



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 23, 24 and 25 July 2013

Site visit made on 25 July 2013

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

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

Decision date: 13 August 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/A/13/2194904

**Land off Mistletoe Row, Oldwood Road, Tenbury Wells,
Worcestershire, WR15 8XA**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Kensington and Edinburgh Estates/WM Housing Group against Malvern Hills District Council.
 - The application Ref 12/00876/OUT, dated 8 June 2012, was refused by the Council by notice dated 5 April 2013
 - The development proposed is outline application comprising a residential development of 44 dwellings (including 18 affordable dwellings), public open space together with associated roads and parking. Access taken from existing access off Oldwood Road. Replacement field access.
-

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant outline planning permission for a residential development of 44 dwellings (including 18 affordable dwellings), public open space together with associated roads and parking. Access taken from existing access off Oldwood Road. Replacement field access, at Land off Mistletoe Row, Oldwood Road, Tenbury Wells, Worcestershire, WR15 8XA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 12/00876/OUT, dated 8 June 2012, subject to conditions 1) to 16) on the attached schedule.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was in outline with all matters reserved except access. The access for general use is onto the existing Mistletoe Row development, a rural exception site that is complete and occupied. There is to be a field gate directly onto Oldwood Road for access to remaining agricultural land.
3. The appeal was made against the Council's failure to determine the application within the prescribed period. In fact, the Council state that they had not received formal notification of the appeal by the time of the Committee meeting that resolved to refuse planning permission. A Refusal Notice was issued. In order to be consistent with the terms of the S106 undertaking, this appeal is taken to be against that refusal of planning permission.
4. A formal site inspection took place after the close of the Inquiry encompassing footpaths, roads and the private land of the site, and this covered all significant vantage points referred to in evidence. Unaccompanied visits had been made after the previous two sitting days to view other areas of the town and its surroundings.

Main Issues

5. These are;

- The principle of development having regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- The accessibility of the site location for this form of development.
- The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.
- In the planning balance, whether any adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Reasons

Principle of Development

6. The site is outside the settlement boundary and in an area where policies of restraint apply. The appellant points to appeal Decisions at Rushwick, in the same Council area (Refs; APP/J1860/A/12/2187934 and /13/2193129) where the Inspector recorded the Council's acceptance that their policies on the supply of housing cannot be considered up-to-date as the Development Plan was prepared to meet housing requirements only to 2011. It is agreed by the parties to this appeal that paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework is engaged for that reason.
7. That paragraph states that at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. The site is not covered by footnote 9 and the paragraph goes on to say, with regard to decision taking, that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, as here, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. That exercise will be carried out as a planning balance following consideration of the remaining two main issues.

Accessibility

8. The Council's objection as part of the first reason for refusal is that the site does not benefit from conventional access to the local bus services and that the footway between the site and Morningside is narrow and unsuitable in its present form. Saved Local Plan Policy DS3 seeks development that will not undermine objectives for sustainable transport. Proposals should demonstrate that consideration has been given to reducing the need to travel and securing access to the development by public transport or by other alternatives to the car. Oldwood road does not appear to have a regular bus service, with buses only serving the school almost opposite the site at the beginning and end of the school day. The nearest usable services are on Bromyard Road to the east.
9. The planning history of the rural exception site is relevant to this consideration, as it shares the same accessibility arrangements as the appeal site. The Framework defines rural exception sites as being small sites used for affordable housing in perpetuity where sites would not normally be used for housing. That is usually taken to mean a location outside the settlement where housing would not be permitted as a matter of policy, as here. Such a location might

bring with it an element of being less well located for access to services for that reason, but a balance would be clearly struck in the decision. In this case there is no evidence to suggest that the decisions for both 20 dwellings and the later 33 were taken on a balance that included the matter of accessibility as a negative aspect, and an intervening refusal did not cite this as a shortcoming, referring instead to access to play provision which was solved with the inclusion of on-site provision. It is also the case that the highway authority did not raise insurmountable objection to the footway or accessibility generally.

