



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2021

by Philip Major BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/W/20/3253204

Land at Green Farm, Chippenham Road, Lyneham SN15 4PA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Gladman Developments Ltd against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/03199/OUT, dated 28 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of agricultural buildings and the erection of up to 200 dwellings, up to 2600m² of B1 Business and up to 600m² of D1 community uses as well as public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Chippenham Road.
-

Preliminary Matters

1. The application is made in outline with all matters reserved for future determination except the means of access from Chippenham Road. With the agreement of the parties I carried out my site visit unaccompanied.
2. It is agreed that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land. That being so it is also agreed that the (so called) tilted balance flowing from paragraph 11d)ii of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is engaged. As such the policies which are most important for determining the appeal are deemed to be out of date, but this does not mean that they carry no weight, and the development plan remains the starting point for my decision making. When the tilted balance is engaged the NPPF indicates 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 of the NPPF taken as a whole.
3. The development plan includes the Wiltshire Core Strategy (CS) adopted in 2015, saved policies from the North Wiltshire Local Plan (LP) adopted in 2006 and the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan (SAP) adopted in 2020. In addition the development plan includes the recently made Lyneham and Bradenstoke Neighbourhood Plan (NP).
4. Despite the wealth of written material submitted during the course of this appeal I agree with the main parties that, in essence, the decision turns on a few critical matters which can be dealt with succinctly.

Decision

5. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of agricultural buildings and the erection of up to 200 dwellings, up to 2600m² of B1 Business and up to 600m² of D1 community uses as well as public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Chippenham Road at land at Green Farm, Chippenham Road, Lyneham SN15 4PA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/03199/OUT, dated 28 March 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule attached to this decision.

Main Issues

6. The main issues in this case are:
 - (a) Whether the proposed site is in a suitable location for the development proposed in the light of development plan policy;
 - (b) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the locality;
 - (c) Whether any adverse impact of the proposal significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal – the planning balance.

Reasons

Location

7. In this part of my consideration of the case I deal with the matters raised by reasons 1 and 3 of the Council's decision notice. In essence these assert that the housing development is not in a location which is supported by any development plan policy, and that the location is in any event unsustainable because of the lack of local facilities and unacceptable transport links. As such the Council considers that there is also conflict with various strands of the NPPF.
8. It is agreed between the Appellant and the Council that the proposal is in breach of Policies 1, 2 and 19 of the CS, and Policy H4 of the LP. Taken together these policies seek to ensure that housing development takes place in sustainable locations, and avoids green field development where possible. Development limits are identified in order to assist in achieving these objectives, and beyond those limits new housing is strictly controlled. Lyneham is amongst the large villages category as identified in the settlement hierarchy of the CS. The site lies outside defined settlement limits.
9. The recently made NP does not allocate land for housing. Its housing policies are supportive of development which is of a small scale (10 dwellings or fewer) preferably on previously developed land. Unusually the NP expresses concerns in relation to a recent planning permission for 50 dwellings granted by the Council. That permission was granted in the context of their being a lack of a 5 year housing land supply.
10. The spatial strategy of the development plan clearly seeks to direct the majority of development to larger settlements. Given that Lyneham is not one of the identified larger settlements the proposal would run counter to that strategy. Despite the lack of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land the policies which drive the spatial strategy are in a sense generally consistent with

the aims of the NPPF to encourage sustainable development. As such those policies retain significant weight in the decision making process, despite being deemed to be out of date. However, any conflict with the development plan has to be balanced against the stated objective of the NPPF to boost significantly the supply of housing. In addition, conflict with the development plan has to be seen in the context of other benefits of the scheme, with which I deal later.

