



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2015

by David Spencer BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 February, 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/15/3006489

Land adjacent Park View, Broseley, Shropshire TF12 5HX

- 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 Mrs Linda Garbett against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 14/01125/OUT, dated 13 March 2014, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2014.
 - The development proposed is an outline application to include access and layout (scale, appearance & landscaping reserved) for the residential development of six detached houses; formation of vehicular access and estate roads (amended description).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an outline application to include access and layout (scale, appearance & landscaping reserved) for the residential development of six detached houses; formation of vehicular access and estate roads (amended description) at land adjacent Park View, Broseley, Shropshire TF12 5HX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 14/01125/OUT, dated 13 March 2014, and subject to the conditions set out in the schedule at the end of this decision.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mrs Linda Garbett against Shropshire Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal proposal was originally submitted as an outline application described as a resubmission of an earlier scheme and included scale as a reserved matter. The description of the appeal proposal has been amended on both the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal submission so that it is clearer as to what the proposed development would entail and that scale would be a reserved matter for a detailed planning application. I am satisfied that these modest amendments do not substantively change the proposal and that they more accurately describe the proposed development. Accordingly, I have used the amended description in my decision.
4. The application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved except for access and layout. The Local Planning Authority determined the appeal proposal on this basis and so shall I.

5. Following the site visit, a high court judgment¹ was issued in respect of a Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014 on planning obligations, with particular reference to affordable housing provision on schemes of less than 10 dwellings. Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014. In light of this judgment and consequential changes to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), the parties were invited to comment on the bearing, if any, of the judgment and changes to the PPG on this appeal.
6. I received a response from the appellant together with a Unilateral Undertaking (UU), signed and dated 27 August 2015. The proposed contributions in the UU would need to be assessed against the statutory tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010.
7. At the time of the site visit the submitted Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (the SAMDev), was in examination including consultation on a number of proposed modifications suggested to make the document sound. The SAMDev was formally adopted on 17 December 2015. Following this change to the development plan, the parties were invited to submit additional representations on the adopted SAMDev and I have taken into account the response received.

Main Issues

8. The main issues in this appeal are firstly whether or not the proposal would provide a suitable site for housing, having regard to the principles of sustainable development and housing land supply and secondly the effect of the proposed access arrangement on highway safety, with particular reference to the relationship to existing access points on Park View.

Reasons

Suitability for Housing

9. The appeal site is outside of but directly adjacent to the development boundary for Broseley. As such it is defined as countryside for the purposes of planning policy. As well as the SAMDev, the development plan also comprises of those policies of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy March 2011 (the Core Strategy). Core Strategy Policies CS6 and CS17 seek, amongst other things, to protect, conserve and enhance the quality and diversity of the natural environment. Core Strategy Policy CS5 seeks to strictly control new development in the countryside, only allowing specific proposals on an exceptional basis. These policies are consistent with paragraph 17 of the NPPF which identifies recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside as a core planning principle. Additionally, Policy CS5 reflects paragraph 55 of the NPPF which seeks to avoid new isolated housing in the countryside unless there are special circumstances.
10. The appeal site is situated on the edge of Broseley, a small town with a good range of services, which is identified in Core Strategy Policy CS3 as key centre in eastern Shropshire. The policy states that Broseley will accommodate additional development that balances environmental constraints with meeting local needs. Table 2 within Policy CS3 identifies an indicative scale of development of up to 500 homes in Broseley over the period 2006-2026. The detailed scale of development has been determined through the SAMDev but I

¹ R (aoa West Berkshire District Council and Reading Borough Council) v. SSCLG [2015] EWHC 2222 (Admin)