10. Of the options open to future residents, it is not reasonable that the walking route should be by turning south out of the site onto Oldwood Road and by way of the footpath links to either the school or to Wheeler Orchard. Apart from being counter-intuitive regarding the initial direction, the route involves difficult stiles and is not an all-season one. Future development of the southern housing site would however overcome some of the drawbacks and would provide choice, but this route would remain indirect.
11. More likely is a route involving turning left onto Oldwood Road and walking down the left hand footway, crossing to Redgate Avenue and thence through the link to Bromyard Road. In addition to giving access to buses and the Co-op shop there, this would be a more pleasant route to the town centre and not very much longer than by way of the main road. Were the Morningside site to be developed there would be some positive changes to the main road route resulting along its frontage.
12. The footway does appear somewhat narrow, but investigation of access chambers to services indicated that there is a degree of overgrowth of vegetation causing much of this problem. There appears to be scope for widening in places, and for a hard surface to be formed across the opposite highway verge onto Redgate Avenue with dropped kerbs. The route would remain alongside a main road, but that is not unusual and the short length between the site entry and either Redgate Avenue, or, longer term, an improved frontage to the Morningside site would be acceptable.
13. Also whilst there appears no doubt that buses do stop outside the Co-op shop on Bromyard Road, there is no stop visible, much less any timetable. There are clearly areas requiring improvement, but funding sought by the highway authority and included within the submitted S106 Undertaking would be used to improve the footway and signage. With that provision, it is concluded that the site should be regarded as being in an accessible location, whether or not the other two sites are developed. Development of either or both of those other sites would provide scope for further improvements and a choice of reasonable walking routes and would make an already satisfactory situation better. The appeal proposal therefore accords with the requirements of saved Local Plan Policy DS3 and with Section 4 of the Framework on promoting sustainable transport, through being able to provide walking routes that are acceptable in both distance and quality.

Character and Appearance

14. Saved Local Plan Policy DS3 sets out general development requirements that include the location of the development being appropriate, the safeguarding of features of the landscape, prominent views and the landscape character of the area. The Proposed Submission Document – Consultation Version of the South Worcestershire Development Plan contains at Policy SWDP25 the need to

demonstrate that, among other things, the development is clearly appropriate to and integrates with the character of the landscape setting.

15. The site is currently cultivated farmland extending further from the road than the present rural exception site, whether or not described or intended as a 'Phase I' and 'Phase II'. Whilst the rural exception site almost abuts the settlement boundary in that the main road separates the two, the appeal site is clearly further from it and is rightly considered to be within the open countryside where policies of restraint apply. The Council has referred to the exceptions in paragraph 55 of the Framework, but these are more usually looked at in relation to applications for solitary, isolated, houses.
16. The nature of the land running down a valley system towards the junction of Morningside and Oldwood Road has been variously described as a 'green wedge' or 'green tongue' although it has no particular designation as performing a policy-backed function. The undeveloped space between Berrington Road/Morningside and Oldwood Road is not repeated between the latter and Bromyard Road and the Council's suggested southern site would further fill-in that area. However, the existence of the 'green tongue' of land is a pleasant feature and it does perform a separating function. That function is particularly evident to the west of the main valley where there is public access along a footpath. To the east there is to be building at the Morningside site, and there is already the rural exception site with its development in depth, as well as other more sporadic development along Oldwood Road.
17. As the 'tongue' widens away from the town, its urban role as a separator and in bringing countryside into the built-up area lessens, as it becomes more akin to true countryside. Hence its role is more to do with its length and penetration of the built-up area than its width and it is concluded that this role does not necessarily rely on the area of the appeal site remaining within it.
18. Building on the presently open farmland would cause visual harm and that is accepted by both main parties. The proximity of the footpath and views from it would mean that the development would be plainly seen. However, much of those views would already encompass the rural exception site as a backdrop and that does not presently appear as an attractive or mature development, although when the planting grows that would change. The views of the Town Council's representative are concurred with that there is an over-dominance of parking and hard areas, and the arrangement of the dwellings is not well related to the open space to the rear, being more arranged along the road frontage. There is as a result an isolated block of dwellings adjoining the field gate to the present appeal site. Development of the appeal site is an opportunity to make-good this unresolved rear area, integrating the car parking areas more within an overall layout.
19. The Council refers to a 'wayside' form of development being more desirable than what is seen as development-in-depth brought about by the appeal proposals. That is clearly not the same as 'ribbon' development, the latter being similar and regular whereas 'wayside' can be characterised as more varied in type and regularity. However, as just stated, the rural exception site does not conform to this 'wayside' aim and there is every likelihood of the Morningside site not doing either, as the 73m contour referred to as the extent of building is some way into the site. No such form of development is evident on the east side of the road and the southern site will further consolidate development-in-depth. None of this can be said to cause harm. The