11. The development plan disaggregates the Council's area into sub areas or community areas. That which includes Lyneham (the Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area remainder) has an indicative housing requirement to 2026 of some 385 dwellings. The total of completions and commitments was 482 dwellings at the date of adoption. Hence it is argued that the area does not need the development proposed. However I find that a somewhat unconvincing argument. Housing supply can rarely be predicted with great accuracy, and it is to be expected that there will be variations across a local authority area. It must also be borne in mind that a 5 year supply of land is not an upper ceiling. Hence, although the relevant sub area may have nominally exceeded its indicative requirement, that is not a compelling argument to turn away other housing development which would contribute to overall housing numbers. That is especially the case if suitable sites come forward.
12. The development applied for also includes elements of business and community uses. The Statement of Common Ground signed by the Council and the Appellant is clear that the provision of employment land outside the defined settlement boundary would be acceptable in principle, albeit that there is no agreement on the weight to be attached to that factor. Core Policy 34 of the CS sets out a number of criteria which would need to be satisfied, but I have no reason to doubt that those criteria could be addressed at reserved matters stage. Similarly it is agreed that proposed community use would be acceptable in principle outside the defined settlement limit and in accordance with Core Policy 48 of the CS.
13. Taken in the round it is clear that the proposed development does not accord with the spatial strategy of the development plan in relation to housing provision, but that it does not offend, in principle, the spatial strategy relating to employment land and community uses. Against this background I turn to the more 'practical' consideration of location. That is, the relationship of the proposed development with on the ground services and facilities.
14. Lyneham has a significant number of services within the village. These include a number of conveniences stores, businesses associated with the motor trade, café, pub(s), village hall, primary school, hairdresser and others. In this rural area this seems to me to be a rich mix of facilities available to the local population for many day to day needs. Whilst some of these facilities are in the southern part of the village compared with the appeal site, the potential walk distance is not onerous. Lyneham could clearly cater for a development of the size proposed in providing many elements of daily needs.
15. In addition the village has a regular bus service to Chippenham and Swindon which would be the envy of many rural locations. There is a clear option to use public transport which many would find a suitable alternative to the private car. That is not to say that private vehicle use would be insignificant at the appeal

site – that would be an unrealistic expectation here – but there is a genuine alternative available. Taking these matters together it is my judgement that Lyneham cannot be regarded as locationally unsatisfactory for development. That is implicitly accepted in the Council's recent permission for 50 dwellings here, and by the NP acceptance of some, albeit limited, housing development.

16. I comment briefly here on the matter of access to the site. Vehicular access is acknowledged to be at a suitable standard as shown on the submitted plans. Questions have arisen in relation to the potential for pedestrian access elsewhere. I do not share the view that the pedestrian access close to the White Hart is unacceptable. It may have a rough surface but I doubt that this would deter many, if any, pedestrians. The potential access further to the south would be more problematic, but I do not see this as crucial to a successful scheme.

Character and Appearance

17. The appeal site is not within a designated landscape, and it is accepted by the main parties not to be in the category of valued landscape as referred to in the NPPF. I note comments made that if development sites were to be designated in Lyneham the appeal site would be a logical candidate. I have also taken note of the representations put forward by all parties in relation to landscape matters. Although there is a difference between those representations it is clear that there is acknowledgement that RAF Lyneham exerts a strong influence on the landscape. Indeed my site observations lead me to conclude that the appeal site is atypical of the wider landscape hereabouts (whichever landscape character assessment is utilised). The identified characteristics of the Lyneham Hills, for example, are not evident on Lyneham airfield. The site is hemmed in by the village on one side and the RAF base on the other. Its current character has internal variations, but is inevitably affected by urban and military development.
18. Part of the land (closest to the MOD boundary) is presently in active use for arable production. A central belt is unkempt and formed mainly of overgrown scrub. Land closest to the village has the appearance of grazing land or paddock and that to the south-east is overgrown and unused. In overall terms the land has a nondescript character which is not reflective of the wider locality. In my judgement it is more urban fringe than countryside in character. It makes no meaningful contribution to the wider landscape because of its self-contained nature.
19. Because of the characteristics of this parcel of land it has low sensitivity to development. The proposal itself would of course change the nature of the land materially, but the opportunity for detailed improvements in parts of the site would mean that the long term effects of development on character would be slight. This is particularly so bearing in mind that the indicative proposals (which are not part of a formal scheme at this stage) show that a large proportion of the land could be given over to improvements in the landscape.
20. In visual terms the land does not have strong links with public viewpoints. There are no public rights of way crossing the land and views into the land are limited and in part affected by MOD development. I do not accept that the current views available across the land can be described as rural views given that they are heavily affected by both village properties and the RAF base. Visual sensitivity to change is also low, and a development of the type

proposed would offer the opportunity to improve visual appreciation of the site, particularly from the area close to The Green. This would offer the opportunity to supplement existing tree and shrub cover and enhance views across the site. Such matters would remain in the control of the Council for determination at reserved matters stage. As a result the magnitude of change would, in my judgement, amount to a slight to moderate change at worst, with the potential to be beneficial in the future as any development matures.

21. Core Policy 51 of the CS seeks to ensure that negative impacts on landscape character (as identified in landscape character assessments) are avoided or minimised. As I have found that the appeal site bears little, if any, relationship to identified landscape character it seems to me that conflict with that policy is limited. In any event the policy makes provision for development, where permitted, to enhance landscape through good design. It is acknowledged that the provision of open space on the site would be likely to exceed required standards, and as such the objectives of Core Policy 52 are likely to be met. This seeks, amongst other things, enhancement of Wiltshire's green infrastructure network, with accessible open space.
22. Drawing together these matters I find that the appeal site makes little contribution to the character of Wiltshire's countryside, is detached from the wider landscape, and that the development would offer the opportunity to enhance the character of this edge of settlement site. Furthermore it would enable the provision of significant areas of publicly accessible open space.

