



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 18 October 2022

Site visit made on 18 October 2022

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/W/22/3298464

Land at Redlands, Reading Road, Sherfield on Loddon, Basingstoke RG8 0PL

- 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 Cooper Estates Strategic Land Limited against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00808/OUT, dated 3 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is Outline application for up to 57 no. new dwellings (all matters reserved except access and layout).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for up to 57 no. new dwellings (all matters reserved except access and layout) on Land at Redlands, Sherfield on Loddon, Basingstoke RG8 0PL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00808/OUT, dated 3 March 2021, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matters

2. The application is made in outline with details of access and layout provided for consideration. The submitted masterplan is titled as 'indicative' but the main parties were agreed that it should be considered on the basis that the layout is fixed and the landscaping illustrative. The scale and appearance of development and landscaping of the site are all reserved for future approval.
3. My formal decision takes the site address from the decision notice and appeal form, as this is a more precise description of the location.
4. The final draft of a unilateral undertaking (UU) was available for discussion at the hearing, supported by a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Compliance Statement. A signed version of the UU dated 1st November 2022 was provided after the event. Its text has been agreed with the Council and I note that the authority is satisfied that the obligations within the UU address the third reason for refusal. I shall return to the matter of CIL compliance later.

Application for Costs

5. An application for costs was made by Cooper Estates Strategic Land Limited against Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- a) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
- b) whether future occupants of the development would have acceptable access to services and facilities; and
- c) whether material considerations exist to outweigh any conflict with the development plan in respect of the first two issues.

Reasons

Character and appearance

- 7. The appeal site comprises the eastern third of a 9.4 ha area of land known as 'Redlands' which has been allocated for residential development under Policy SS3.7 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011 to 2029) (LP). The Inset Map to the LP shows the site as falling within the settlement boundary but outside of the area indicated for development, which is shown hatched.
- 8. Outline planning permission was granted in September 2017 to enable the construction of 150 homes to the west of the site. I shall refer to this as 'the 150 unit scheme'. Reserved matters approval has been secured and this development is well advanced, with a number of dwellings already occupied. The appeal scheme would be accessed through this development which is served by a new arm on the A33 Taylor's Farm roundabout.
- 9. The land to the east of the A33 has historically been agricultural, the only significant urban influence being an energy recovery plant and sewage treatment works on Whitmarsh Lane, approximately 500 m south of the site. The 150 unit scheme breaches the barrier of the A33, but it forms part of a planned extension of Basingstoke. To the south of Redlands, another site known as 'Land East of Basingstoke' has been allocated for 450 dwellings and the provision of social and physical infrastructure.
- 10. The 150 unit scheme represents an incongruous protrusion into the countryside when considered on plan. However, the reality is that it is well contained by mature trees and hedging which screen much of the development. The main public views are from the access road and the public footpath (RoW4) which runs along the southern boundary. These are negative impacts in landscape and visual terms, measured against the original baseline, but ones which the Council will have considered when allocating the Redlands site for development.
- 11. The Redlands site falls within the 'Lowland Mosaic Open' Character Area, as defined within the Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment. Aerial photography shows a patchwork of agricultural fields which could be described as a mosaic. There are some attractive open views southwards from RoW4, but the landscape in the vicinity of the appeal site is predominantly enclosed. A strong framework of mature trees, hedges and woodland blocks acts to truncate views.
- 12. Following the accompanied site visit, I walked an agreed route using public footpaths in the area. This included Whitmarsh Lane and Moulshay Lane. The development under construction is not visible from most vantage points. Even allowing for the seasonality of vegetation, the housing is largely screened from the surrounding countryside and has no effect on its prevailing rural character.