shortcomings in the layout of the rural exception site could be improved upon in views from the main road as part of the entry to the town as well as from the 'green tongue'.

20. In conclusion on this main issue, there will be adverse effects from building on open land, but these are on balance, only low adverse, and there is scope for realising the visual benefits of a well designed and laid-out scheme making good some of the harm that has already taken place. The proposal would satisfy the requirements of Local Plan Policy DS3 on the protection of the landscape character and similar requirements emerging in the South Worcestershire Development Plan Policy SWDP25.

Planning Balance

21. The harm that has been identified above is a low adverse effect on the landscape character of the area, but only through building on currently open agricultural land, with sufficient area, and importantly length, of open 'green tongue' remaining to perform its function. A loss of foraging land for wildlife should also be included as minor harm, given the remaining land available.
22. The benefits can be summarised as follows, utilising the appellant's scale for clarity;
- Improvements to the footway that are required to make this development acceptable but would benefit the residents of the rural exception site. This is a significant benefit.
 - Improvements to bus stops and information that are required to make this development acceptable but would benefit existing users in a wide area either side of Bromyard Road. This is a considerable benefit.
 - Flood prevention measures that, through incorporating provision for climate change, would have an immediate beneficial effect, but reducing over time to the point where the climate change provision is required to only mitigate the effects of development. This is of some benefit.
 - The provision of bat and bird boxes would not be a direct replacement for lost foraging land, but is a benefit that would not otherwise be provided. This is of some benefit.
 - The 'village green' would be available for use by existing residents of the rural exception site which appears to have limited accessible green areas. This is a considerable benefit.
 - The unresolved rear area of the rural exception site and the isolated block by the access gate would be improved by the addition of well designed further dwellings and landscaping, secured through the consideration of reserved matters. This is a significant benefit.
 - The intended provision, through the particular 'tighter than usual' timescales for starting secured by condition, of market and affordable housing at an early date. The former would be in line with the aim of the Framework and Ministerial statements on the need to boost significantly the supply of housing and the latter would assist in providing accommodation quickly, of value given the doubts expressed over the timescale for both the Morningside site and the southern site. This is a considerable benefit.

23. In addition, and as made clear in paragraph 7 of the Framework, there are three dimensions to sustainability;

- *An economic role*, where the development would be on land of the right type, which is available, and in the right place and at the right time to support growth generally and assist in maintaining the viability of Tenbury Wells as a settlement and the services it provides.
- *A social role*, through the meeting of needs for present and future generations, assisting through the support that this will bring for the use of services, and the social life of the town. The provision of affordable housing among market housing will foster social cohesion which together with the existing rural exception site would help provide a balanced community.
- *An environmental role* has been set out previously and the net result of the development would be beneficial, with housing placed in an accessible location, allowing access to transport and services other than by car, assisting in a general movement towards a low carbon economy.

The proposal would therefore further the aims of promoting sustainable forms of development, and significant weight attaches to this.

