



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held between 25 and 27 September 2018

Site visit made on 27 September 2018

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th November 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R3325/W/18/3197690 **Land west of Stalbridge Road, Henstridge**

- 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 South Somerset District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/03029/OUT, dated 18 July 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2018.
 - The development proposed is up to 130 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system and vehicular access point from Woodhayes Way.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for up to 130 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system and vehicular access point from Woodhayes Way at land west of Stalbridge Road, Henstridge in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/03029/OUT, dated 18 July 2017, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Procedural matters

2. The application is for outline permission with details of means of access submitted for approval and all other matters reserved. A Development Framework Plan has been submitted which illustrates a possible layout and I shall consider that plan on this basis.
3. Before the inquiry opened, the Council advised that it did not wish to defend its third reason for refusal concerning drainage and flooding. Consequently I shall not consider this as a main issue.
4. The Council and the appellant had also reached agreement regarding highway safety matters and the Council advised that it wishes to withdraw its second reason for refusal. This is subject to imposition of a condition requiring improvements to footway provision in the village. These works are shown on a plan submitted by the appellant but the appellant questions the need for them. I shall deal with this as a main issue.
5. Following the closing of the Inquiry, on 26 October 2018 the Government launched a consultation on proposals to update planning practice guidance on housing need assessment. Further comments were provided by both main parties on that consultation document.

Main Issues

6. The main issues in the appeal are:
- i) whether or not the proposal accords with planning policies for the location of housing development;
 - ii) the accessibility of the proposal to services, facilities and employment opportunities by sustainable means; and
 - iii) the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

Planning policies for the location of housing development

7. The appeal site forms an area of open land which adjoins the built up area of Henstridge on its southern side. There is housing development off Woodhayes Way which is to the immediate north of the site. The eastern part of the site extends up to the A357 Stalbridge Road. Along that road there are dwellings which are mainly along its eastern frontage with a smaller number on its western side.
8. Policy SS1 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2015) (LP) identifies the settlement strategy of the plan. Within that strategy Henstridge is a Rural Settlement and at the lowest level in the hierarchy. These settlements are to be considered as part of the countryside to which national countryside protection policies apply. National policy allows for some housing development in the countryside but this is restricted. Policy SS1 refers to exceptions which are identified in Policy SS2 of the LP.
9. Policy SS2 states that development in Rural Settlements is to be strictly controlled. Housing development is to be limited to that which meets identified housing need. Development should be commensurate with the scale and character of the settlement. It should have access to two or more of the services listed in paragraph 5.41 of the LP and should have the support of the local community.
10. The proposal would provide for 35% affordable housing, with the tenures split between 80% social rented housing and 20% intermediate housing. Although it has not been demonstrated that specific needs of the village would be met the proposal would provide for more than the 7 intermediate dwellings and 12 social rented dwellings that were identified as being needed in the Parish Council's survey. This being the case however, the proposal would greatly exceed the scale of development that would be necessary to meet identified housing need.
11. The scale of the proposal relative to that of the village would be significant but the Council does not allege that there would be any harm to the character and appearance of the area. Up to 130 dwellings would be added to a current total of about 695 dwellings. This level of growth would exceed the housing requirements set out in Policy SS5 of the LP for all but one of the Rural Centres which are above Rural Settlements in the hierarchy. Considered in these terms the proposal would not be commensurate with the scale of the village.
12. Furthermore the proposal does not have the support of the community as evidenced by the representations that have been made by interested parties.

The Parish Plan¹ does not support substantial further housing. In these respects the proposal would not accord with Policy SS2 of the LP.

