable area, I have treated them as only illustrative in reaching my decisions.

5. In February 2018, after Appeal A had been determined, but prior to the determination of Appeal B, the Council adopted the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites (WBLPP1). I have therefore determined the appeals on the basis of the WBLPP1 and saved policies from the Waverley Borough Local Plan of 2002 (LP).
6. On July 24<sup>th</sup> the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework (the revised Framework). The parties were given the opportunity to comment on the revisions before and at the Hearing. I have taken their responses into account in reaching my decision.
7. The Council refused both schemes for four reasons. The second, third and fourth of which related to the need for an appropriate legal agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing and other infrastructure, the need for which would be brought about by the development. Completed S106 agreements relating to both schemes were presented at the Hearing and on this basis the Council did not pursue its reasons for refusal in relation to a) provision of affordable housing; b) contributions towards education, environmental enhancements, play space, recycling and the maintenance and management of SuDS and public open spaces; and c) a programme of highway works. However, the appellant raised a number of concerns about the basis for some of the contributions. I therefore gave the parties additional time to address these matters and as a consequence completed Deeds of Variation were submitted after the Hearing. I will return to this matter later.

### **Main Issues**

8. I therefore consider the main issues in both appeals to be:
  - a) Whether the appeal site is suitable for the amount of residential development proposed, having regard to local and national planning policy for the delivery of housing, including the matter of housing land supply;
  - b) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside.

### **Reasons**

9. The appeal site is a large, irregular-shaped field extending to approximately 4.4 hectares and sub-divided by a conifer hedge. It occupies an area between Dunsfold Road and Alfold bypass (the A281) just outside the defined village boundary of Alfold Crossways. It is largely enclosed by mature vegetation along its boundaries. A tree belt along Green Lane, which is just beyond the site, provides enclosure along much of the site's northern boundary. The site also has shared boundaries with the gardens of adjacent residential development including Brockhurst Cottages, which is within the village boundary and Brockhurst Farm, Spinners and Yeomans Cottage, which are not. There is a single access in the form of a field gate providing access on to Dunsfold Road. For planning purposes the site is in the countryside.

10. The proposed dwellings would be built on the part of the site closest to Dunsfold Road, with the remainder being given over to be additional public open space. There would be a mix of houses, including a number of affordable units; 15 with the scheme for 39 dwellings (Appeal A) and 9 with the scheme for 23 houses (Appeal B). A new vehicular access would be provided from Dunsfold Road together with a new footpath along the eastern side of the road.

#### *Housing land supply*

11. The WBLPP1 is a recently adopted plan for the purposes of Paragraph 74 of the revised Framework and the associated footnote 38. From evidence provided by other recent appeal decisions following the plan's adoption it is clear that the Examining Inspector (EI) considered that there was a supply of 5.2 years at 1 April 2018. This was based on the requirement to provide 590 dwellings per annum with a 5% buffer which the EI determined to be the appropriate housing requirement for the area. These conclusions were arrived at following the consideration of detailed evidence at the examination.
12. I appreciate from the evidence submitted by the appellant that there is a significant element of doubt as to whether or not the allocations that have been agreed will be delivered in a timely fashion. There was some convincing data which suggested that the five-year land supply could be closer to three years than five. However, it is not the purpose of a Hearing to challenge the conclusions of the EI or the provisions of a development plan that has been adopted so recently. Whilst I am also aware that the plan is the subject of a challenge, at this time the WBLPP1 is the formerly adopted plan and it therefore carries full weight in my assessment of the appeal proposals.
13. In this situation the 'tilted balance', set out in Paragraph 11 (d) (ii) of the revised Framework does not apply and the appeals must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In coming to this view, I have also had regard to a series of decisions<sup>1</sup> by the Secretary of State for residential developments on sites around Farnham, each of which would have provided more than 100 dwellings. He determined that the tilted balance did not apply following the adoption of WBLPP1 and consequently dismissed those appeals contrary to the recommendations of his Inspectors.