24. In conclusion, and based only on the matters detailed in the main issues above, it is concluded that the limited harm identified does not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, the terms of the test in paragraph 14 of the Framework. In fact it is the benefits of the scheme that significantly and demonstrably outweigh the harm such that at this point in the Decision it is concluded that the development should be permitted.

Other Considerations

25. Notwithstanding the findings of the Rushwick Inspector, the Council now say that the present appeal is the first in which they have offered detailed evidence on the five year supply 'target' and the detailed components of the 'supply' and where they challenge evidence proffered by an appellant.

26. The Council rely on the target figure going forward for scrutiny in the emerging South Worcestershire Development Plan. Details of the inter-relationship of the three authority's requirements were given and the emerging plan is said to reflect up-to-date need and the duty to co-operate. Paragraph 216 of the Framework says that from the day of publication, decision-takers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to three considerations. That approach was re-iterated by the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in a debate of 17 July 2013 regarding the weight afforded emerging plans increasing according to their progress.

27. With regard to the three considerations in paragraph 216, the stage reached by the South Worcestershire Development Plan does allow the level of weight generally to be increased. Many policies of the emerging plan would be accorded this increased level and Policy SWDP25 has been dealt with in that way earlier in this Decision. However, moving on to the second bullet point, there are significant unresolved objections to the very parts of the plan that are pertinent to consideration of housing targets, which lowers considerably the weight that can be accorded. The third bullet point is then in real doubt as to whether the figures being put forward would be consistent with the aims of the

Framework to boost significantly the supply of housing and to meet the full objectively assessed need.

28. There seems some confusion over the use elsewhere of the terms 'objectively assessed' and 'objectively tested', but it can be taken that the Council has objectively assessed the need. However, until that assessment has been tested through the Examination in Public process, it is far from clear that this assessment meets the *full* need. As a result it is concluded that the figures in the emerging South Worcestershire Development Plan should be accorded insufficient weight at this stage to be the target for five year housing land supply purposes in this appeal.
29. Other sources of possible targets have been considered. The Phase 2 Regional Strategy figure is derived from an evidence base between 2001 and 2003 and whilst subject to scrutiny in public, now stands a real risk of being out of date. The appellant sets out the problems with using the latest household projections, as they may be over-influenced by the state of the housing market at the time, and that should not be a reliable base for the future. The 2008 figures have been used in other appeals and in the absence of local figures for such as second homes, for which the Malvern Hills area may well be attractive, should give a robust figure when the households to dwellings conversion is carried out.
30. Be that as it may, the evidence is that once the conclusion has been reached that the emerging plan figures should not be used, the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land even with a 5% buffer and with all other considerations on supply going in their favour. Those supply considerations contain scope for much doubt due to the predictive nature of the exercise, and of the many sites and decisions referred to, only the Morningside site and the southern site were visited. Conclusions on lapse rates, windfalls, the inclusion of proposed site allocations, build-out timetables and other possible constraints on supply can be left for the South Worcestershire Development Plan Examination in Public, which is the proper forum for detailed testing.
31. As previously stated, this conclusion, resulting from the limited weight that can, at present, be placed on the emerging South Worcestershire Development Plan, is not decisive in the determination of the appeal, which is set out in the planning balance above, but adds weight to it.

Conditions and Undertaking

32. Conditions had been agreed between the main parties and set out in a Statement of Common Ground. Of note, and a matter to which weight has been attached in this decision as a benefit, is the shorter time scales for reserved matters. It is appropriate and necessary to attach conditions requiring details of levels, roads and highway drains with requirements over timing, and a condition on archaeology. In order to protect the living conditions of existing residents, control should be exercised on hours of operation and parking during the building phase, as well as a requirement for wheel washing in that phase to ensure no mud is left on the highway. It was agreed that there is no need to attach the suggested condition on driveways and service roads as the approved plan referred to will only be put forward at reserved matters stage. Control of the site entry and that to the remaining fields is however appropriate now.