The Planning Balance

23. The proposal would deliver up to 200 homes, 40% of which would be affordable (delivered by the mechanism of a S106 obligation which I address below). These are very substantial benefits in a context of the significant shortfall in housing land supply and the need for affordable housing. The provision of employment land is a moderate benefit, whilst the provision of community based development (identified during the consultation phase of the proposal) would also attract some weight in favour of the proposal.
24. There would be no unacceptable impact on trees, and the access to the site would be suitable. Heritage impacts are acknowledged to be at a scale which does not militate against the proposal, and I have no reason to depart from the assessments carried out. Similarly, ecological matters and drainage can be satisfactorily dealt with. These matters weigh neither in favour nor against the proposal as they would be required to be addressed in any scheme.
25. The proposal would conflict with the development plan in relation to the spatial strategy for housing, and I am conscious that the NP has been recently adopted. However, the most important policies of the development plan are deemed to be out of date because of the lack of a 5 year housing land supply. The quantum of supply which is not currently catered for leads me to the view that conflict with development plan policies for housing should attract only moderate weight in this case.
26. The Council's decision notice makes reference to a number of paragraphs in the NPPF, which has since been updated. The Council has accepted that reference to paragraph 79 (now paragraph 80) is not directly applicable to a major proposal of this nature, and I agree with that position. Paragraph 54 (now 55) no longer applies in light of the S106 obligation. I am satisfied that local

facilities are acceptable and that transport links into and out of the site can be made so. Hence there is no conflict with NPPF paragraphs 102 to 104 (now 104 to 106). I am satisfied that the proposal could be designed to be sympathetic to local character and history, so avoiding conflict with paragraph 127c) (now 130c)). There is limited conflict with paragraph 170b) (now 174b)) relating to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, as I have set out above.

27. Taking these matters in the round it is my judgement that the substantial weight in favour of the provision of market and affordable housing, and the additional weight afforded to employment and community facilities, creates a compelling case for granting planning permission.
28. I realise that granting permission for up to 200 houses (the exact number would be for reserved matters to determine) will be disappointing for those who oppose the proposal. However, and notwithstanding the recent making of the NP, the limited harms associated with granting permission do not reach the necessary threshold set out in the NPPF. The proposal falls to be determined as a sustainable development in NPPF terms and as such it is not in conflict with paragraphs 7, 8, 9 or 11. The adverse impacts of granting planning permission (conflict with the spatial strategy and limited landscape harm) would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

Conditions and S106 Obligation

Conditions

29. The Appellant has indicated agreement with the suggested list of conditions provided by the Council. I agree that in order to bring forward the site quickly it would be reasonable to curtail the period in which reserved matters are applied for. It would also be reasonable to set out in more detail the list of approved drawings and expectations relating to the quantum and height of development in order to ensure the development is appropriate to the locality.
30. Conditions requiring the submission of detailed development management plans relating to ecological matters, biodiversity, construction methods, lighting and arboricultural matters are all necessary in order to ensure the development has minimal impact on the natural resources of the locality and is carried out in a satisfactory manner. It is also reasonable and necessary to impose conditions requiring detailed specifications of primary and secondary access, together with local improvements for pedestrian access, in order to ensure safe access and egress at the site. A travel plan is necessary, as are details of low energy vehicle infrastructure, to reduce private car use, and to ensure that such use minimizes any impact on the environment.
31. Detailed specifications for surface and foul drainage systems are necessary and it is reasonable to seek these by condition in order to prevent flooding or pollution. A landscaping condition requiring implementation and maintenance for a reasonable period would also be reasonable and necessary in order to ensure the development is assimilated into its surroundings.
32. I have amended the wording of conditions where necessary for precision. I have not included the Ecology Parameters Plan within the conditions as this is

not agreed as a plan on which the Council took its decision. In any event appropriate control rests with the Council.

Obligation

33. An obligation pursuant to S106 of the 1990 Act has been submitted. This is dated 14 May 2021 and has been duly signed as an agreement by the Council, the landowner and the Appellant. The obligation makes provision for a number of matters including the provision and allocation of affordable housing, the provision and management of open space and sustainable drainage. Contributions towards air quality monitoring, off site playing fields and secondary education, and waste and recycling are included.
34. The Council has provided a compliance statement to justify each of the requirements of the obligation. The justification makes reference to compliance with development plan and other policies and strategies. I am satisfied that the requirements of the obligation meet the tests of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and it can therefore be taken fully into account in reaching my decision.