13. The Council's landscape witness argued that the appeal site has a sense of scale and grandeur and that it is a significant piece in the overall jigsaw puzzle. This overstates the importance of the site in the wider landscape. The absence of buildings does give the land an open character, but this is only experienced within the site itself, from the new housing development immediately adjacent and in views from a short section of public footpath across the 'Redlands Garden Site'. The latter does not have permission for development but it forms part of the Redlands allocation and is likely to be developed in the future. There may be scope to preserve views into the site as part of a future scheme, but the probability is that the quality of those views will be significantly eroded.
14. The photograph taken from Viewpoint 31 within the Council's evidence was taken from a position several metres off the footpath and on the edge of the site. This is not representative of the public views available, but even if it was the land is seen against the backdrop of buildings. The approved plans for the 150 unit scheme show negligible landscaping along the boundary with the site. The visibility of the new housing detracts from the rural character of this land.
15. The Council has raised concerns over the effect of the proposal on views from the nearest dwellings within the adjoining development. These properties are not yet complete or occupied and therefore future residents would choose their new home in full knowledge of any planning application for the appeal site. This is not a matter to which I have attached any significant weight, notwithstanding the appellant's acceptance that the receptors should have been factored into the Landscape and Visual Appraisal submitted with the application.
16. There was discussion at the hearing on whether some of the vegetation on the periphery of the site is within the appellant's control. The precise boundary is difficult to establish even with the benefit of a site visit. Nevertheless, the layout of the appeal scheme makes provision for a landscaped margin on its north, south and east boundaries. There is no information to suggest that existing trees and hedging may be removed by adjoining landowners. Indeed, I saw that there has been substantial tree planting outside of the eastern boundary which should develop over time into a woodland block and thereby reinforce the new edge to the settlement.
17. Policy SS3.7 of the LP sets out the requirements for ensuring high quality development on the Redlands site. Criterion b) is most relevant to the Council's case. This states that the development should respond positively to the special landscape qualities of the area, ensuring that the density, heights and layout of buildings minimise any visual impacts of this location. The design and layout of development needs to present a strong and defensible green buffer to the north and east, including the use of open space to limit the visual impact of development. According to the policy, this will include 'locating development in the western part of the site' and avoiding residential development to the north of the existing field boundary, which forms the northern edge of the site.
18. The scheme under construction takes up two thirds of the Redlands allocation leaving the easternmost third undeveloped. The proposed development would occupy this area, outside of the hatched area on the Inset Map and on land which is shown to be retained in its existing land use on the Indicative Development Framework Plan in the East of Basingstoke and Redlands Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD). The proposal would conflict with the requirement of Policy SS3.7 that development

be confined to the western part of the site. However, it would comply with other aspects of the policy, notably through its provision of a multi-functional green space corridor around the outer edges of the site. Details of the planting within this corridor would be provided as part of the reserved matters, but I am satisfied that it would be effective in mitigating any adverse visual impacts. The Council has accepted that the site already enjoys a high level of containment.

19. The net density of the proposal would be broadly similar to that of the 150 unit scheme. The Council argued that the density was too high and that this would fail to make the transition between suburban development immediately to the west and open countryside immediately to the east. However, I am not altogether convinced that a lesser density is necessary. The proposal would create an appropriate edge to the built-up area – better in fact than the 150 unit scheme which provides a weak boundary with the adjoining field.
20. My overall conclusion is that, whilst there would be a degree of conflict with the LP Policy SS3.7, the proposal would meet the overarching objectives of the policy insofar as it seeks to ensure that development responds positively to the special landscape qualities of the area and limit the visual impacts of the development. There would be compliance with LP Policies EM1 and EM10 insofar as these seek to ensure that new development is sympathetic to the character and visual amenity of the landscape.

Access to services and facilities

21. Redlands is a discrete allocation within the LP, but it has close connections with the East of Basingstoke allocation immediately to the south. Criterion i) of Policy SS3.7 explains that joint masterplanning of the two sites should be used to ensure that development is brought forward in a coordinated manner. The policy states that the Redlands site should not be developed in isolation.
22. The SPD sets out more detailed development principles that build on Policy SS3.7 (Redlands) and Policy SS3.9 (East of Basingstoke). It has been the subject of public consultation and is a material consideration in determining planning applications. Development Principle 1e within the SPD reinforces the need for a coordinated approach to the delivery of housing and related social and physical infrastructure. It recognises that the majority of infrastructure will be on the larger of the two sites and therefore the landowners of Redlands will need to provide appropriate contributions towards infrastructure. Development is required to be phased in a manner which sees the introduction of the facilities and primary school at the earliest point possible, to begin to establish a local community. The SPD explains that conditions will be used at the outline stage where appropriate to secure this coordinated approach.
23. The development plan gives some idea as to the Council's expectations on the timing of development. Policy SS3.7 suggests that Redlands will deliver in the period 2017/18-2020/21 whereas Policy SS3.9 anticipates delivery for East of Basingstoke being 2018/19-2022/23. There is an implied acceptance here that development at Redlands may take place in advance of the neighbouring site. This is not surprising; the East of Basingstoke allocation is more complex, involving multiple land uses in addition to housing. There will be a need to provide a community centre, local shopping facilities, sports facilities including playing pitches, and a primary school if required by the Education Authority.

