



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 13 April 2023

Site visit made on 13 April 2023

by Graham Chamberlain BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/21/3287502

**Land to the North and South of Bartlow Road, Linton, Cambridgeshire
CB21 4LY**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Abbey Developments Ltd against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00629/S73, dated 11 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2021.
 - The application sought planning permission for residential development for up to 55 dwellings with landscape buffer and new vehicular accesses from Bartlow Road without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref S/1963/15/OL, dated 1 September 2017.
 - The condition in dispute is No 11 which states that: *Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage to connect to manhole 7501 via a pumped regime shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the implementation programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.*
 - The reason given for the condition is: *To reduce the risk of pollution to the water environment and to ensure a satisfactory method of foul water drainage in accordance with the Policy NE/10 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for residential development for up to 55 dwellings with landscape buffer and new vehicular accesses from Bartlow Road at Land to the North and South of Bartlow Road, Linton, Cambridgeshire CB21 4LY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 21/00629/S73, dated 11 February 2021, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. An application for an award of costs was made by Abbey Developments Ltd against South Cambridgeshire District Council (the 'Council'). This application is the subject of a separate Decision.
3. Section s73(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that on applications made under s73, the local planning authority (and by extension and Inspector) shall consider only the question of the conditions subject to

which planning permission should be granted. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development, with Condition 11 varied, on flood risk, pollution and the water environment.

Reasons

5. Condition 11 of Planning Permission S/1963/15/OL states that the foul water drainage connection shall be to manhole 7501. This would result in wastewater bypassing the older part of the network and entering a more modern section. There is dispute regarding the origins of this requirement. The Utilities Assessment submitted with the outline application summarises Anglian Water's (AW) advice that there is sufficient capacity for discharge to manhole 7501 or manhole 1502 in Bartlow Road. That said, in response to a report prepared by AE Designs Ltd on behalf of Linton Parish Council (LPC), the Council imposed Condition 11. The applicant at the time was content to accept the drainage strategy it required, perhaps as an expediency to achieve planning permission.
6. The appellant is seeking to 'vary' Condition 11 to allow connection to either manhole 7501 or an alternative connection along Bartlow Road. Foul water from the southern section of the site would be pumped uphill to the new connection whereas the northern section would be a gravity system. The appellant submits that the alternative would be a more practical solution as the pipe run would be shorter and would not need to cross third party land. The Council refused the application to vary the condition due to concerns over the capacity of the foul drainage system in 'dry weather' conditions i.e. without ground or surface water ingress.
7. The concern outlined above directly contradicts the advice from AW, which is the statutory sewerage undertaker for the area under the Water Industry Act 1991. AW undertook separate pre planning assessments for the northern and southern parts of the site. The subsequent reports set out broadly similar conclusions. After calculating the discharge flows from the development with reference to guidance in Sewers for Adoption, AW concluded that a 150mm internal diameter pipe is required to drain the development and the nearest point for such a connection is located at Bartlow Road.
8. Moreover, AW stated that they had assessed the impact of wastewater conveyance from the proposed development into the public foul sewage network and could "*confirm that this is acceptable as the foul sewerage system, at present, has available capacity*". As a result, the recommendation was for connection to Bartlow Road with the pumped section having a discharge rate of 3.8 litres a second. AW have not departed from these initial findings. Indeed, their response to the consultation on the s73 application the subject of this appeal can be summarised as 'no objection'.
9. Accordingly, AW undertook a technical assessment with reference to published guidance that considered both the flow of the wastewater from the development and the capacity of the system to accommodate it. Therefore, my start point is to afford this advice significant weight, especially as it was given by experts representing the statutory sewerage undertaker.

