



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2020

by Mrs H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1138/W/20/3244550

Land at Silverdale, Silverton, Devon EX5 4GA

- 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 Northern Renovations against the decision of Mid Devon District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02019/MOUT, dated 7 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is residential development of up to 20 dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for residential development of up to 20 dwellings at Land at Silverdale, Silverton, Devon, EX5 4GA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/02019/MOUT, dated 7 December 2018, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal application was made in outline form with all matters, save for access, reserved for future consideration. In the context of an outline application, I have treated all aspects pertaining to layout and design detailed in the submitted plans as purely indicative.
3. During the course of the appeal, a signed S106 planning obligation (S106) was submitted, covering the provision of affordable housing and contributions towards public open space, early years provision, secondary school infrastructure and transport. I return to this matter later in my decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - whether the location of development accords with local policies in respect of accessibility of facilities and minimising the need to travel;
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - the effect of the proposal on highway safety, considered individually and cumulatively with other planned developments.

Reasons

Location of development

5. The appeal site lies to the northern edge of Silverton adjoining the housing developments of Silverdale and Applemede to the east and south. To the north

of the site, adjoining part of the red line site boundary, is the recent development known as Exe View. Exe View is a small development of two storey houses on an elevated part of the site, through which the appeal site would be accessed.

6. Policy COR1 and COR9 of the adopted Mid Devon Core Strategy 2026 (2007) (CS) establish a strategy for the achievement of sustainable communities through, amongst a range of other objectives, providing accessible forms of development that reduce the need to travel by car and which are integrated with public transport.
7. CS Policy COR12 concentrates development in Tiverton, Cullompton and Crediton with a limited role for Bampton. The Policy makes clear that other settlements will have only very limited development that is required to meet local needs and support local facilities, including affordable housing.
8. Silverton is one of the villages defined in CS Policy COR17 to receive specific minor development within its settlement limits. It has a modest range of facilities including a convenience shop and post office, school, and public transport provision. There is no dispute between the parties that the site is outside of the defined settlement limits for Silverton. Therefore, whilst the site is not isolated, it is nonetheless in the countryside in policy terms.
9. CS Policy COR18 relates to development in the countryside and seeks to restrict development in order to maintain its rural qualities and maximise accessibility to services and facilities by means other than the private car. The Policy does not provide for market housing on sites outside of the settlement limits and the scheme would be formed of a large part of such housing.
10. Therefore, insofar as the proposal is a major housing development, adjoining, but outside of the settlement limits of Silverton, the proposal conflicts with, in particular, CS Policies COR17 and COR18.

Character and appearance

11. The appeal site is part of a pleasant sloping field which has robust treed boundaries along its northern and western edges and is bound on at least two sides by existing, modern residential development. It largely comprises the lower part of the field which is gently undulating. Garden boundaries of dwellings adjoining the site are predominantly low and open in places, giving the site a clear influence of residential development. The site rises up from the rear gardens of the adjoining bungalows to the highest point along the northern tree-lined boundary.
12. The proposal is made in outline form with scale, layout, appearance and landscaping reserved for future consideration. A theoretical layout plan (drawing no 18009_SK04 Rev A) shows a scheme of 20 dwellings around an estate road running north-south and angled towards the south-west at the end, broadly following the site's eastern and southern boundaries. The northern edge of the proposal would be formed from a new definitive boundary feature.
13. Given the arrangement of dwellings on at least two of its sides and with a cluster of two storey dwellings at a high point to the north, the absence of any substantial boundary or separation by tree buffer and the residential influence of adjoining dwellings, the site is visually well integrated with the settlement. Views from the nearest dwellings, the gardens belonging thereto and from

some gaps in between these houses are possible, but, despite its elevation, the site is not prominent on the arrival to, or on leaving the village.