24. The 150 unit scheme was permitted without any mechanism to ensure that the infrastructure on the East of Basingstoke site would be in place. However, the Council does not wish to see additional housing on the Redlands site until substantive progress has been made on the East of Basingstoke allocation. This site has not moved forward and discussions are still at an early stage. There are no current applications and the latest Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment is predicting the delivery of only 250 units before 2029. The remaining 200 units would be delivered beyond the plan period. The Council is therefore concerned that the proposal would bring forward housing without the necessary supporting infrastructure – thus failing to adopt the coordinated approach being sought under the development plan.
25. The phasing information within Policies SS3.7 and SS3.9 means that it was always likely that at least some of the future residents of the Redlands site would move into their new homes without having access to the infrastructure in the neighbouring allocated site. There is no compelling evidence to suggest that this infrastructure will not be delivered. It is more a question of when it will come forward and what residents of the proposed development would do in the meantime. The evidence suggests that there may be a delay of several years before infrastructure is in place. This is clearly not ideal, but it needs to be balanced against the benefits of housing delivery in a situation where the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.
26. Residents of the appeal scheme would need to travel to existing services and facilities in the interim period. The 12 pupils generated by the development would most likely travel to Four Lanes Primary School which is roughly 2.5 km away on foot. A controlled crossing on the A33, installed as part of the 150 unit scheme, improves safety on this journey, and also provides access to the Sherfield Park development which contains a modern community centre, local shop, playing field and equipped play area. I was told that secondary pupils catch the bus from Sherfield Park to Everest Community Academy. More extensive shopping facilities, including a superstore, are available at the Chineham District Centre, approximately 3.3 km away along the A33. A regular bus service links Sherfield Park to this District Centre, in addition to providing access to Basingstoke Town Centre and railway stations at Basingstoke and Bramley.
27. Sherfield Park Parish Council have stated that the existing facilities within its area do not have the capacity to serve the proposed development. It states that Sherfield Park Community Centre is already at capacity for bookings and further advises that the nursery has a waiting list. However, these claims are not supported by any firm evidence and the concerns of the Borough Council are centred on whether occupants of the new homes would be reliant upon the private car. It would be naive to suggest that there would be no additional trips by motor vehicle – it is likely that some residents would choose this mode of transport. However, the opportunity exists to walk and cycle to local facilities, in addition to using public transport.
28. Looking at the matter in the round, the delay in providing infrastructure within the East of Basingstoke development must weigh against the appeal scheme. However, future residents would have reasonable access to existing services and facilities in the intervening period and a proportion of journeys would be made via sustainable transport modes. The situation would improve in the longer term once the new community to the east of the A33 is established and therefore any harm arising from additional car use would reduce over time.

Other Matters

29. I heard from one local resident concerned about the effect of the proposal on traffic on the A33. It was obvious at my site visit that this is a busy main road. However, the Council will have considered the impacts on the highway network when deciding whether to allocate land for development at Redlands and Land East of Basingstoke. The proposal would be modestly scaled relative to the committed dwelling numbers in those allocations and the existing access road has the capacity to accommodate the additional traffic generated. The Highway Authority considers the highway impacts to be acceptable and I concur.
30. There is no substantive technical evidence to support the suggestion, advanced by a local councillor, that the proposal may have an adverse impact on ecology within the catchment of the River Loddon. The Biodiversity Officer raised no objection to the scheme which I note from the calculations submitted would secure a net gain for biodiversity.
31. The site is situated approximately 590 m from the Grade II Listed Le Fevre to the north and roughly 735 m from the Grade II Listed Church of St Leonard. I saw that the church spire is visible from within the site, above the trees and vegetation on the northern boundary. However, the Council confirmed at the hearing that it was not alleging any adverse impacts on heritage assets, including the remnant parkland associated with Sherfield Hall. Based on my observations at the site visit, I have no reason to take a different view.