13. Notwithstanding these considerations however the village has seven of the eight services listed in paragraph 5.41 of the LP, including a primary school, a shop with post office, two public houses, a village hall, a recreation area and a church. There is no health centre but the village greatly exceeds the minimum requirement of Policy SS2 for two of the listed services.
14. Although in terms of the level of local services the proposal would accord with Policy SS2 of the LP, for the reasons given above, considered overall the proposal would not accord with that policy. On this basis the proposal would also not accord with Policy SS1 of the LP.
15. Policy SS5 of the LP provides the total housing requirement and its distribution. The overall requirement is for at least 15,950 dwellings of which 2,242 dwellings or 14% of the total are to be in Rural Settlements. Policy SS5 requires the distribution of development across the settlement hierarchy to be in line with the numbers set out in the policy. At the present time, just over halfway through the plan period, a greater amount of housing has been provided in the Rural Settlements than the number set out in the policy. This currently stands at 16.8% of the total.
16. Any exceedance of the figure identified for Rural Settlements in that policy would not necessarily conflict with it as the overall figure is expressed as a minimum. The higher than planned provision in the Rural Settlements to date coupled with lower provision in Yeovil are of concern to the Council in terms of the distribution strategy. However the increased proportion of homes built in Rural Settlements to date is slight. The Council advised that it is working with developers to overcome constraints in respect of large-scale developments in the urban areas. Applications for those developments are expected in the near future. There is no evidence before me to demonstrate that the proposal would prejudice the achievement of such developments or that the distribution strategy over the rest of the plan period would be seriously compromised.
17. While I do not find there to be conflict with Policy SS5 in terms of housing numbers and their distribution, the policy requires provision in accordance with the policy on development in rural settlements. As I have found that the proposal would be in conflict with Policy SS2 it would also be in conflict with Policy SS5 in this respect. I conclude on this main issue that the proposal would not accord with development plan policies for the location of housing development.

Housing Land Supply

18. It is common ground between the main parties that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The supply currently stands at about 4 years' worth. On this basis Policies SS1 and SS2, in as far as they concern housing development, and Policy SS5 are out-of-date. This triggers the application of paragraph 11(d) of the Framework which provides that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts would

¹ Henstridge, Yenston and Bowden Parish Plan Spring 2015

significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework as a whole.

Accessibility

19. As well as the village services there are public transport services which provide access to other centres including Yeovil. The timings and frequency of those services are limited but they nonetheless enable wider travel by sustainable means. In addition to buses there are rail services at Templecombe which is a short distance away. There are sources of employment nearby at Henstridge Airfield and Marsh Lane as well as at Stalbridge. Cycling to those destinations would be possible. In these respects the site is reasonably well located in terms of its accessibility by sustainable means.
20. The level of out-commuting from Henstridge at the present time is higher than the average for the district as a whole and it is possible that this level may increase as a result of the proposal. However figures provided by the Council also demonstrate that the proportion of people working from home in Henstridge is higher than the district average. The nearest doctor's surgery which is in Stalbridge is due to close and residents will have to travel further afield to access health services. It is likely that the car would be the predominant form of transport for the residents of the development but nonetheless travel to services, facilities and employment opportunities by sustainable means would still be likely to account for a significant proportion of journeys.

Highway Safety

21. Following the Council's decision the appellant submitted further information to the Council to demonstrate that the highway network has sufficient capacity to accommodate traffic from the development. This includes assessment of traffic that would arise from schemes proposed in Stalbridge which are in the area of North Dorset District Council. The appellant has also submitted schemes for improvement of pedestrian facilities along the A357 in Henstridge and on Furge Grove. The Council is now satisfied that the proposal would not be harmful to highway safety subject to provision of those improvements. The appellant questions whether the improvements to pedestrian facilities are necessary however. The highway authority did not require such provision and neither was a need for this identified in the Access/Safety Review undertaken for the Council.²
22. Pedestrian access from the development to the village facilities would be either via the A357 High Street, which offers the most direct route or via Furge Grove and Church Street. The former route is along the main road and although there are footways along that road, there is a section which has no footways. Along this section there are houses whose front doors open directly onto the road. There is a marked zone of about 0.6m in width along the front of those buildings but this is not wide enough for safe pedestrian access. Although pedestrians use that route at present they do so with care and it is likely that many, including parents accompanying children to and from the primary school will use the alternative route along Furge Grove and Church Street. Those roads only have partial footways and for most of that route there are no footways. However traffic volumes are much lighter than those on the main