#### *Location of development*

14. Within the WBLPP1 the villages of Alfold and Alford Crossways have been treated as one settlement for the purposes of establishing housing numbers, even though they have separately defined built-up area boundaries. Alfold as a whole is described as a small village with limited facilities. However, as it lies outside the Green Belt and the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), it has relatively few environmental constraints.
15. The spatial strategy set out in Policy SP2 of the WBLPP1 recognises that there is a limit to which sites within existing settlements can meet the borough's housing needs. It therefore accepts that some expansion will be necessary through the development of suitable sites on the edge of settlements. As part of this overall strategy some limited growth is proposed around the medium sized villages. Tightly drawn village boundaries, which were identified in the

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/R3650/W/15/3132971, APP/R3650/W/15/3139911 and APP/R3650/W/16/3152620

2002 Local Plan, will therefore need to be adjusted as Policy SP2 acknowledges that growth is likely to take place beyond them. The supporting text of Policy SP2 envisaged that the mechanisms for delivering this spatial strategy would be three-fold: a) Part 2 of the Local Plan, b) neighbourhood plans and c) decisions made on planning applications together with any subsequent policies and guidance. The Inspector who dismissed an appeal for a proposal of 97 dwellings at Farnham Park Hotel<sup>2</sup> was satisfied that the additional housing needed in Farnham would be allocated in Part 2 of the Local Plan, unless there was an early review of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan.

16. The Issues and Options consultation on Part 2 of the Local Plan was concluded in July. It proposed an amendment to the settlement boundary of Alfold Crossways to include a site which is currently being developed for 55 homes. However, it did not allocate any other sites for housing development within Alfold. The identification of other sites was considered to be a task for the neighbourhood plan. However, unlike the situation in Farnham, the neighbourhood plan for Alfold is at a very early stage in its development. Other than a call for sites, no progress has been made on this plan. Although the Council indicated that the appeal is not a preferred site for Part 2 of the Local Plan because more suitable sites have been found, no information about such sites was put before me.
17. Paragraph 50 of the revised Framework states that where a draft plan has yet to be submitted for examination, refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified. Furthermore, the Council did not provide any reasons as to why granting planning permission for a development on this site would prejudice the outcome of the plan-making process. In these circumstances, and having regard to the supporting text of Policy SP2 referred to above, it seems to me that the suitability of the appeal site for residential development must be determined on its individual planning merits.
18. Policy ALH1 of the WBPLPP1 sets out the housing allocations for each of a series of named settlements. The allocation for Alfold is a minimum of 125 dwellings. Appendix D of the plan indicates that there are commitments and completions within the village totalling 84 and therefore sites will be needed to make up the balance of at least 41 units. A development of 39 houses on the appeal site would ensure that the minimum allocation set out in Policy ALH1 was almost fully met, whereas the proposal for 23 would make a significant contribution towards its achievement. Neither scheme would result in an over-provision of housing within the village.
19. The Council's Land Availability Assessment (2014) suggested the appeal site could yield 32 dwellings. In 2016 this was revised downwards to 15 dwellings in recognition that the south western area of the site could offer potential by infilling and rounding off development on the Dunsfold Road frontage. I understand that this figure has subsequently been reduced to 5 dwellings. However, no evidence was provided as a basis for justifying this reduced figure.
20. Most of the existing development within Alfold Crossways is on either side of Loxwood Road. Only a small part extends into the area that is north of the junction with Horsham Road where it occupies the area between Dunsfold Road and the A281. A development on the appeal site would extend the built form

---

<sup>2</sup> APP/R3650/W/17/3178819

of the village on its northern edge. The site is just over 1km from the petrol station, which includes a convenience store, but the village post office is over 2km to the south. Children would need to be driven to the nearest schools which are outside the village at Cranleigh and Loxwood. Even though there is a footway along Loxwood Road, the lack of street lighting and the distances involved mean that there are few facilities within walking distance of the site, although it is close to the village hall and recreation ground.

21. However, any site on the edge of the village will be similarly related to day-to-day facilities and services. It is therefore likely that future residents will primarily rely on private car travel to get around, due to the lack of convenient alternatives and the distances they will have to travel. I note that the Council's Sustainability Report 2016 suggested that green field sites around settlements such as Alfold should be the final location in which to deliver growth. Nevertheless, the WBLPP1 still allocated a housing requirement of at least 125 dwellings to the village.
22. Taking all these factors into account, I conclude that the appeal site would be a suitable location for a residential development. It would not conflict with the Council's spatial strategy as set out in Policies SP2 and ALH1 of the WBLPP1, both of which identify Alfold as a parish that should accommodate a limited amount of growth which is likely to take place outside existing settlement boundaries. It would also accord with the revised Framework's objective of significantly boosting housing supply (Paragraph 55) and doing so on a medium sized site which could be built-out relatively quickly (Paragraph 68).