- have very little evidence that Broseley's role as a sustainable key centre where additional housing development is planned has been diminished in the SAMDev.
11. The appeal site is part of a larger field which is over to pasture. The topography of the field is distinctive in that the appeal site occupies a generally flat area which forms part of a plateau before the land sharply drops away to the west and south west. Accordingly, given the elevated location there are views across the appeal site, including from the public footpath across the southern part of the site, towards the undulating landscape to the west. However, the north-west corner of the appeal is bounded by high hedging and trees which conceal former poultry houses. As such a notable part of the appeal site would have a limited inter-visibility to the wider countryside at this point.
 12. Moreover, the appeal site is adjoined to the north, east and south-east by existing residential development. Despite the presence of some boundary hedging to the appeal site, this residential development, by virtue of its scale and in some cases by being positioned on land that rises above the appeal site, is clearly visible and provides an influential context. As such, the appreciable degree of enclosure resulting from the existing housing around the appeal site means that the appeal proposal would not constitute a harmful breach into open countryside.
 13. I appreciate that the south-west boundary of the appeal site, where the land falls away down towards Tynning Cottage, has no existing boundary and at present provides long range views towards Shirlett from the footpath across the site, parts of Mill Lane to the north and Hockleybank to the east and undoubtedly from a number of residential properties surrounding the appeal site. However, I have very little evidence before me that the appeal site has a local landscape designation or a particular landscape quality that has been objectively assessed as requiring protection. Whilst there are pleasant views over the appeal site towards the wider Shropshire countryside, there is no private right to a view.
 14. In terms of public views, whilst the limited views from Mill Lane and Hockleybank would be affected, I do not consider this harm to be significant, given the degree of existing enclosure and strong residential character along these byways. The views towards Shirlett from the public footpath across the appeal site would be preserved by the proposed layout which leaves a notable undeveloped area in the south-west corner. Additionally, I am satisfied from my observations on my site visit that the topography and intervening tree and hedge cover would mean that the appeal proposal would not be conspicuous in views from public footpaths² to the south-west. Additionally landscaping along the south-west boundary of the site would assist its assimilation into the wider landscape and this would be a reserved matter for a detailed application.
 15. It has also been put to me that the appeal site was part of common land or grazing land known as 'The Tynning' which dates back to the Eighteenth Century. However, I have very little evidence of whether the appeal site is a local heritage asset. The site is not within the Broseley Conservation Area although the boundary of this designation adjoins the appeal site along Mill Lane and the cottages to the east at Hockleybank. I note that the Council's Historic Environment Team considered that there would be no detrimental impact on the Broseley Conservation Area. From my observations on site of

² Footpaths 0114/UN31/2 and 0114/UN21/1

the potential relationship of the appeal proposal and the intervening presence, in places, of other residential development, I share the view that there would be no harm to the setting of the conservation area. I also find, for the reasons set out above, that in terms of character, despite the countryside designation in local planning policy, the appeal proposal would not result in any significant harm to the countryside character in this part of Broseley.

16. Section 38(6) of the planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is reaffirmed at paragraphs 11 and 12 of the NPPF and whilst the Core Strategy pre-dates the NPPF I nonetheless find the policies cited in the Council's decision notice to be consistent with the NPPF and therefore in accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF these policies carry significant weight. Nonetheless, paragraph 12 of the NPPF reasserts the principle that material considerations could mean that a proposed development that conflicts with the development plan should be approved. The NPPF is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
17. The NPPF at paragraph 47 places an obligation on local planning authorities to significantly boost the supply of housing in their area. Consequently, paragraph 49 of the NPPF stipulates that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which for decision makers is articulated in the second part of paragraph 14 of the NPPF. This means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay or where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies out of date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in NPPF taken as a whole.
18. The Council maintains in its appeal statement that it has a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land, predicated on including elements of supply that were contained within the then emerging SAMDev document. The Council has not submitted an additional representation following adoption of the SAMDev. However, the appellant submits that any margin on the five year housing supply is both small and debatable and from the Council's earlier consideration of the appeal proposal, I have very little reason to disagree with this assessment. I am also mindful that where a five year supply is marginal, it should be treated as a minimum and as such the requirement at paragraph 47 of the NPPF to boost housing supply is a notable material consideration.
19. Whilst I note that Core Strategy Policy CS3 expresses Broseley's housing development levels as being up to 500 homes for the period to 2026 which is now reflected as "around 200 dwellings" in Policy S4.1 of the SAMDev, I have very little evidence that either of these quotas should not be breached for sustainability reasons. As such any capping of sustainably located windfall sites that could make a contribution to housing supply would not be in accordance with the NPPF, against which the SAMDev has been prepared.
20. Given the general need to boost the supply of housing, it is my assessment, from the evidence before me, that the appeal proposal, notwithstanding its development plan location in the countryside, should be considered in the context of the balance required at paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