Unilateral Undertaking

32. The submitted UU includes commitments relating to affordable housing, allotment provision, on-site open space, public art, a landscape management plan, travel plan and school travel plan contribution. On the basis of the CIL Compliance Statement, I am satisfied that the obligations within the 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. They meet the requirements of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and secure compliance with Policies CN1, CN6, CN9 and EM4 of the LP in relation to infrastructure delivery.

Planning Balance

33. It is common ground that the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites. A report to members¹ advised that the authority had a 4.5 year supply on 1 April 2021, calculated using the standard method set out in national planning practice guidance (PPG). This amounts to a deficit of roughly 720 homes after applying a 10% buffer. This does not represent an acute housing shortage, but it is a shortfall nonetheless. The parties are agreed that the position is likely to worsen and will not be rectified until sometime after the adoption of the review local plan. This is not expected until Autumn 2025 at the earliest. The housing land supply position will not be helped by the ongoing delays in bringing forward the East of Basingstoke allocation.
34. The failure to demonstrate the requisite supply of housing land means that paragraph 11 (d) of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') is engaged. This explains that, in situations such as this, the policies which are most important for determining the application should be deemed out-of-date.

¹ Local Plan Update, Appendix 1 of the Statement of Common Ground

Permission should therefore be granted unless: i. the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or ii. 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.

35. There is no suggestion here that the proposal would affect any of the protected areas or assets listed in Footnote 7 of the Framework. The relevant balance to apply is the 'tilted balance' set out in the second limb of paragraph 11 (d).
36. The scheme would provide a number of important benefits, notably the delivery of 34 market homes and 23 affordable homes. Given the shortage of housing in the Borough and worsening affordability, and the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, these benefits carry great weight as a material consideration. The scheme would also generate employment and support the construction industry, in addition to providing a net gain for biodiversity. These benefits attract some additional weight in favour of granting planning permission.
37. The submitted UU contains various provisions but the majority are aimed at mitigating the impacts of the development and providing for a high quality environment which caters for the needs of future residents. With the exception of the obligations relating to affordable housing, which are positive benefits, I have treated the UU as neutral in the planning balance.
38. Against the benefits I must weigh the adverse impacts. The delay in providing infrastructure within the East of Basingstoke development must count against the proposal. However, this is tempered by the fact that future residents would have reasonable access to existing services and facilities in the intervening period, including by sustainable transport modes. In the longer term, the scheme would be wholly sustainable in locational terms.
39. There would be a degree of conflict with the LP Policy SS3.7. However, the scheme would meet the overarching objectives of the policy and it would not cause any material harm to the character or appearance of the area. The well-contained nature of the site and restricted views into the development mean that any adverse impacts resulting from the development of the eastern part of the allocation would be extremely limited. The fact that the proposal would take the Redlands site above the allocation figure of 165 dwellings does not, in itself, constitute a reason for dismissing the appeal.
40. I have given careful consideration to the evidence, including that presented by interested parties. However, my overall finding is that there are no adverse impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. The proposal would therefore constitute a sustainable form of development. This compliance with national policy is an important material consideration which would be sufficient to outweigh any conflicts with the development plan and its supporting SPD.

Conditions

41. The main parties put forward a list of suggested conditions for discussion at the hearing. I have considered these against the tests set out in paragraph 56 of the Framework and the PPG.

42. In addition to the standard conditions for outline permissions, I have attached a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty. To protect the safety and living conditions of local residents during the build phase, conditions are needed to secure a Construction Environmental Management Plan and Construction Method Statement. For the same reasons, a condition is justified to control the timings of deliveries to the site and removal of spoil from the site.
43. I have attached various conditions specifying the information to be submitted as part of the reserved matters. These secure compliance with relevant development plan policies and cover matters such as housing mix, sustainable design, biodiversity mitigation and enhancement (including tree protection, environmentally sensitive lighting and the monitoring of new habitat creation). I have also attached a condition to ensure compliance with water efficiency standards. Landscaping is a reserved matter, but it is reasonable to impose a condition setting out the level of detail expected, in addition to a condition regarding finished ground and floor levels.
44. The site lies in an area of archaeological potential and therefore a condition is necessary to secure the submission and implementation of a written scheme of archaeological investigation. This will ensure that any buried features and deposits are recorded prior to development taking place.
45. To encourage sustainable transport modes, conditions are needed to secure the provision of cycle parking, electric vehicle charging infrastructure and pedestrian and cycle connections into the Redlands Garden Site. To ensure the longevity of the roads within the proposed development, I have imposed a condition requiring details of future management and maintenance.
46. It is important that future residents have satisfactory access to refuse storage and that adequate provision is made for refuse collection, and therefore I have attached the suggested condition in relation to this.
47. Although the submitted details of surface water drainage are deemed to be acceptable by the local planning authority, conditions are necessary to ensure their implementation and the long term maintenance of the system. This will prevent surface water flooding.
48. A condition is suggested in relation to the approval of external materials, but this is unnecessary as the appearance of development is a reserved matter. The proposed condition requiring 15% of affordable dwellings to be built to lifetime mobility standards duplicates provisions within the UU and therefore fails the test of necessity.