#### *Character and appearance of the countryside*

23. Policy RE1 of the WBLPP1 states that beyond the Green Belt the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside will be recognised and safeguarded in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
24. The site is not covered by any national landscape designation. Neither is it within or adjacent to any of the areas with local landscape designations. It is therefore not a 'valued landscape' in the terms set out in Paragraph 170 of the revised Framework. The site lies within an area identified as landscape type: Wooded Low Weald. The Dunsfold to Pollingfold Wooded Low Weald Character Area has a more open appearance, characterised by larger fields and fewer woodland blocks than other parts of the Wooded Low Weald. As the appeal site is smaller than some of the surrounding fields, is enclosed and does not include woodland, it is not typical of the landscape beyond its northern boundary.
25. The appeal site is visually well contained. There are no long distance views into it due to the surrounding mature hedgerows and substantial tree belt on its northern edge. The coniferous hedges which enclose and bisect the site are not part of the historic landscape pattern and are incongruous features. Furthermore, the site's proximity to the A281 reduces any sense of remoteness or tranquillity. All these factors indicate that the appeal site is unremarkable and makes only a minor contribution to the character of the wider landscape and countryside.
26. Either of the proposals would result in the loss of a section of open, undeveloped countryside. Even though the visual impact on the wider landscape would be limited, the introduction of houses would reduce the sense of openness in the immediate locality. However, I am not persuaded that the

intrinsic character and beauty of the wider countryside would be unduly harmed by either of the schemes. Both proposals would dedicate part of the site as public open space which would be managed. The introduction of enhanced landscaping and ecological improvements would safeguard the rural character of the area for the long term. The open space would also create an effective buffer between the northern end of the village and the open countryside beyond. The critical difference between the two schemes is the precise extent of the developable area.

#### *Appeal A*

27. Appeal A would introduce buildings into an area between the northern corner of Vintners large garden across to the eastern most boundary of Spinners. This would represent an encroachment of development well beyond both the existing development and the currently defined village boundary. In my view the illustrative layout shown on Drawing No 16.011.09 Rev F would fail to have sufficient regard to the form and layout of the existing development at Brockhurst Cottages. This adjacent development is within the built-up area of the village and is distinctly different in character to the scattered dwellings that are to be found in the outlying area. The extent of developable area within Appeal A, shown on Drawing No 16.011.010 Rev G, would also significantly restrict the amount of the site which would be retained as open space. In my view the result would be a disproportionate scale of development that would be harmful to the appearance of the site and its immediate surroundings.
28. I therefore conclude that the extent of the developable area in Appeal A would give rise to an unacceptable degree of harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, contrary to Policy RE1 of the WBLPP1.

#### *Appeal B*

29. The illustrative layout for Appeal B, shown on Drawing No 16.011.009 Rev L shows that the built form would approximately align with the rear of buildings to the rear of Brockhurst Cottages and the midpoint of the rear boundary of Spinners. This would enable the new residential development to be effectively integrated into the existing surrounding built form. The extent of the developable area, shown on Drawing No 16.011.010 Rev I, would respect the existing village boundary and would enable a good sized portion of the site to be retained as open space. The introduction of buildings into the south-western part of the site would be offset by the high degree of protection that would be afforded to the remainder of the site, which would be safeguarded as accessible open space within the countryside. In my view the proposal strikes an appropriate balance between the proportion of the site that would be developed and that which would be left open.
30. I therefore conclude that the extent of the developable area within Appeal B would result in only limited harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Consequently, conflict with Policy RE1 carries little weight in the overall balance.

### **Planning obligations**

31. Planning obligations, incorporating Deeds of Variation, have been provided for both appeals. The agreements are between the land owner, the appellant (Cove Construction Ltd), Waverley Borough Council and Surrey County Council.

They both include contributions towards community facilities (for play space equipment and the extension of Alfold Cemetery), early years education, primary education, highway improvements and sustainable transport vouchers. Each contribution was supported by a justification statement.

32. I am satisfied that these obligations meet the tests set out in the Framework and comply with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations. I have therefore taken them into account in my decisions.