21. To accord with the presumption in favour of sustainable development at paragraphs 14 and 49 of the NPPF, the proposal must jointly and simultaneously achieve the various strands of sustainability. I have no evidence that the proposed development would harm economic sustainability in the area. In terms of social sustainability it would widen the choice of quality homes in Broseley, including a proportion of affordable homes and make a modest contribution to the overall supply of housing. I observed on my site visit new house building taking place at Dark Lane and Duke Street, however, as set out above, I am not persuaded that these developments mean there should be a moratorium on further house building in Broseley given that a deliverable land supply to meet housing need in the District as a whole is only likely to be marginally in excess of 5 years.
22. Importantly, for both the social and environmental dimensions of sustainability, the appeal proposal would be within easy walking and cycling distance of the town centre and other facilities and services in Broseley. Concern has been expressed about the quality of connecting routes to the town centre. I noted that some lengths of both Hockley Road and Swan Street are without footways, but these are relatively short lengths on what are quiet streets within the built fabric of Broseley. There are a number of streetlights on both connecting routes and where footways do exist they are of a reasonable quality such that I cannot see why residents of the proposed dwellings would be deterred from making the short walk into the town centre. I also noted the gradient of Hockley Road from its ascent at No.7 up to the terrace at Hockleybank, but again, this is a relatively short stretch of highway and I did not find the gradient to be atypical from those found elsewhere in the undulating nature of the town.
23. Accordingly, I see little reason why Hockley Road would not provide a convenient and safe access to the town centre, which is only a couple of hundred metres to the east of the appeal site. As such the appeal site would be sustainably located to services and facilities and there is a very real prospect that occupants of the proposed dwellings would not be reliant on the private car to access essential day-to-day services. This would be a notable benefit of the proposed site and as such attracts significant weight in any balancing exercise. Residents have expressed concern that local infrastructure cannot accommodate the demands arising from the appeal proposal. However, I have very little evidence from those service providers either as part of the planning application or appeal processes that there are insurmountable infrastructure capacity issues in Broseley.
24. In terms of the natural environment, the appeal proposal would be integrated within a predominantly residential context at this edge of Broseley and would not harm the wider quality and diversity of the Shropshire rural landscape. As such the objectives of Core Strategy Policies CS5, CS6 and CS17 regarding controlling development in the countryside and protection of the natural environment would remain uncompromised. The appeal proposal would also not constitute the isolated development in the countryside which paragraph 55 of the NPPF cautions against.
25. I therefore conclude that notwithstanding the position of the appeal site in countryside for the purposes of the development plan, the proposal would provide a suitable site for housing, having regard to the principles of sustainable development and housing land supply.