14. The Council has identified that the site is approximately 55m away from the closest boundary of Silverton Conservation Area (CA), which includes some individually listed buildings in Kings Street. Applemede sits between the site and the boundary of the CA. The significance of the CA derives from the picturesqueness of the traditional built form of the village and the number and arrangement of key historic buildings therein.
15. The Silverton CA Appraisal and Management Plan (2015) indicates that areas which were considered to form a positive backdrop to the CA were included in a boundary change undertaken in 2015. Conversely, areas that were not considered to be visible or contributory in a positive manner were deliberately removed from the CA boundary at that time. Neither Silverdale, Applemede or the appeal site have ever been included within the CA boundary.
16. Whilst the wider agricultural hinterland around the village is a positive characteristic, the CA does not derive more than a limited degree of significance from it, given its largely contained nature. Though it is inevitable that there would be some views to the development from gaps between buildings, and in particular in one long view from King Street, this would be little different to the manner in which Applemede is currently experienced and which would likely result from any new development given that the village is largely surrounded by higher land.
17. It is clear that the main village thoroughfare, Fore Street/High Street, is a characterful street with traditional terraced and closely grouped dwellings forming part of the CA. However, due to there being limited gaps between the buildings, there is little visual permeability from it to areas beyond. The Silverdale/Applemede estates do not feature in the majority of public views from Fore Street/High Street. Consequently, the appeal site, which is further behind Applemede/Silverdale (albeit higher) would not have a noticeable visual effect on the village centre. This is also evident from the lack of visibility of the more elevated Exe View from most parts of the CA.
18. I have considered the individually listed heritage assets in King Street (including Arden House and Gauntlet Cottage), which are Grade II listed detached dwellings located within the tightly arranged street. None of these assets derive significance from a wider setting. Though a particular long view from King Street would be affected by the proposal, this would not lead to any loss of significance of any of the individually aforementioned heritage assets.
19. Thus, there would be no harmful impact from the proposal on the significance of the CA, its setting, or the setting of any individually designated heritage asset therein.
20. The proposal would be particularly visible from Applemede. But to be visible does not necessarily equate to harm in a wider sense. In my view, the development would not be incongruous with the context of the area, given that it would take the form of similar residential development found in the immediate surroundings. The manner in which the views would affect the outlook from any individual private property is not a consideration in the context of the proposal's effect on the wider character and appearance.

21. Therefore, whilst the proposal would result in a loss of approximately 0.65 hectares of agricultural land, the manner in which it would extend the village by spreading upwards onto higher land is consistent with the way that the village has historically developed over time. The mitigating factor in this regard is that the north-westernmost, highest and most visible parts of the field would remain undeveloped, helping to maintain the agricultural setting of the village in longer views. There would be no material harm or loss to qualities of the site consistent with those for the 'River Valley Slopes and Combes Landscape Character Type' within which the area falls¹.
22. In view of this main issue, and subject to details as part of a reserved matters application, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be consistent with, in particular, CS Policy COR2 and Policy DM2 of the Mid Devon Local Plan Part 3 (Development Management Policies) (adopted 2013) (LPP3). These Policies, amongst other things, seek to enhance the character and appearance of the countryside, and ensure new development demonstrates a clear understanding of the characteristics of the site, its wider context and the surrounding area.

Highways impacts, including cumulative considerations

23. The existing highway network is typical of a rural village in that there are some narrow roads, predominantly within the core, historic centre of the village. More modern developments that lie on the outskirts of the village have more generously engineered highway layouts, including footways. There are two main routes which would serve the appeal site, both of which would involve at least small sections of narrow road with absent stretches of footway.
24. One of the routes would utilise Fore Street/High Street, both of which are narrow and where the shortage of private parking results in a high level of on-street parking. Given the narrowness of the street, the on-street parking causes delays for vehicles needing to pass one another. The street does not have footways running its full length, with the result that some pedestrians need to walk within the highway.
25. The use of TRICS data and specific traffic counts to predict the impact of a development on the local highway network is an accepted method. The evidence suggests that there would be increased vehicular movements utilising the available routes (approximately 11 - 12 journeys during both AM and PM peaks). Though I accept it would be a notable increase from a single development, nothing leads me to believe that such an increase in vehicular movements would be materially harmful or 'severe' under the terminology specified in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
26. I note the concerns about the more vulnerable users of the Fore Street/Main Street route, including elderly pedestrians, and the likelihood of an increased pedestrian/vehicular conflict. Given that this will not be the only vehicular route to the site for vehicles, based on the number of predicted trips and directional split, I do not consider that there would be a material increase in the instances of pedestrians waiting for vehicles, or vice versa, so as to undermine the safety of users. This is particularly so because each dwelling within the development