33. Sustainable drainage and the likelihood of benefit to an area that has suffered flooding through run off and rising river levels has been taken into account in the decision, and therefore a condition is required to secure this provision. Similarly, a condition requiring details and implementation of bat and bird boxes is required. In order to protect wildlife, a condition is required to control the removal of the hedgerow, and re-wording was discussed to ensure a proportionate approach and timing.
34. A condition seeking details of the provision of sustainability measures, such as energy reduction and generation, was resisted by the appellant, saying that this can be deferred to reserved matters stage. Whether or not the 'where appropriate' requirements of Policies QL1 and DS3 apply is a matter between the Council and the appellant in the discharge of the condition, but to avoid the 'bolted on' approach that appears to have been taken with the use of solar panels at the rural exception site, it is considered essential that the condition be attached now to allow the detailed design of the dwellings to incorporate sustainability measures as an integral part of the design.
35. A condition is required listing the drawings as, otherwise than as set out in this decision and conditions, it is necessary that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. As this is an outline application the wording of the condition should make clear that it is only in respect of those matters not reserved for later approval, in this case access.
36. A signed and dated unilateral undertaking was presented making provision for the delivery of the affordable housing to which weight has been attached in this decision. An open space contribution is included along with the contribution to improve the accessibility of the site. The figure for the latter has been suggested by the highway authority and there is a definite need for works to be carried out to make the development acceptable. The fact that the works would benefit existing residents has been taken into account in the appeal decision. The undertaking satisfies the tests in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, being necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Conclusion

37. Paragraph 14 of the Framework is engaged due to the Development Plan being out of date with regard to the supply of housing. The required balancing exercise has shown that the limited harm identified does not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and that in fact the benefits significantly and demonstrably outweigh the harm. Those benefits can be secured by conditions and the undertaking and with those provisions and for the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be allowed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Hugh Richards who called;	of Counsel
Rosie Murray BA(Hons) MRTPI	Malvern Hills District Council
Arthur Amos BSc(Hons), PGDipLD, CMLI	Arthur Amos Associates
Simon Jones BA DipTP MRTPI	Malvern Hills District Council

FOR THE APPELLANT

Satnam Choongh who called;	of Counsel
Charles Potterton BA DipLA CMLI	Potterton Associates Ltd
Philip Rawle BSc(Hons) MA DipTP MRTPI	PRP Consultants Ltd

INTERESTED PERSONS

E Hudson	Tenbury Wells Town Council
A Jenyon	Resident
R Routledge	Resident

DOCUMENTS

Document	1	Statement of Common Ground – Planning
Document	2	Statement of Common Ground – Landscape
Document	3	Letter and Comments on Case submitted by R Jenyon
Document	4	Replacement Appendix 05a and Appendix 03 Photo 15a to A Amos Proof of Evidence
Document	LPA1	Table 2 (RM4)
Document	LPA2	Table 2 update (RM5)
Document	LPA3	DCLG Decision and Inspector's Report Hailsham APP/C1435/A/12/2186147
Document	LPA4	Wainhomes (South West) Holdings Limited v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government Hansard 17 July 2013
Document	LPA5	Hansard 17 July 2013
Document	LPA6	e-mail 17 July regarding stakeholder consultation
Document	LPA7	SWDP Housing Background Paper 30 November 2012
Document	LPA8	Interim Position Statement 5YHLS 25 June 2013
Document	LPA9	Opening submissions
Document	LPA10	Consideration Sheet Exception Site 33 dwellings
Document	LPA11	Historic Housing Delivery handwritten sheet
Document	LPA12	Regional Spatial Strategy for the West Midlands