Highway Safety

26. I made an unaccompanied site visit to the appeal site and location on the evening of 29 June 2015 to coincide with the peak period when car borne commuters would be likely to be returning home. I also made an unaccompanied site visit during the mid-morning period on 30 June 2015 prior to an accompanied site visit. My observations during these periods, whilst only snapshots, have, nonetheless, provided me with an appreciation of local highway conditions.
27. The appeal proposal would have an access onto Park View, an adopted highway of reasonable width at the appeal location, which connects a residential area of Broseley to Hockley Road to the east and Swan Street and Woodhouse Road to the north. To the south of the proposed point of access Park View is a no through route and consequently it is a lightly trafficked road, in part due to the alternative connecting road to Hockley Road which avoids Hockleybank.
28. There are generally few parking restrictions in the vicinity of the appeal site and at the time of my site visits, on-street parking on Park View, Hockley Road, Swan Street and Woodhouse Road was limited. I noted an appreciable number of properties benefit from off-street parking and at various locations there appears to be dedicated off-street parking including to the rear of Hockleybank and on Woodhouse Road. Additionally, due to the width of the highway, on-street parking at Hockleybank would not hinder access into the appeal site. Accordingly, I observed little evidence that the highway network connecting the appeal site to the principal roads through Broseley to be congested or that specifically on-street parking would block the proposed point of access.
29. The connecting routes are in places narrow and meandering, involving the highway passing close to the frontage of properties. Whilst these constricted conditions may make HGV deliveries difficult I do not consider that this in itself should be a reason for withholding planning permission. Numerous other properties are served by this historic street pattern and I have little evidence that 6 additional dwellings would place an undue burden on it, particularly in the absence of an objection from the local highway authority. I note that the gradient on a short section of Hockley Road is steep and may well be difficult in wintry conditions, as evidenced by the position of a salt bin on the turn into Hockleybank. However, such conditions would only be temporary and an alternative and level highway access is available via either Swan Street or Woodhouse Road. As such I do not consider the gradient of Hockley Road to be an impediment to safe highway access to the appeal site.
30. The proposed point of access would emerge onto Park View at point where there is an existing gateway and footpath stile into the appeal site and access for the garage and driveway for the dwelling known as 'Langdale'. Opposite the proposed point of access is a single vehicle width passageway which serves an area of communal off-street parking to the rear of No.9 Hockleybank.
31. The appeal proposal would undoubtedly affect the current access arrangements to 'Langdale' in order to secure the required width and visibility. A revised access plan has been submitted by the appellant showing that the necessary standards can be secured without any construction on the landownership of either 'Langdale' or No.42 Park View. I have little contrary evidence that the proposed access involves land other than that under the appellant's control and public highway.

32. It would however, change how 'Langdale' is accessed from the highway, and as such the driveway for this property would be emerging at an angle at the new junction arrangement. However, given the relatively low volumes of traffic from the appeal proposal and the generally low levels of traffic on Hockleybank I do not consider this arrangement to be unsafe. Those regularly accessing the proposed dwellings would be familiar with it and generally the junction layout and the layout of the highway network in the vicinity would induce low traffic speeds. For similar reasons, I also consider the resultant crossroads arrangement with the access to the off-street parking at Hockleybank would be acceptable in respect of highway safety.
33. In considering the highway safety issues I attach significant weight to the lack of an objection from the local highway authority to either the principle of the proposed scale of residential development proposed in this part of Broseley or the specific position and standard of the junction at the proposed point of access. I have not been presented with any compelling contrary evidence in terms of existing local highway safety to lead me to an alternative conclusion other than the proposed access arrangement onto Park View would not result in any significant harm to highway safety. Consequently, the appeal proposal would accord with the sustainable design and development principles of Core Strategy Policy CS6. The proposed dwellings would represent a sustainable pattern of development likely to maximise sustainable transport solutions and avoid any severe impact on the transport network. The proposal would thus accord with paragraphs 30 and 32 of the NPPF.