¹ Mid Devon Landscape Character Assessment 2011

- would have its own parking provision so as to avoid any further pressure to park within High Street/Fore Street.
27. Despite the undisputed substandard nature of the Upexe Lane/Tiverton Road junction, there does not appear to be any issue with its capacity or that of any of the junctions involved in the routes that would serve the new development. I do however accept that inconsiderate parking in close proximity thereto will occasionally necessitate specific manoeuvres that would ideally be avoided.
 28. I have considered the impact of the proposal on The Shute, in terms of increased pedestrian and cycle traffic, in the context of its narrowness in places, but also in terms of its convenience for accessing the village centre. On the whole, this shortcut is beneficial for enhanced accessibility and its increased use will not lead to the exacerbation of any particular noteworthy problems, other than that users will need to wait to pass one another more regularly.
 29. On the whole, the village is compact and the journeys from the site to most village facilities are modest in distance. Whilst I accept that a gradient change will be a deterrent to some individuals in terms of their ability to walk or cycle, I do not consider that the likely level change across the site itself or that encountered on routes to such facilities will result in users being solely reliant on vehicles. In any event, the specific highway design of the proposal, other than the access, would be subject of a reserved matters application where its layout, gradient and surfacing could be further assessed against the relevant highway policies and guidance, including Manual for Streets.
 30. The design of the access junction to the new development itself is a detailed matter. Despite that it is on a corner from the Exe View courtyard, there does not appear to be any particular issue with the layout or geometry of the junction that would make it unsafe for use. Nor do I consider that the introduction of a new access in this position would materially compromise the use of the Exe View courtyard for its originally intended purposes.
 31. In terms of the cumulative highway impacts of the proposal, I note from the evidence that planning permission has previously been granted in the village for two schemes containing a combined total of approximately ten dwellings. This is a modest number of dwellings and both sites are separated from one another and from the appeal site, so as to avoid a concentration of vehicular movements using only a limited number of routes.
 32. Though I note the general issue of parking and road congestion within the village, particularly in its main street, I do not consider that the cumulative effects of all three proposals would be so material so as to warrant refusal of the current proposal.
 33. Pulling together this main issue, the proposal would not lead to prejudicial effects on highway safety, considered either individually or cumulatively with other planned developments. The proposal would therefore comply with, in particular, Policy DM2(d) of LPP3 which requires, amongst other things, that new development creates safe and accessible places. For similar reasons, the proposal would also comply with Paragraphs 108 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other Matters

34. The draft Silverton Neighbourhood Plan (NP) has been produced and has undergone various stages of consultation. Whilst the Plan's direction of travel would be to steer away from large developments and prevent development on the appeal site, it has yet to be independently examined and thus, only attracts limited weight in my decision.
35. I have taken into account the numerous objections received from local residents, the Parish Council and Silverton Parish Neighbourhood Plan Committee. These include the impact of the proposal on the character of the area and the amenities of local residents, particularly within Silverdale and Applemede, access, parking, traffic, highway safety, ecology, the impacts on flood risk, drainage, the impacts on the infrastructure and facilities, and the cumulative impacts of development, particularly in advance of the emerging Local Plan Review. I have addressed the matters relating to the character and appearance of the area, highway safety and cumulative impacts above.
36. I note the suggestion that there is a healthy supply of houses for sale in the area and that recently completed properties have remained unsold or unoccupied. There is no cogent evidence to this effect and such a phenomenon has not prevented the formulation of policies for the provision of minor housing allocations within the emerging NP.
37. Whilst I accept that there may be concerns regarding pressure on general infrastructure, there is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that existing services and facilities are so under pressure, or that they would not have the capacity to accommodate the residents of the proposed development, particularly given the matters covered by the submitted S106.
38. In terms of the living conditions of the neighbouring properties, as the proposal is in outline form, a scheme could be designed as part of a future submission to avoid harmful overlooking or overbearing effects. I do however note that the construction of dwellings on the site would remove a pleasant outlook from the rear gardens of those dwellings in Silverdale and Applemede. However, the planning system does not exist to protect a view, which is a private, not public interest. The same applies to the preservation of property values.
39. In relation to biodiversity, the Council did not raise any objections in this regard, subject to appropriate conditions and measures, and I find no reason to reach an alternative view. The site appears limited in terms of its biodiversity value as corroborated by the submitted Phase 1 Habitat Survey.
40. The other matters raised did not form part of the Council's reasons for refusal. I am satisfied that these matters would not result in a level of harm that would justify dismissal of the appeal and can be dealt with by planning conditions or through the S106, where appropriate. In addition, I have considered the appeal entirely on its own merits and, in the light of all the evidence before me, this does not lead me to conclude that these other matters, either individually or cumulatively, would be an overriding issue warranting dismissal of the appeal.