Conclusion

49. For the reasons set out above, and having taken account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Gregory Jones KC	Instructed by Phillips Planning
Paul Watson	Phillips Planning
Mark Gibbins	Indigo Landscape
Andrew Blacker	WSP (Transport)

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Brigid Taylor	Planning Consultant acting on behalf of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
David Coomes	EDCO Design
Gregg Chapman BSc MSc MRTPI	Assistant Planning Manager, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Christopher Circuit	Chair of Sherfield Park Parish Council
Paul Miller	Chineham ward councillor
Nick Robinson	Bramley ward councillor
Chris Tomblin	Bramley ward councillor
Kate Tuck	Basing & Upton Grey ward councillor
Jenny Vaux	Chineham ward councillor
Thanga Rekha Venkatasubramaniam	Local resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

Council

- 1) Parish Boundaries Map
- 2) Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Report (with corrections)

Appellant

- 3) Closing Statement
- 4) Wyatt, R (On the application Of) v Fareham Borough Council (Rev1) [2022] EWCA Civ 983
- 5) Costs application summary

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Location Plan (Drawing No.19/01 Rev D)
 - Site Layout Plan (Drawing No. 775-GA-01 Rev F)
 - Tree Protection Plan (Drawing No. 15087-7)
 - Refuse and Cycle Strategy (Drawing No. 775-GA-02 Rev A)
 - Indicative Masterplan (Drawing No. 775-MP-01 Rev K)
 - Indicative Masterplan - Schedule (Drawing No. 775-MP-02 Rev J)
 - Masterplan Swept Path Analysis (Drawing No. 70002740-ATR-004 Rev C)
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is later.
- 3) Applications for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this planning permission.
- 4) 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.
- 5) No development (including site clearance, groundworks or construction) shall take place until a Construction Method Statement with details, schedules and drawings that demonstrate safe and coordinated systems of work affecting or likely to affect the public highway and/or all motorised and/or non-motorised highway users, 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 include details of:
 - i. the parking and turning of vehicles of site operatives and visitors off carriageway (all to be established within one week of the commencement of development);
 - ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials away from the maintainable public highway;
 - iii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development away from the maintainable public highway;
 - iv. wheel washing facilities or an explanation why they are not necessary;
 - v. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - vi. a scheme for recycling and disposing of waste resulting from construction work; and
 - vii. the management and coordination of deliveries of plant and materials and the disposing of waste resulting from construction activities so as to avoid undue interference with the operation of the public highway,

particularly during the Monday to Friday AM peak (0800 to 0900 Hours) and PM peak (1630 to 1800 Hours) periods.

- 6) No development (including site clearance, groundworks or construction) shall take place until a site specific Construction Environmental Management Plan to manage the impacts of construction during the life of the works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan must demonstrate the adoption and use of the best practicable means to reduce the effects of noise. The plan should include, but not be limited to:
- a. Procedures for maintaining good public relations including complaint management, public consultation and liaison;
 - b. Arrangements for liaison with the Council's Environmental Protection Team;
 - c. All works and ancillary operations which are audible at the site boundary, or at such other place as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, shall be carried out only between the following hours: 0730 Hours and 1800 Hours on Mondays to Fridays and 0800 and 1300 Hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays;
 - d. No impact pile driving in connection with the construction of the development shall take place on the site on any Saturday, Sunday or Bank Holiday, nor on any other day except between the following times: Monday to Friday – 0900 to 1700 Hours unless in association with an emergency or with the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority;
 - e. Deliveries to and removal of plant, equipment, machinery and waste from the site must only take place within the permitted hours detailed above;
 - f. A waste disposal policy; and
 - g. A programme for the suppression of dust during the construction.