Other Matters

35. The majority of matters raised by local people have been covered in the main part of this decision. I note, however, the assertion that residential property will become available at the adjacent MOD base in the near future. However I have no substantive evidence which would warrant any such accommodation materially affecting the 5 year supply of housing land. I also have no evidence that the MOD has any concerns relating to the 'buffer' between its land and the main part of the village being developed. I am also aware that local residents are concerned by the prospect of increased traffic. However the highway authority has not indicated that the network cannot absorb extra traffic from this proposal, hence this is a matter which does not weigh against the proposal. In relation to the provision of healthcare and other services I do not have sufficient information for me to conclude that the proposed development would materially impact on provision such that it could be deemed to be a determinative issue in this appeal.
36. The matter of whether or not the proposed employment and community facilities would in fact be provided has been raised. However, I must deal with the proposal before me and those elements are included. It remains with the Council to make determinations at the reserved matters stage.

Overall Conclusion

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

Philip Major

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than 1 year from the date of this permission or before the expiration of 1 year from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.
- 2) No development shall commence on site until details of the following matters (in respect of which approval is expressly reserved) have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
 - a) The scale of the development;
 - b) The layout of the development;
 - c) The external appearance of the development;
 - d) The landscaping of the site.Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 3) An application for the approval of all of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of one year from the date of this permission.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents unless otherwise varied by details submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in accordance with the conditions of this planning permission:

Location Plan (CSA/3008/118)

Proposed Site Access Arrangement (19-008/001) March 2019
- 5) Notwithstanding the details set out in the description of development, the development hereby approved shall comprise no more than 200 dwellings and buildings falling within Use Class E (c, e, f & g).
- 6) Notwithstanding the details set out in the description of development, the dwellings and buildings falling within Use Classes E (e-f) shall be no greater than two storeys in height.
- 7) No development shall take place until full details of the proposed site levels (above ordnance datum), together with the finished floor slab levels of the proposed buildings and structures (including roads and footpaths), in relation to existing ground levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 8) Concurrent with the first reserved matters application a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted in accordance with the measures outlined in the Ecological Assessment (CSA/3008/08) to be approved in writing by the local planning authority. The content of the LEMP shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following information:
 - a) Description of features to be managed including a map identifying the extent of habitat areas and species locations on site;
 - b) Aims and objectives of management for all ecological features identified pursuant to subparagraph a);

- c) Appropriate management requirements for achieving the aims and objectives identified in subparagraph b);
- d) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a 5 year period);
- e) Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the LEMP;
- f) Details of ongoing monitoring and any remedial measures;
- g) Details of how the aims and objectives of the LEMP will be communicated to future occupiers of the development;
- h) Details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body/ies responsible for its delivery;
- i) Details of how contingencies or remedial action will be identified, agreed with the local planning authority, and implemented, if any of the aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met.

The LEMP shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details, and a report shall be submitted to the local planning authority annually detailing works undertaken and performance against aims and objectives.

- 9) No development shall commence on site (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:
- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities;
 - b) Identification of biodiversity and tree protection zones on a plan;
 - c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements) including in respect of the on site watercourse, and protection of water quality;
 - d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features;
 - e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works;
 - f) Details of responsible persons and lines of communication;
 - g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person(s);
 - h) Details of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs;
 - i) Ongoing monitoring, including compliance checks by a competent person(s) during construction and immediately post-completion of construction works.

A report prepared by a competent person(s), certifying that the required mitigation and/or compensation measures identified in the CEMP have been completed to their satisfaction, shall be submitted to

the local planning authority every three months from the start of the development until the completion of the final planting.

- 10) No demolition, site clearance or development shall commence on site until an Arboricultural Impact Assessment; Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan prepared by an arboricultural consultant providing comprehensive details of construction works in relation to trees has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. All works shall subsequently be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details. In particular, the method statement must provide the following:
- a) A specification for protective fencing to trees during both demolition and construction phases which complies with BS5837:2012 and a plan indicating the alignment of the protective fencing;
 - b) A specification for scaffolding and ground protection within tree protection zones in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012;
 - c) A schedule of tree works conforming to British Standard 3998:2010;
 - d) Details of general arboricultural matters such as the area for storage of materials, concrete mixing and use of fires;
 - e) Plans and particulars showing the siting of the service and piping infrastructure;
 - f) A full specification for the construction of any arboriculturally sensitive structures and sections through them, including the installation of boundary treatment works, the method of construction of any access driveway including details of any no-dig specification and extent of the areas of the driveway to be constructed using a no-dig specification;
 - g) Details of the works requiring arboricultural supervision to be carried out by the developer's arboricultural consultant, including details of the frequency of supervisory visits and procedure for notifying the local planning authority of the findings of the supervisory visits;
 - h) Details of all other activities, which have implications for trees on or adjacent to the site;

The AMS shall include for monthly site visits by the developer's arboricultural consultant and a report detailing the results of site supervision and any necessary remedial work shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. Remedial works shall be carried out as approved by the local planning authority.