### **Planning Balance**

33. The Government is seeking to significantly boost the supply of homes by ensuring a sufficient amount of land comes forward where it is needed. Paragraph 15 of the revised Framework states that the planning system should be genuinely plan-led. On the evidence before me, the WBLPP1 is up-to-date for the purposes of demonstrating that the Council has a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, notwithstanding doubts that were expressed by the appellant. However, the spatial strategy acknowledges that it will not be possible to accommodate the necessary growth within existing development boundaries.
34. Policy ALH1 of the WBLPP1 has set a minimum housing requirement for Alfold. As no sites have been allocated in the draft of Part 2 of the Local Plan, the Council appears to be relying on the neighbourhood plan to identify suitable sites. However, this plan has barely got off the starting blocks. The only other means of selecting sites is making decisions on planning applications, such as those which are before me. Neither of the appeal proposals would result in an over-provision of housing within Alfold. The determining factor in each case is therefore whether or not any harm that I have identified is outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.

### *Appeal A*

35. The provision of 39 additional homes would give rise to economic benefits in the form of short term employment opportunities during construction. Additional expenditure by future residents in the locality would be limited by the lack of locally based facilities within Alfold. The overall economic benefits of the scheme would therefore be modest, particularly as the Council is able to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing.
36. From what I have read it is apparent that there is a considerable need for affordable housing across the Borough. Provision of 15 units of affordable housing would therefore be a social benefit associated with this scheme; a factor that also weighs in the scheme's favour.
37. However, I found that Appeal A would give rise to unacceptable harm to the environment. This would result from the extent of its encroachment into countryside beyond the built-up area boundary and its failure to respect the layout and extent of the existing development within the village. This harm would not be offset by the provision of public open space and other associated environmental improvements.
38. In my view, this environmental harm would outweigh the modest social and economic benefits of Appeal A. I therefore conclude that appeal A is unacceptable.

### *Appeal B*

39. The provision of 23 additional homes and the additional expenditure by future residents would result in limited economic benefits, having regard to the Council's housing supply position. The scheme would provide 9 units of affordable housing. This would be a modest social benefit and weighs in the scheme's favour.
40. I found that Appeal B would give rise to only limited harm to the countryside as the extent of the developed area would respect the surrounding pattern of development. The provision of the public open space, additional landscaping and ecological improvements would largely offset the harm arising from the extension of the village into the countryside.
41. In the absence of significant harm to the environment, the modest social and economic benefits that would arise from the provision of additional homes, including those which would be affordable, tip the balance in favour of granting planning permission for Appeal B.

### **Conditions**

42. Lists of conditions relating to both schemes were presented and discussed at the Hearing. I have considered and imposed those that are relevant to Appeal B having regard to the tests set out in Paragraph 55 of the revised Framework. I have amended the wording where necessary for the sake of clarity, precision and the avoidance of repetition.
43. Conditions imposing standard time limits and requiring approval of the reserved matters are required when granting outline planning permission. These should reflect the extent of the developable area shown on the submitted drawings and which provided the basis for my assessment of the scheme. A condition specifying the plans approved at this stage and which identifies the developable area is therefore essential to provide certainty.
44. A condition requiring implementation and maintenance of the landscaping scheme approved as part of the reserved matters is essential to protect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. A materials condition is necessary in the interests of the appearance of the development. Conditions to secure agreement to a surface water drainage scheme and its subsequent implementation is required to reduce the flood risk. Similarly, completion of facilities to accommodate foul drainage is necessary to protect the environment.
45. In order to ensure highway safety and protect the living conditions of neighbours, appropriate management of the site operations during construction is necessary. This can be secured by agreement to a construction management plan. In order to preserve any archaeological remains, an appropriate programme of works is required.
46. Before any of the dwellings are occupied it is necessary to provide space for vehicles to park and turn around, electric charging points, secure parking for bicycles and to provide new residents with a welcome pack giving details of local facilities and public transport services.



## Conclusions

47. I conclude that Appeal A is contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, Appeal A should be dismissed.
48. In the case of Appeal B, I conclude that although there is limited conflict with the development plan arising from the site's countryside location, there are material considerations that outweigh the harm I have identified. Therefore, Appeal B should be allowed, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule of Conditions.