² Road Safety Audit Access/Safety Review 6 September 2018

- road, speeds are low and there is sufficient width to accommodate pedestrians and traffic.
23. The scheme of pedestrian improvements would include provision of a footway of 1.8m width along High Street to the north of its junction with Marsh Lane. As this would narrow the carriageway to a single lane the scheme includes new traffic signals to ensure one-way traffic through that section of the road. This scheme would provide for continuous pedestrian access through the village. The appellant also proposes a new footway on part of Furge Grove, which could be accommodated without reducing the carriageway width. While much of Furge Grove and Church Street would remain without footways, pedestrian safety on that route would be improved.
 24. Promotion of walking is part of the Government's drive to raise the quality of life through the creation of sustainable communities.³ It is important to maximise opportunities for walking between the proposed development and the village facilities and the pedestrian improvement works would help to achieve this. The works are necessary in the interest of ensuring pedestrian safety and enabling sustainable travel to support local facilities. Policy TA5 of the LP requires new development to address its own transport implications and to maximise the potential for sustainable transport. The pedestrian improvement works would be necessary to ensure the proposal accords with that policy.
 25. The visibility splays on both sides of the junction of the new access road with Woodhayes Way would be in accordance with the distances recommended in Manual for Streets.⁴ However as parking takes place on Woodhayes Way, parked vehicles may obstruct those visibility splays. The highway authority had no objection to the proposal subject to conditions requiring that there is no obstruction to the visibility splays.
 26. The national policy tests for conditions⁵ require that conditions are reasonable and enforceable. It would not be within the appellant's power to control parking on the highway and therefore such a condition would not be reasonable or enforceable. Other powers are available to the highway authority to restrict on-street parking through a Traffic Regulation Order if considered necessary. There are also legislative powers to prevent the unlawful obstruction of junctions.⁶
 27. Because of the curvature of Woodhayes Way on both sides of the proposed junction, visibility is available over greater distances than the splays shown on the plan. While parked vehicles may obstruct the splays, it is likely that drivers emerging from the junction would be able to see past them. This would not accord with the highway authority's standards but nonetheless I find that rigid application of the standards in this case would go beyond what is necessary to ensure highway safety.
 28. Furthermore, it is likely that traffic speeds on Woodhayes Way are low because of the curvature of the road and the presence of parked vehicles reducing the carriageway width. Existing traffic flows on that road and those likely to arise from the development have been demonstrated by the appellant to be light.

³ See Department for Transport LTN 1/04 – Policy, Planning and Design for Walking and Cycling

⁴ 2.4m x 43m as recommended in Table 7.1 of Manual for Streets

⁵ paragraph 55 of the Framework

⁶ Highways Act 1980 and the Road Traffic Act 1988

The team undertaking the Access/Safety Review for the Council observed no access or safety issues from the proposed access junction.

29. For these reasons I find that the proposed new access junction would not adversely affect highway safety in the absence of conditions restricting parking within the visibility splays.
30. I have taken into account the concerns expressed in the Parish Plan regarding on-street parking in the village. The layout of the development is not a matter before me but this can be controlled at reserved matters stage to ensure that adequate off-street parking facilities are provided within the development. I conclude on this main issue that the proposal would not be unacceptably harmful to highway safety.

Other Matters

31. The Council has withdrawn its reason for refusal concerning drainage but interested parties remain concerned about this matter. Surface water drains across the site via a drainage channel and flows through a culvert under the A357. At times of heavy rainfall there have been instances of flooding both on the road and to the east of the road, affecting residential properties. The proposed development would increase impermeable areas and thus surface water run-off but this would be controlled and limited through provision of sustainable drainage measures. A management and maintenance plan for the sustainable drainage system could be required by a condition to ensure the system is properly maintained. The appellant states that the proposed drainage works would provide betterment in terms of reducing the risk of localised flooding.
32. Concern has been expressed about tannery waste having been previously deposited in a former quarry near the site. Ground conditions have been investigated in the Phase 1 Environmental Report which does not reveal any specific source of contamination close to the site. Furthermore the Council's Environmental Health Officer raised no objection to the application.
33. Reports have been provided which demonstrate that there would be no detrimental effect on foul drainage and that there would be no significant effect on air quality during construction. The agricultural land that would be lost is not best and most versatile land. I have taken into account other matters which have been raised including low water pressure. Those matters do not alter my conclusions on the main issues.