- 11) All soft landscaping comprised in the approved details of landscaping, as required by the reserved matters applications and details required by conditions within this decision notice shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season within or following the completion of each phase, first occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. All hard landscaping shall also be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part

of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

- 12) No development shall commence on site (including any works of demolition), until a Construction Method Statement (CMS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CMS shall include the following;
- a) Details of arrangements for the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - b) Details of arrangements for loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - c) Arrangements for the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - d) Details of the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
 - e) Details of wheel washing facilities;
 - f) Details of measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - g) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works (including a prohibition of burning waste or other materials during the demolition/construction phase);
 - h) Details of measures for the protection of the natural environment;
 - i) Proposed hours of construction, including deliveries;
 - j) Drainage arrangements during the construction works;
 - k) Proposed vehicle routing for construction vehicles;
 - l) Details of proposals for the provision of road cleaning of the B4069 road near to the site access at times when such road cleaning is needed.

The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved CMS.

- 13) Concurrent with the first reserved matters application details of further bat surveys at Building 8 (barn as identified in the CSA bat survey) together with any necessary mitigation roost locations and the licensing arrangements which will be followed to ensure demolition is undertaken lawfully, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details and photographs shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority showing the completed mitigation roost(s) in place on the site.
- 14) Prior to commencement of construction, a Lighting Strategy for the site shall be submitted to the local planning authority for agreement in writing. This shall include a lux plot that demonstrates that a level of 1lux or less can be achieved across all habitat identified as bat mitigation habitat on the Ecological Parameters Plan (CSA/3008/119). All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be retained thereafter in

accordance with the strategy. No other lighting shall be installed without prior written approval from the local planning authority.

- 15) Prior to first occupation of any dwelling, community building or employment unit, the ghost island right turning lane outlined on drawing 19-008/001 including a pedestrian refuge, and a kerbed island in the access bellmouth, lowered kerb crossing point on both sides of the B4069, 2 metre wide footway leading from the development to the pedestrian refuge, street lighting, highway drainage alterations to accommodate the right turning lane, resurfacing of the entire width of the B4069 road over the length of the right turning lane scheme, shall all be provided in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.
- 16) Prior to first occupation of any dwelling community building or employment unit hereby permitted the access shall be provided with visibility with nothing to exceed the height of 600mm above carriageway level between the carriageway edge, and a line drawn from a point 2.4 metres back along the centre line of the access from the carriageway edge, to points on the nearside carriageway edge 90 metres to the east, and 59 metres to the west.
- 17) Prior to first occupation of any dwelling, community building or employment unit hereby permitted the junction between the B4069 and St Michael's Close just to the east of the development access point shall have its footways adjusted and a new drop kerb crossing point provided over the St Michael's Close bellmouth junction in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.
- 18) Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling, community building or employment unit hereby permitted a bollarded emergency access onto the B4069 shall be provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 19) No residential unit shall be occupied until those parts of the Odyssey Residential Travel Plan, dated March 2019, capable of being implemented prior to occupation have been implemented. Those parts identified for implementation after occupation shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable contained therein, and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied. The Residential Travel Plan Co-ordinator shall be appointed and carry out the identified duties to implement the Residential Travel Plan for a period from first occupation until at least 2 years following occupation of the last residential unit.
- 20) Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling, community building or employment unit hereby permitted a scheme of Ultra Low Energy Vehicle infrastructure shall be provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved and thereafter be permanently retained.
- 21) No development shall commence on site until a scheme for the discharge of surface water from the site/phase, including SuDS (sustainable drainage systems) and all third party approvals (as necessary), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the lead local flood authority and the sewerage undertaker. Scheme details shall include any required off-site capacity

improvements needed to allow the site/phase to be served, and to include a programme allowing sufficient time for the delivery of any required improvements.

- 22) No development shall commence on site until details of the works for the disposal of sewage, including the point of connection to the existing public sewer, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No dwelling shall be first occupied until the approved sewerage details have been fully implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Philip Major

INSPECTOR