S106 Obligation

41. Paragraph 56 of the Framework and Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations (2010) (as amended) require that planning obligations should only be taken into account in any grant of planning

permission where they 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.

42. The main parties have submitted a signed and completed S106 dated 9 April 2020 for affordable housing, early years provision contribution, secondary school infrastructure and separate transport provision, and public open space contribution. These contributions are required in accordance with the AIDPD² Policies AI/DE/3, AL/IN/2, AL/IN/3, AL/IN/4 and AL/IN/5.
43. In relation to affordable homes, Local Plan 2 Policy AL/DE/3 states that the Council will seek 35% of the total number of dwellings on sites where a proposal involves more than 2 dwellings. The S106 provides for the required 35% affordable dwellings in accordance with this Policy in order to meet the district-wide affordable housing need. The S106 necessarily sets out the need for an affordable housing scheme to deal with the requisite number, tenures, definitions and provision rate.
44. An area of Public Open Space would ordinarily be required for a development of the scale proposed under Local Plan 2 Policy AL/IN/3. In the absence of an onsite provision, £937.30 per dwelling will be paid to enable the Council to make an alternative area of public open space available within the parish of Silverton, based on the normal cost of providing public open space elsewhere.
45. Under Local Plan 2 Policies AL/IN/5, new development is required to cover the cost of additional educational facilities that would otherwise become oversubscribed. To this end, a contribution of £3288.15 per dwelling would be paid towards additional places at the nearby secondary school, Clyst Vale College. In addition to this, the costs of transporting these additional pupils would also be secured (£381.90 per dwelling).
46. Whilst the S106 provides for £250 per dwelling towards an early years provision, the Council has not provided adequate reasoning in relation to an adopted Policy that explains its inclusion or how it would be spent given the findings in relation to primary school capacity. As such, this contribution is not required to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
47. Therefore, with the exception of the early years contribution, I am satisfied that the proposed obligations set out above are necessary, directly related, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development, in accordance with CIL Regulations 122. The need these obligations is supported by the relevant Development Plan policies, representations from the Council's consultees, the Council's Planning Committee report and appeal statement.

Planning balance and conclusion

48. In terms of its principle, location and scale, the proposal conflicts with CS Policies COR17 and COR18. As these are the most important policies for determining the application, the proposal conflicts with the Development Plan taken as a whole. However, in terms of their relevance to the scale and distribution of housing, the parties agree that policies COR17 and COR18 are out-of-date owing to their inconsistency with the Framework.

² Mid Devon Allocations and Infrastructure Development Plan Document (adopted 2011)

49. Where policies are out-of-date, the 'tilted balance' outlined in paragraph 11 (d) of the Framework is engaged. The tilted balance sets out that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
50. The Council's undisputed five year housing land supply (5YHLS) position as at April 2019 showed a 7.43 year's supply with a 5% buffer. That there is a five year supply does not in itself disengage the tilted balance, though it tempers the weight that may be attributed specifically to the delivery of housing.
51. The Council's draft Local Plan Review (eLPR) is currently in the process of being examined. The latest update is that the Inspector's findings on the main modifications are still awaited. Emerging Policies S13 and S14 of the eLPR seek to replace CS Policies COR17 and COR18 respectively. The proposal would also conflict with these emerging Policies.
52. Whilst the Council indicates that these policies are not the subject of *unresolved* objections, there were objections and there is still room for uncertainty and change at least until the final report is received. As previously noted by my colleague in the Willand decision³, "*until all objections have been resolved and the Inspector's final report received, the weight that can be attached to the emerging plan is limited*". In line with my colleague's findings, I therefore attach limited weight to the aforementioned eLPR Policies.
53. I have already indicated that the emerging NP is not sufficiently progressed to enable me to attach more than limited weight to its policies.
54. I have found that the development would be acceptable in terms of its effects on the character and appearance of the area and that it would not prejudice highway safety on its own or in terms of cumulative effects. The provision of open space, school places and affordable housing would be addressed through the submitted S106.
55. The benefits of the proposal include the number of dwellings and the social benefit of increased access to housing, although these are afforded modest weight owing to the existence of a 5YHLS. Another benefit is the policy-compliant affordable housing provision which would help to meet the needs in the parish of Silverton. The Council has provided evidence of the unmet need of which there is a greater amount than can be met by the proposed scheme. As such, I attach considerable weight to this benefit. There would also be short-term economic impacts from the construction phase and longer term economic impacts from the reliance of new residents on local facilities. I also attach moderate weight to these additional benefits.
56. Drawing all this together, my overall conclusion is that the adverse impacts arising from this development do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the scheme's benefits. The proposal would therefore represent a sustainable form of development when assessed against the Framework read as a whole.
57. In weighing all of the relevant factors in this case, I conclude that the other considerations, including the application of the tilted balance under the