The Unilateral Undertaking

34. The Unilateral Undertaking (UU) provides two options for payment of a contribution towards primary education. Alternatively, if I find that the contribution would not be necessary then this provision of the UU would not have effect. Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (the CIL Regulations) requires that planning obligations meet three tests. These include that the obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
35. The local catchment area primary school is St Nicholas C of E Primary School which is in Henstridge. The population forecast for that school shows that it will have 33 spare places in 2019, rising to 49 spare places in 2022. These figures are consistent with those for the Wincanton School Planning Area which

show declining primary school pupil numbers and increasing capacity in the catchment area over that period.

36. Following the County Council's original response to the planning application in which it requested a contribution towards primary education provision, it has received updated information regarding pupil product ratios from new developments in Somerset.⁷ It also provided updated information on build costs for new school accommodation in relation to pupil numbers. The County Council presented this updated information to the Inquiry to support its request for an increased level of financial contribution from that originally requested.
37. This evidence justifies the calculation used in the revised request in that it uses up-to-date figures. On the basis of the latest pupil product ratios the development would generate 42 children of primary school age. It would take some time for all of those school places to be needed however because of the requirement for approval of reserved matters and the time it would take to build out the development. It would be unlikely that a need for 42 pupil places would arise at the same time. The school would have more than adequate capacity to accommodate the children from the development when the places are required. On this basis I find that the primary education contribution as set out in paragraph 1.1.43 of the UU would not meet the tests in Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations.
38. I find that the other provisions of the UU in terms of early years' facilities, affordable housing, provision and maintenance of open space facilities and a Travel Plan meet the tests in Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations. In particular a contribution towards Early Years' facilities would be needed as a result of the development, the affordable housing provision would accord with the requirements of Policy HG3 of the LP and there is an identified need arising from the proposal for the open space facilities specified in the UU. The Travel Plan is necessary to encourage travel by sustainable means. The UU would also accord with Regulation 123 of the CIL Regulations which restricts the pooling of infrastructure contributions.

Overall Balance

39. Given that there is less than a 5 year supply of housing land in the district the proposal would be of benefit in helping to address that shortfall. There is a particular acute need for affordable housing and the proposal would make a significant contribution in this regard. I have found that the site is reasonably accessible to local services and facilities. All of these factors weigh significantly in favour of the proposal.
40. Construction jobs would be generated and there would be associated expenditure in the local economy. The residents of the new dwellings would support local businesses through their expenditure. Although the economic benefits arising during the construction period would be temporary, these considerations attract significant weight.
41. The sustainable drainage scheme would be designed to reduce the possibility of localised flooding. This would provide a further benefit to which I give moderate weight.

⁷ Pupil Product Ratio Study for Somerset County Council by Cognisant Research

42. The proposal would not accord with development plan policies for the location of housing but those policies are out-of-date on the basis of the lack of housing land supply. The policies require housing to be in line with the distribution strategy. That strategy limits provision in Rural Settlements where local services are likely to be limited and there would be high reliance on the private car for transport. I have found that the proposal would not prejudice the overall distribution strategy and that it would have a reasonable degree of accessibility by sustainable means of transport. Any harmful effects in these respects would be limited. For these reasons I give limited weights to the conflict with the development plan and to the harms identified. Those limited weights are not sufficient to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the significant and moderate weights that I have given to the benefits of the proposal.