*Sheila Holden*

INSPECTOR

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE APPELLANT

James Corbett Burcher	Counsel
David Murray-Cox BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI	Associate Director, Turley
Richard Henshaw BA(Hons) Bpl MRTPI	Director of Land and Planning – Intelligent Land
Joanna Ede BA(Hons) DipLD CMLI	Director, Head of Landscape and VIA, Turley

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Sue Field	WS Planning and Architecture
Kevin Deanus	Councillor for Waverley Borough and ward member for Alfold

## DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT AND AFTER THE HEARING

- 1 Note on planning obligations (prepared by appellant)
- 2 Extracts from WBLPP1 (final version of adopted policies)
- 3 Copy of A3 to the Landscape Statement of Joanna Ede – printed at A3
- 4 Separate List of conditions agreed by the parties for both appeals
- 5 Plan showing the village boundaries of Alfold and Alfold Crossways
- 6 Section 106 obligations for both appeals dated 4 September 2018

## Schedule of Conditions

- 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 and 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 shall take place not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The reserved matters submitted in accordance with Condition 1 shall be in accordance with the extent of the developable area shown on the following approved plans 16.011.001 Revision D, 16.011.009 Revision L, 16.011.010 Revision I, 096.0002.003 Revision E, 096.0002.004 Revision A and COVE20586-01A.
- 5) The landscaping works which have previously been submitted and approved pursuant to Condition 1 shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the agreed details in the first planting and seeding seasons after commencement of the development or as otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Following occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
- 6) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
  - a. a programme of works including measures for traffic management;
  - b. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
  - c. loading and unloading of plant and materials;
  - d. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
  - e. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding behind any visibility zones, including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
  - f. measures to prevent deposit of material on the highway;
  - g. wheel washing facilities;
  - h. highway condition surveys to be undertaken before and after construction and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused;
  - i. on-site turning facilities for construction vehicles;
  - j. routes to be used by construction vehicles to and from the site;
  - k. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;

- l. measures to minimise the noise (including vibration) generated by the construction process to include hours of work, proposed method for piling foundations, the selection of plant and machinery and the use of noise mitigation barriers;
- m. all plant, machinery and equipment installed and operated during the construction period shall be enclosed or attenuated so that the rating level of noise emitted does not exceed the background sound level, when measured according to British Standard BS4142:2014 at any adjoining or nearby noise sensitive premises;
- n. details of any floodlighting, including location, height, type and direction of light sources and intensity of illumination.
- o. no floodlights or other forms of external lighting shall be installed during construction without the prior written approval of the local planning authority;
- p. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
- q. no burning of waste or any other materials on the site;
- r. delivery, demolition and construction working hours.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

- 7) No development shall take place until details of the layout of internal roads, footpaths, footways, and cycle routes have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details should include visibility splays for all road users, crossing points, turning areas, required signage and road markings. The layout shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted.
- 8) No development shall take place until full details of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Those details shall include:
  - a) A design that satisfies the SuDS hierarchy and is compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the revised Framework;
  - b) Evidence, including detailed calculations, that the proposed solution will effectively manage the associated discharge rates and storage volumes for the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 year rainfall events including consideration of the allowances for climate change storm events, throughout all stages of the development (pre, post and during);
  - c) Details of management and maintenance regimes and responsibilities;
  - d) Long and cross sectional drawings of each SuDs element;
  - e) A finalised drainage layout plan;
  - f) A construction phase plan;
  - g) An exceedance flow plan.

- 9) No development shall take place until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 10) No development above ground level shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 11) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be first occupied until its respective car parking space/s, and any required turning facilities, have been laid out in accordance with a scheme previously submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the parking and turning areas shall be retained for their designated purpose.
- 12) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be first occupied unless and until the following facilities have been provided for that dwelling:
  - a) Secure parking of bicycles within the development site;
  - b) An electric vehicle charging point;
  - c) A travel plan welcome pack to include information relating to provision of local public transport, walking, cycling, local shops, schools and community facilities.
- 13) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be first occupied until confirmation has been provided and approved in writing by the local planning authority that either: all waste water network upgrades to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed; or a housing and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to permit any dwelling to be occupied.
- 14) The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the recommendations set out in the Ecological Impact Assessment Report by EPR dated October 2017: including those in Section 4 'Impact Assessment and Mitigation' and Section 5 'Residual Impacts, Compensation and Enhancement'.

**End of Schedule of Conditions**