³ APP/Y1138/W/18/3214685

Framework, are of such weight that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the Development Plan.

58. As such, for the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

Planning conditions

59. I have considered the conditions in light of paragraph 55 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have undertaken some minor editing in the interests of precision and clarity. Where necessary, I have sought agreement to the imposition of pre-commencement conditions.
60. As the application is made in outline form, the standard outline conditions in relation to time limits and reserved matters applications are necessary.
61. As the proposal is for up to 20 dwellings, a condition has been added to explicitly state the maximum permissible number of dwellings.
62. In the interests of the avoidance of flood risks, conditions are necessary in relation to surface water infrastructure, both permanent and where required temporarily for the duration of construction works.
63. In the interests of the safe and efficient management of the highway network and to limit the disruption to nearby neighbours, it is necessary to impose a condition relating to the submission of a construction management plan. Such management, particularly of the highway network for the duration of construction, is necessary in view of the constrained nature of the roads serving the development.
64. In the interests of highway safety, it is necessary to ensure that priority is given to essential highway and pedestrian infrastructure before any other part of the development is commenced. The detailed design and implementation of other highway infrastructure, including gradients and street furniture, is thereafter necessary to ensure a satisfactory highway layout. In the interests of promoting sustainability, it is necessary to secure a scheme for the provision of electric vehicle charging points within the development.
65. In order to secure a satisfactory development in terms of its character, appearance and impact on ecological interests, amongst other things, it is necessary to seek a condition requiring specific details as part of the reserved matters applications. These details should include, but are not limited to, details of site levels, ecological enhancement measures and a site waste management plan.
66. The suggested condition relating to a construction environment management plan is not necessary because the same aspects have been amalgamated within a detailed construction management plan.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1. Before any part of the development hereby permitted is begun, detailed drawings of the layout, scale and appearance of the buildings, and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called the Reserved Matters) shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
2. Application(s) for approval of all the Reserved Matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the Reserved Matters which have been approved, whichever is the later.
4. The development hereby permitted shall be limited to a maximum of 20 dwellings.
5. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a programme of percolation tests has been carried out in accordance with BRE Digest 365 Soakaway Design (2016), and the results approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority. A representative number of tests should be conducted to provide adequate coverage of the site, with particular focus placed on the locations of the proposed infiltration devices/permeable surfaces.
6. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until the detailed design of the proposed permanent surface water drainage management system has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The design of this permanent surface water drainage management system will be in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage systems, and those set out in the Preliminary Drainage Strategy 100 Rev B and Preliminary Drainage Strategy 101 Rev A and Silverdale Drainage Calculations.
7. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until the full results of a groundwater monitoring programme, undertaken over a period of 12 months, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority. This monitoring should be conducted to provide adequate coverage of the site, with particular focus placed on the locations and depths of the proposed infiltration devices.
8. No development shall commence until a temporary surface water drainage management plan, to demonstrate how surface water runoff generated during the construction phase will be managed for the full construction period, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan must satisfactorily address both the rates and volumes, and quality, of the surface water runoff from the construction site and must also include details of how eroded sediment will be managed to prevent it from entering the permanent surface water drainage management system and include a timetable for the implementation of the management plan. Once approved, the management plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and maintained thereafter.
9. No development shall commence on site until a Construction and Environment Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include, but shall not necessarily be limited to, details of the following:

- a) the timetable of the works;
- b) daily hours of construction;
- c) any road closure;
- d) hours during which delivery and construction traffic will travel to and from the site, with such vehicular movements being restricted to between 8:00am and 6pm Mondays to Fridays inc.; 9.00am to 1.00pm Saturdays, and no such vehicular movements taking place on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays;
- e) the number and sizes of vehicles visiting the site in connection with the development and the frequency of their visits;
- f) the compound/location where all building materials, finished or unfinished products, parts, crates, packing materials and waste will be stored during the demolition and construction phases;
- g) areas on-site where delivery vehicles and construction traffic will load or unload building materials, finished or unfinished products, parts, crates, packing materials and waste with confirmation that no construction traffic or delivery vehicles will park on the County highway for loading or unloading purposes, unless prior written agreement has been given by the Local Planning Authority;
- h) steps and procedures that will be implemented to minimise the creation and impact of noise, vibration, dust and waste disposal resulting from the site preparation, groundwork and construction phase of the development;
- i) measures to be employed to prevent the egress of mud, water and other detritus onto the public and any non-adopted highways;
- j) details of wheel washing facilities and obligations;
- k) the proposed route of all construction traffic exceeding 7.5 tonnes;
- l) details of the amount and location of construction worker and visitor parking and proposals to promote car sharing amongst construction staff in order to limit construction staff vehicles parking off site; and
- m) photographic evidence of the condition of adjacent public highway prior to commencement of any work.

The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Construction and Environment Management Plan.

10. Other than for the works described below, no other part of the development hereby approved shall be commenced until:
- a) The access road has been laid out, kerbed, drained and constructed up to base course level for the first 20.00 metres back from its junction with the public highway;
 - b) The ironwork has been set to base course level and the visibility splays required by this permission laid out;
 - c) The footway on the public highway frontage required by this permission has been constructed up to base course level;
 - d) A site compound and car park have been constructed to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
11. The proposed estate road, cycleways, footways, footpaths, verges, junctions, street lighting, sewers, drains, retaining walls, service routes, surface water outfall, road maintenance/vehicle overhang margins, embankments, visibility splays, accesses, car parking and street furniture shall be constructed and laid out in accordance with details to be approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before their construction begins. For this purpose, plans and sections indicating, as appropriate, the design, layout, levels, gradients, materials and method of construction shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

12. The occupation of any dwelling shall not take place until the following works have been carried out:
 - a) The access and site roads within the development shall have been laid out, kerbed, drained and constructed up to and including base course level, the ironwork set to base course level and the sewers, manholes and service crossings completed;
 - b) The footways and footpaths which provide the dwelling with direct pedestrian routes to an existing highway maintainable at public expense have been constructed up to and including base course level;
 - c) Both vehicular and pedestrian/cycle route visibility splays have been laid out to their final level;
 - d) The street lighting for the access, site roads and footpaths has been erected and is operational;
 - e) The car parking and any other vehicular access facility required for the dwelling by this permission has/have been completed;
 - f) The verge and service margin and vehicle crossing on the road frontage of this dwelling have been completed with the highway boundary properly defined; and
 - g) The street nameplates for the development have been provided and erected.
13. Prior to first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved, a scheme for Electric Vehicle Charging Points ("EVCP") shall have been first submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, such scheme to include provision of at least a single EVCP for each dwelling comprised in the development which has a private driveway or garage within its curtilage ("Relevant Dwelling"). The installation of the EVCPs shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme prior to first occupation of each Relevant Dwelling.
14. The detailed drawings required to be submitted by Condition 2 shall include the following information: boundary treatments, existing and proposed site levels, site section drawings, finished floor levels and materials, details of any areas of proposed public open space, and an ecological management plan for ecological mitigation and enhancement contained in the submitted Ecological Appraisal.
15. As part of the Reserved Matters submission(s) referred to in Condition 2, a Site Waste Management Plan which will detail the proposed method of dealing with waste from the site, including transportation of waste from the site where this is necessary. This will include the specific destination for each wastage type and the route that is required. Details shall also include measures to encourage the reuse or recycling of waste and shall set out how the construction and operation of the development will accord with best practice sustainable waste management principles. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the agreed Site Waste Management Plan.