Other Matters

34. The appeal proposal was originally recommended for approval with paragraph 7.1 of the officer's report noting that an affordable housing contribution in line with Core Strategy Policy CS11 and accompanying SPD³ could be secured by way of a Section 106 agreement at the reserved matters stage. The Council's reasons for refusal do not cite the absence of a contribution towards affordable housing, however, the matter is expanded upon in the Council's appeal statement. Paragraph 4.6 of the statement submits that planning permission should not be granted without an appropriate mechanism to secure the provision of affordable housing.
35. Core Strategy Policy CS11 seeks all developments to achieve an overall target of 33% local needs affordable housing. The supporting text to the policy recognises the practicalities of implementing the policy and sets a threshold of on-site contributions on sites of 5 or more dwellings. On the basis of the policy and the accompanying SPD, the appeal site would trigger a need for two of the proposed dwellings to be affordable and although I have few details on the precise tenure mix that the Council would be seeking I note that the SPD generally seeks a 70:30 split between rented and low cost home ownership.
36. The Unilateral Undertaking (UU) submitted by the appellant makes provision through the submission of reserved matters for the submission of the details of the affordable housing dwellings by tenure, type and bed-space numbers to be agreed by the Council. It also includes a trigger point as to when the completed affordable houses would be transferred and arrangements for the occupation of affordable rented dwellings. It also includes a mechanism

³ Shropshire Local Development Framework: Type and Affordability of Housing Supplementary Planning Document (September 2012)

- whereby any balance after on-site contributions have been provided would be provided by way of a financial payment. I have no submissions from the Council on the content of the submitted UU in response to my correspondence⁴.
37. I am satisfied, in the context of Policy CS11 that the provisions in the submitted UU are 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. These provisions of the UU therefore comply with the CIL Regulations and so I have taken them into account in making my decision.
38. The occupier of No. 9 Hockleybank submits that the elevated alignment of the proposed access to the dwellings would result in car headlights unacceptably interrupting occupiers of a first floor bedroom which has a window facing towards the appeal site. I have carefully considered the orientation of No.9 and the proposed alignment of the estate road and consider that headlights from vehicles approaching the junction are more likely to be directed towards the gap between No.9 and the terrace to the north. I accept that there will be some ancillary light spill from headlights towards the bedroom window but this would be against a backdrop of street lighting on Hockleybank and the likelihood that a bedroom window would have some means of screening (i.e. curtains, blinds etc). As such I am not persuaded that headlights from the appeal site would result in a significant disturbance to the occupiers of this habitable room at No.9.
39. A number of representations have been received about surface water run-off from the appeal site resulting in localised flooding. I have little evidence that the appeal site results in flash flooding in the locality. However, I note that the land levels on the site slope towards Hockleybank and as such surface water from the appeal site would need to be addressed and this could be secured by condition.
40. The Council's consideration of the appeal proposal took into account the Broseley Town Plan 2013-2016 which was approved by Broseley Town Council on 10 September 2013. The Plan seeks to limit additional housing town over and above that approved on Dark Lane. Policy H.4 seeks to avoid development creating an unacceptable load on the narrow streets of the town. The document also includes Appendix A which provides a settlement policy in the context of the then emerging SAMDev. The policy states that proposed housing developments should be small scale to reflect the local character and the design principles of the Town Plan.
41. From the evidence before I am unclear as to the status and therefore the weight to be attached to the Broseley Town Plan. It has been subject to public consultation and prepared in the context of the Core Strategy and NPPF. Consequently it is a material consideration. In some respects I have found that the appeal proposal would accord with the plan, by virtue of its small scale and the lack of harm to the historic character and highway network. Clearly, there would be conflict with the Plan's housing policy H.1 but this conflict would be outweighed by the material consideration of the NPPF to boost housing supply in sustainable locations such as key centres like Broseley where there is a good range of day-to-day services. I note the Town Council's concerns that the proposal would result in 6 "executive" scale dwellings, but the appeal proposal

⁴ Dated 10 September 2015

would widen housing choice, including, following the submission of the UU, a proportion of affordable housing, which is an important objective of the NPPF.