Conditions

43. I have imposed the conditions as suggested by the main parties with the exception of those concerning obstruction of the visibility splays, for the reasons given above. It is necessary to ensure that development takes place in accordance with the approved plans including the provision of the new access as shown in order to provide certainty and to ensure highway safety. There is a scheme for a proposed new footpath along Stalbridge Road, part of which would pass through the site. A condition allowing for that provision would be necessary in the interest of providing pedestrian accessibility towards Stalbridge.
44. There are existing trees and hedgerows within and around the site which would be retained in the interest of biodiversity. I have included a condition requiring their protection during construction works. A condition requiring provision of sustainable drainage measures is necessary to ensure that drainage is controlled and that localised flooding is avoided. A construction management plan is required in order to ensure that the living conditions of local residents are protected and that highway safety is not adversely affected during the construction period.
45. I have found that the pedestrian improvement works shown on the plans would be necessary in the interest of highway safety and accessibility and have imposed a condition accordingly. In doing so I note that adequate pedestrian provision on Furge Grove may be secured by another development on that road which appeared to be underway at the time of my visit. However in the absence of those works and to avoid uncertainty I have included this requirement in the condition. The proposed works include tactile paving on High Street which the Council's Access/Safety Review advised would be necessary. Finally it is necessary to include a condition requiring the mitigation measures set out in the Ecological Impact Assessment to be carried out in order to safeguard biodiversity.

Conclusion

46. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Thea Osmund-Smith of Counsel instructed by Richard Lomas of Gladman Developments Ltd

She called

| | |
|---|---|
| Richard Lomas BSc (Hons), DipTP, MRTPI | Planning Manager, Gladman Developments Ltd |
| Nigel Weeks MSc, BSc, F.Con.Eng | Technical Director, Stirling Maynard Transportation |
| Matthew Travis BSc (Hons), MSc, C.WEM, M.CIWEM, CSci, C.Env | Director, Enzygo Ltd |
| Megan Pashley | Gladman Developments Ltd |

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Philip Robson of Counsel instructed by the Solicitor to South Somerset District Council

He called

| | |
|--|--|
| James McKechnie BA (Hons), PGDip, FCIHT, CMILT | Transportation Divisional Director, Hydrock Consultants Ltd |
| Joanna Manley BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI | Specialist (Strategic Planning), South Somerset District Council |
| Frances Gully BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI | Corporate Property Estates and Planning Advisor, Somerset County Council |
| Sarah Hickey | Solicitor, South Somerset District Council |
| Marc Dorfman | Planning Officer, South Somerset District Council |

INTERESTED PARTIES

| | |
|---------------|---------------------------|
| Ken Courtenay | Henstridge Parish Council |
| Paul Dimishky | A357 Action Group |
| Hayward Burt | District Councillor |

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| William Wallace | District and County Councillor |
| Andrew Smulian | Local resident |
| Deanna Coates | Local resident |
| Adrian Gaymer | Local resident |
| Terence Padfield | Local resident |
| Christopher Savage | Local resident |
| Katie Jillians | Local resident |
| Deborah Petheram | Local resident |
| Peter Oswick | Local resident |
| Peter Thompson | Local resident |
| Richard Kidd | Local resident |

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE INQUIRY:

- 1 Opening statement on behalf of the appellant
- 2 Plan Ref. 4746-53-02A
- 3 Plan Ref. P17033-06-01E
- 4 Planning obligation
- 5 Land west of Stalbridge Road, Henstridge – Early Years and Primary Education Impact Rebuttal
- 6 Planning Approvals in Rural Settlements
- 7 Henstridge and South Somerset – Method of Travel to Work
- 8 Travel Statement for residential development at Furge Lane – Hydrock
- 9 Access/Safety Review for Hydrock/South Somerset District Council 6 September 2018
- 10 Pupil Product Ratio Study for Somerset County Council
- 11 E-mail correspondence between Frances Gully and Richard Lomas
- 12 E-mail from Frances Gully dated 27 September 2018
- 13 Statement of Common Ground
- 14 Schedule of Agreed Conditions
- 15 Statement by Ken Courtenay
- 16 Statement by Paul Dimishky
- 17 Design Statement for the Village of Henstridge 2001

- 18 Henstridge, Yenston and Bowden Parish Plan Spring 2015
- 19 Endorsement of Henstridge, Yenston and Bowden Parish Plan (Executive Decision)
- 20 Closing submissions on behalf of the Council
- 21 Closing submissions on behalf of the appellant

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER INQUIRY:

- 22 Cherkley Campaign Limited v Mole Valley District Council (2014) EWCA Civ 567
- 23 Supplementary Representations by Gladman Developments Ltd
- 24 Further representations by South Somerset District Council

Richborough Estates

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 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: CSA/3228/109A.
- 5) The proposed access shall be constructed generally in accordance with details shown on plan number 4746-53-02A, shall be available for use before first occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) No development shall take place on land edged red as shown on approved plan ref. CSA/3228/109A which may be required to facilitate the provision of a footpath link running parallel to the A357 as shown on Somerset County Council's plan Ref. T1004127-HW-002.
- 7) No development or site preparation works shall take place until a scheme of tree and hedgerow protection measures has been prepared in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 and submitted to the local planning authority for approval. The approved protection measures shall thereafter be installed and made ready for inspection by the local planning authority's Tree Officer prior to any commencement of development. The approved protection requirements shall remain implemented in their entirety for the duration of the construction period and may only be moved or dismantled with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority.
- 8) No development shall take place until details of the surface water drainage scheme based on sustainable drainage principles together with a programme of implementation and maintenance for the lifetime of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage strategy shall ensure that surface water run-off is attenuated on site and discharged at a rate and volume no greater than greenfield run-off rates and volumes. The approved works shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved programme and details.

The details shall include:

- details of phasing (where appropriate) and maintenance of drainage systems during construction of all phases.
- Information about the design storm period and intensity, discharge rates and volumes both before and after development, temporary storage facilities, means of access for maintenance (6m minimum), the methods to be used to delay and control surface water discharged from the site and measures to prevent

- flooding and pollution of receiving groundwater and/or surface waters.
- Any works required off-site to ensure adequate discharge of surface water without causing flooding or pollution (which should include refurbishment of existing culverts and headwalls or removal of unused culverts where relevant). The details shall demonstrate that there will be no detrimental effect downstream from any upgrading of the culvert beneath Stalbridge Road, or if this is not feasible, discharge rates and volumes shall be restricted to meet the capacity of the existing culvert.
 - Flood water exceedance routes both on and off the site. No part of the site shall be allowed to flood during any storm up to and including the 1 in 30 event. Flooding during storm events in excess of this including the 1 in 100 year (plus 40% allowance for climate change) shall be controlled by limiting this to the designed exceedance routes which shall be demonstrated to prevent flooding or damage to properties.
 - A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, management company or maintenance by a Residents' Management Company and/or any other arrangements to secure the operation and maintenance to an approved standard and working condition throughout the lifetime of the development.
- 9) No development shall take place until a construction management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall include details of the hours of operation, routes to be used by construction vehicles, their expected number per day, delivery hours, vehicle parking for contractors, specific measures to be adopted to mitigate impacts arising from construction in accordance with the Environmental Code of Construction Practice and a scheme to encourage the use of public transport by contractors. The approved plan shall be adhered to fully at all times throughout the construction period.
- 10) No development shall take place until a scheme for pedestrian improvements has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before any dwelling hereby permitted is occupied and shall be retained thereafter. The submitted scheme shall have regard to the following:
- i) dropped kerbs and tactile paving at the following junctions:
 - Woodhayes Way/A357 Stalbridge Road
 - Woodhayes/Townsend Green
 - Woodhayes/Bugle Court
 - Woodhayes (Marlstone Court)
 - Woodhayes/Furge Lane
 - Furge Lane opposite Furge Grove;
 - ii) installation of Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD) Sign Dig. 544.1 Pedestrians in Road Ahead plus distance plate (380 yds) signs at the following locations:

- Junction Furge Lane/Furge Grove
 - Junction Church Street/A357; and
- iii) a signal-controlled priority arrangement along A357 High Street including footway provision, appropriate signage and tactile paving at Furge Lane/Marsh Lane generally in accordance with plan Ref. P17033-06-01E.
- 11) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a footway of 1.8m minimum width has been provided on Furge Grove between its junction with Furge Lane and the existing footway to the north on Furge Grove. The retained carriageway width shall be no less than the existing carriageway width.
- 12) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures recommended in the Ecological Impact Assessment by CSA Environmental dated June 2017.

Richborough Estates