Document	LPA13	S106 contributions justifications
Document	LPA14	Developability Panel Sites Tenbury Wells
Document	LPA15	Closing Submissions
Document	APP1	Appeal Decision Kings Sutton APP/Z2830/A/13/2194278
Document	APP2	C Potterton 456/A/21 and 22
Document	APP3	Bus service information
Document	APP4	Northern Area Development management Committee 3 July 2013 re. Morningside site
Document	APP5	Northern Area Development management Committee 3 July 2013 re. The Crown, Martley
Document	APP6	Opening Submissions
Document	APP7	Minister of State for Housing and Planning 15 June 2004
Document	APP8	Time estimates for delivery of housing
Document	APP9	Examination of the SWDP, Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions
Document	APP10	MHDC Annual Monitoring Report December 2006
Document	APP11	MHDC Annual Monitoring Report December 2007
Document	APP12	MHDC Annual Monitoring Report December 2008
Document	APP13	MHDC Annual Monitoring Report December 2009
Document	APP14	Closing Submissions
Document	APP15	S106 Undertaking dated 25 July 2013
Document	APP16	73m contour drawing Morningside site

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) Approval of the details of the appearance, layout and scale of the buildings and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.
- 2) Application for the approval of the matters reserved by conditions of this permission shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of 12 months from the date of this permission. This shall be in the form of a 'reserved matters' application. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than whichever is the latest of the following dates:
 - 1 The expiration of 12 months from the date of this permission, or
 - 2 The expiration of 12 months from the final approval of the reserved matters, or
 - 3 In the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.
- 3) No development shall commence until a detailed plan showing the levels of the existing site, the proposed slab levels of the dwellings approved and a datum point outside of the site, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) No development shall commence until foul and surface water drainage details, incorporating sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the

development, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the scheme shall be implemented in accordance with these approved details before the first of the dwellings are occupied.

- 5) No demolition/ground works/construction work shall take place outside the following hours:
Monday to Friday 07.30-18.00 hrs
Saturdays 08.00-13.00hrs.
There shall be no such work on Sundays or Bank or Public Holidays.
- 6) No development shall commence until a programme for the removal of hedgerows, together with proposals for a survey for nesting birds by an appropriately qualified ecologist, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Should the actual timing of intended removal require it, a report and recommendations prepared by that ecologist shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any such removal occurs and the removal shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations as approved.
- 7) No other works on site shall commence until visibility splays have been provided from a point 0.6m above ground level at the centre of the new access to the adjoining farmland and 2.4 metres back from the near side edge of the adjoining carriageway, (measured perpendicularly), for a distance of 59 metres in each direction along the nearside edge of the adjoining carriageway. Nothing shall be planted, erected and/or allowed to grow on the triangular area of land so formed which would obstruct the visibility described above.
- 8) No development shall commence until the engineering details and specification of the proposed roads and highway drains have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be first occupied until the scheme as been constructed in accordance with the approved drawings.
- 9) No development shall commence until parking for site operatives and visitors has been provided within the application site in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and such provision is to be retained and kept available during the construction of the development.
- 10) No development shall commence until wheel cleaning apparatus has been provided in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and such provision shall be operated and maintained during the construction of the development hereby approved.
- 11) The development shall not be first occupied until the roadworks necessary to provide access from the nearest publicly maintained highway have been completed in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 12) No development shall commence until details of the roadworks proposed including the specification of making good of surfacing, grassing and landscaping, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved roadworks including the making

good of surfacing, grassing and landscaping shall be completed within a period of two years from the commencement of work on the site, or another period agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- 13) No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

- 1 The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording.
- 2 The programme for post investigation assessment
- 3 Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording.
- 4 Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
- 5 Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
- 6 Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

No development shall take place other than in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation.

The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the approved Written Scheme of Investigation and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

- 14) No development shall commence until details of sustainability measures (including energy, waste, recycling and water management) to be incorporated into the design of the dwellings hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented prior to the occupation of each dwelling, and shall be retained operating as approved thereafter.
- 15) No development shall commence until details of the location and numbers of bat and bird boxes have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the bat and bird boxes shall be retained thereafter.
- 16) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1204/sit/01, 02 and 03 but only in respect of those matters not reserved for later approval.