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 7) No development (including site clearance, groundworks or construction) shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological assessment in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) that has been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority in order to recognise, characterise and record any archaeological features and deposits that may exist on the site. The assessment should take the form of trial trenches located across the whole of the application area. The investigation shall be carried out in accordance with the details so approved.
- 8) No development (including site clearance, groundworks or construction) shall take place until a programme of archaeological mitigation in accordance with the approved written scheme of investigation as secured under Condition 7 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The programme of archaeological mitigation shall include where appropriate, details of a post-excavation assessment, specialist analysis and reports, the method of archaeological recording of archaeological remains to mitigate the impact of development and details of any publication and public engagement. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 9) No development (including site clearance, groundworks or construction) shall take place until a Wildlife Protection and Mitigation Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include details of the following:
- (a) details of how woodland and hedgerow habitats adjacent to the area of the proposed development will be protected during the construction works and how woodland hedgerow buffers in line with the Council's Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD will be maintained between development and the woodland/hedgerows during the operational phase of the development.
 - (b) details of the timing/ecological watching brief required to address the protection of breeding birds, bats, badgers and reptiles before and during any development works.
 - (c) details of proposals for mitigating any potential adverse effects on bats, badgers or birds and any features that they are dependent on. This is to include details of measures that will be taken to avoid light spillage along bat commuter routes and habitat as well as a badger re-survey prior to any development on site.
 - (d) provisions for the supervision and monitoring of the plan, including briefing construction personnel, and the name and contact details of the person responsible for this.

No development or other operations shall take place other than in complete accordance with the approved Wildlife Protection and Mitigation Plan. No habitat or other landscape features that are to be retained as part of the approved Wildlife Protection and Mitigation Plan shall be damaged or destroyed or removed without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority, before practical completion of the development. If a habitat or other landscape feature is removed or damaged in contravention of this condition, a scheme of remedial action, with a timetable for implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within 28 days of the incident. The scheme of remedial action must be approved by the Local Planning Authority before practical completion of the development and implemented in accordance with the approved timetable.

- 10) No development (including site clearance, groundworks or construction) shall take place until full details of a habitat creation, enhancement and management scheme to achieve the biodiversity net gain, as shown in the submitted DEFRA biodiversity offsetting metric, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and thereafter maintained in accordance with the details so approved. The details shall include:
- a) The additional recommendations given in Section 5.16 of Corylus Ecology's Biodiversity Net Gain Report dated 29th Jan 2021.
 - b) The proposals for on-site habitat creation and enhancement to achieve the biodiversity net gain as shown in the submitted DEFRA biodiversity offsetting metric (including sources of planting stock and its origin).
 - c) The provision of arrangements to secure the delivery of the offsetting measures (including a timetable for their delivery) submitted; and

- d) A management and monitoring plan (to include for the provision and maintenance of the submitted offsetting measures in perpetuity). The written approval of the Local Planning Authority shall not be issued before the arrangements necessary to secure the delivery of the agreed offsetting measures have been executed. The scheme shall be implemented in full accordance with the requirements of the scheme or any variation so approved and thereafter retained in perpetuity.

A monitoring report shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority on the 1st November of each year of monitoring (Years 1-3 after creation / enhancement, year 5, year 10 and every 5 years thereafter), which will assess the condition of all habitats created and/or enhanced and any and all necessary management or replacement / remediation measures required to deliver the agreed biodiversity net gain.

- 11) No part of the development shall be occupied until cycle parking facilities have been provided in accordance with detailed drawings to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, such drawings to show the position, design, materials and finishes thereof. Development shall be carried out, and thereafter maintained, in accordance with the approved details.
- 12) No part of the development shall be occupied until refuse storage and collection facilities have been provided in accordance with detailed drawings to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such drawings shall show the position, design, materials and finishes thereof. Development shall be carried out, and thereafter maintained, in accordance with the approved details.
- 13) No part of the development shall be occupied until a Construction Statement detailing how the new dwellings shall meet a water efficiency standard of 110 litres or less per person per day has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority through a demonstration that this requirement for sustainable water use cannot be achieved on technical or viability grounds). The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 14) No part of the development shall be occupied until details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as an agreement has been entered into under section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a private management and maintenance company has been established - details of which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 15) Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be in accordance with Policies CN1 and CN3 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029 with particular regard to the provision of an appropriate housing mix.
- 16) Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be supported by full details of both hard and soft landscape works including ground levels or contours; means of enclosure; location and design of play areas; hard surfacing materials and minor artefacts and structure (e.g. furniture, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, external services). Soft landscape details shall include planting plans with specification (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), schedules of plants

noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/ densities where appropriate, a schedule of tree planting to include the specification of tree planting pits where appropriate with details of any irrigation or drainage infrastructure, tree root barriers (if necessary) to prevent damage or disruption to any proposed hard surfacing or underground services, drains or other infrastructure and details of the location of external lighting sufficient to demonstrate how lighting is to be achieved without conflict to proposed tree planting, with allowance for reasonable growth. The hard and soft landscaping details shall be accompanied by an implementation programme.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the relevant part of the development or in accordance with the timetable agreed with the Local Planning Authority which shall include appropriate planting to be undertaken at the earliest opportunity. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of species, size and number as originally approved, to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and thereafter maintained in accordance with the details so approved (and in accordance with the separate S106 Landscape Management Plan), to include detailed long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas to address all operations to be carried out in order to allow successful establishment of planting and the long term maintenance of the landscaping in perpetuity, and including provisions for review at least every five years).

- 17) Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment prepared in accordance with the BS5837:2012 "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction" (or equivalent document if replaced). The assessment shall be based upon a comprehensive survey of all the trees on and adjacent to the site and shall demonstrate which trees can be retained and which trees are to be removed, plus details of any tree protection necessary as a result of the survey. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 18) Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be supported by a statement of how the development will be of a high quality of sustainable design. This will include reference to how the layout, design and construction of the development will involve the efficient use of natural resources through: reducing resource requirements in terms of energy demands and water use; the consideration of opportunities for renewable and low carbon energy technologies; the use of passive solar design to maximise the use of the sun's energy for heating and facilitate sustainable cooling of buildings; and the mitigation of flooding, pollution and overheating.
- 19) Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be supported by a measured survey and plan prepared to a scale of not less than 1:500 showing details of existing and intended final ground levels and finished floor levels in relation to a nearby agreed datum point which shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 20) Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be supported by an environmentally sensitive lighting plan. The plan shall be in line with recommendations made under Guidance note 8 by The Bat Conservation Trust and Institute Of Lighting Professionals. The scheme shall be implemented in full accordance with the requirements of the scheme or any variation so approved and thereafter retained in perpetuity.
- 21) Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be supported by a scheme for the provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure for both unallocated and allocated parking spaces. The development shall then proceed in full accordance with the approved scheme.
- 22) Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall include vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access connections into the Redlands Garden Site allocation and to the further part of the Redlands site allocation (policy SS3.7 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011 - 2029 referred to as 'Phase 1' on Inset Map 'Policies SS3.7 and SS3.9 Inset Map' within the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011 - 2029) and shall include details of these accesses. The details shall include the road width, kerb radii, visibility splays, details including sections of construction, finishing materials and the cross falls and longitudinal falls, surface water drainage, and lighting. The approved details of the accesses shall be completed in accordance with a schedule and associated plan for the construction of the roads and the aforementioned accesses that shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The accesses shall not be opened to vehicular traffic if they are able to provide vehicular access to the A33 along the Public Right of Way; Sherfield on Loddon Footpath 4.
- 23) The drainage system shall be constructed in accordance with the Additional Surface Water Drainage Details and Flood Risk Assessment ref: 02740 and thereafter maintained. Surface water discharge shall be limited to 4.7 l/s. Any changes to the approved documentation must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority. Any revised details submitted for approval must include a technical summary highlighting any changes, updated detailed drainage drawings and detailed drainage calculations.
- 24) Details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings. The submitted details shall include:
 - a) Maintenance schedules for each drainage feature type and ownership;
 - b) Details of protection measures.Development shall be carried out and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 25) No deliveries of construction materials or plant and machinery and no removal of any spoil from the site shall take place before the hours of 0730; nor after 1800; Monday to Friday, before the hours of 08:00; nor after 1300; Saturdays nor on Sundays or recognised bank or public holidays.

*** END OF CONDITIONS ***