Conclusions and Conditions

42. Whilst the proposal would conflict with development plan by virtue of being in countryside, the particular characteristics of the appeal site and its sustainable location close to services and facilities in a key centre identified for additional development are significant factors which weigh in favour of the appeal proposal. Importantly, given the evidence of only a marginal five year supply of deliverable housing land the need to boost the supply of housing, including affordable housing to meet local needs, is a material consideration which also weighs heavily in favour of allowing the appeal. The proposal would also be acceptable in terms of local highway safety and residential amenity. However, I have noted that there would be limited harm arising from the loss of some public views over wider countryside. However, the limited localised adverse impacts would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and in this way the appeal proposal would represent a sustainable housing development for which there is a presumption for at paragraphs 14 and 49 of the NPPF.
43. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised in the evidence, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
44. The Council suggested a number of conditions which would be necessary if the appeal was to be allowed. I have considered these in the light of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). For clarity and to ensure compliance with the PPG, I have amended some of the suggested wording. I have also taken into account The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015⁵ which requires specific and carefully justified reasons for the imposition of pre-commencement conditions.
45. I have attached conditions limiting the life of the planning permission and setting out requirements for the reserved matters in accordance with the Act. Given that layout is not a reserved matter I have also added a condition which confirms the approved plans, which is necessary in the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt. The approved plans included the submitted highway survey plan from October 2014 which the local highway authority deemed acceptable. Access is not a reserved matter and therefore it is not necessary to impose a condition requiring the submission of further details. However, given the topography of the site it is necessary to manage the issue of surface water drainage at the appeal site and in the interests of highway safety and local flood risk this matter cannot be retrospectively addressed once the development has commenced. As such a pre-commencement condition is necessary and I have amalgamated the Council's two suggested conditions in the interests of clarity.
46. A condition requiring a contaminated land site investigation report is necessary to ensure future occupiers of the land are not exposed to unacceptable risks and that proximate water, property and ecological systems are not adversely affected. This too is a matter which cannot be defaulted to a later stage and as such is justifiably a pre-commencement condition. The appeal site is adjoined on three sides by existing residential development and access to the appeal

⁵ Part 6, paragraph 35 (1) (a) (ii)

site for construction traffic is through an historic street pattern. As such conditions controlling the hours of construction and aspects of the construction management are necessary to protect the living conditions of local residents.

47. The Council has also suggested a condition controlling external lighting in the interests of bats that may be foraging the hedgerows around the site. From the plans before me there is no proposed street lighting or floodlighting. Small-scale lighting for householders does not require planning permission and, on balance, I am not persuaded that the Council's suggested condition is necessary or enforceable over the lifetime of the development. Therefore I have not imposed it.

David Spencer

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins 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 begin not later than two 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 plans:
Dwg No .HD3 Rev B – Site and Location Plan
Highway Survey Plan (October 2014) which stipulates that. "No new construction shall be carried out on the landownership of Langdale or 42 Park View. Access to these properties are to be kept clear and unaffected."
- 5) As part of the first application for Reserved Matters and prior to the commencement of development a contoured plan of the finished road levels shall be submitted for approval in writing by the local planning authority together with details for the surfacing of the new access road, driveway and parking areas. The submitted plan and accompanying material will confirm that the design has fulfilled the requirements of Shropshire Council's Surface Water Management: Interim Guidance for developers (or successor document) where exceedance flows up to 1in100 years plus climate change should not result in the surface water flooding of more vulnerable areas within the development site or contribute to surface water flooding of any area outside of the development site, including measures to intercept water prior to flowing onto the public highway. Development shall be carried out in accordance

with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings.

- 6) No development shall take place until a site investigation of the nature and extent of contamination has been carried out in accordance with a methodology which has previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The results of the site investigation shall be made available to the local planning authority before any development begins. If any contamination is found during the site investigation, a report specifying the measures to be taken to remediate the site to render it suitable for the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The site shall be remediated in accordance with the approved measures before development begins.

If, during the course of development, any contamination is found which has not been identified in the site investigation, additional measures for the remediation of this source of contamination shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The remediation of the site shall incorporate the approved additional measures.

- 7) 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 approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
- i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
 - ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
 - iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
 - v) wheel washing facilities
 - vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
 - vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
- 8) Construction works shall not take place outside 07:30hours to 18:00hours Mondays to Fridays and 08:00hours to 13:00hours on Saturdays nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Schedule ends.