10. The report by AE Designs Ltd in 2016 considered the capacity of the sewer system also with reference to Sewers for Adoption and British Standards. The author calculated the wastewater flows from existing occupied buildings with no allowance for highway drainage or informal connections. A formula was then applied to determine the necessary pipe capacities. The assessment also considered gradients. Ultimately, it was determined that sections of the sewer network were in a 'parlous configuration' as several were found to be failing due to insufficient capacity to convey flows or an inability to self-cleanse. The overall conclusion was that the extant sewer system should not be further stressed by additional connections. The Council rely on this report as the main justification underpinning their decision.
11. However, AW have reviewed the AE Designs Ltd report and not raised any concerns with a Bartlow Road connection or the drainage system more generally, including matters relating to pipe capacity, gradient or the ability to self-cleanse. Indeed, their position has been reaffirmed as recently as November 2022. Meeting notes¹ also suggest that AW have reservations about the methodology used in the AE Designs Report.
12. Mr Eves of PFA Consulting has also reviewed the report by AE Designs Ltd. His initial critique in April 2021 explained that the methodology used was flawed because it was based on discharge units. In effect, this assumes that all wastewater from all properties would hit the system at the same time. This is a very worst-case scenario that is highly unlikely. Instead, Mr Eves suggests that Sewers for Adoption advocates a methodology based on peak flows. For these reasons, he recommended at the hearing that I give the report by AE Designs Ltd no weight on account of it being "wrong". That is a clear and unambiguous position taken by an expert.
13. This is important because the Council has not provided a technical rebuttal of Mr Eves's assessment. In fact, the methodological flaws were not discussed in their appeal statement. Mr Eves nevertheless undertook a further assessment in November 2022 based on the Sewers for Adoption flow rate methodology. This demonstrates that the flows in the system with the proposed development would be within the pipe capacity in all but one section. That said, the flow rates can be halved in sections of the network where wastewater does not need to travel as far, which would include the area initially found to be over capacity.
14. Thus, the evidence provided by Mr Eves satisfactorily demonstrates that there is sufficient dry weather capacity in the system. Indeed, there appears to be reasonable head room in the sections of concern if capacity is calculated on the basis of 3x Dry Weather Flows + 10%. This assessment has not been challenged with substantive technical evidence by either the Council or LPC and little evidence has been provided to suggest the sewers surcharge in dry weather. Instead, the Council and LPC referred me back to the findings in the AE Designs Ltd report, which both AW and Mr Eves have concerns about. The report by Create Consulting Engineers Ltd relating to the variation of Condition 11 does not assess capacity or directly endorse the report by AE Designs Ltd. Accordingly, the evidence before me on the dry weather capacity of the sewer network does not justify a departure from AW's advice.
15. LPC have wider concerns than those of the Council, and suggest the system lacks capacity due to surface water infiltrating into the system, or being directly

¹ See Appendix F of the Statement of Common Ground

discharged into it from some properties. LPC submit that AW did not consider surface/ground water infiltration and discharge when concluding that the system has capacity.

16. When discussing this at the hearing the appellant's put an analogy to me that even if LPC were correct on this point, then in a flood event the appeal scheme would feed or pump only a relatively small amount of wastewater at a controlled rate into an already 'overflowing bath' and therefore the impact would be insignificant.
17. However, the National Planning Policy Framework states that a proposal should not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. 'Flood risk' is the combination of the probability and the potential consequences of flooding². In this instance the consequences of sewer flooding could be unpleasant and damaging to the environment. However, it is important to carefully consider the probability that the proposal would increase the likelihood of this occurring. Therefore, it is necessary to assess whether ground/surface water infiltration and discharge has resulted in the sewer system periodically flooding due to a lack of capacity, and thus whether the wastewater flows from the appeal scheme would compound, or result in, a lack of capacity and increased risk of flooding.
18. The comments from AW lack clarity in this respect as they do not directly discuss the matter. Moreover, at the committee meeting on the 29 September 2021 AW suggested that they cannot consider surface and ground water runoff entering the foul only system because it should not be there. In effect there seemed to be an indication that AW only considered dry weather conditions when determining the capacity of the sewer system. However, AW conceded at the same meeting that the system is not closed, and that surface and ground water is seeping in. Therefore, a dry weather assessment that fails to factor in these points could be problematic.
19. Nevertheless, AW did also explain at the committee meeting that they had reviewed matters after flooding and had come to the same conclusions regarding capacity. Moreover, there was also a suggestion that when analysing and assessing growth, AW allow for 25% infiltration. Mr Eves explained at the hearing that it is standard industry practice to include 10% infiltration to account for water seeping through manholes or directly into clay pipework. If AW had allowed for 25% then this would be more than double the norm and would have been an acknowledgement of local concerns and circumstances.
20. However, it is unclear whether this is what they actually did, because the calculations are not before me, and this was not directly confirmed at the committee meeting. Nevertheless, AW are aware of local concerns about surface water flooding after attending the committee meeting and from discussions with LPC. They have also reviewed the appeal statement submitted by LPC and have not changed their views. Indeed, they have granted technical consent for the appellant to connect to Bartlow Road.
21. AW have installed flow monitors in the sewer system to assess what happens during periods of rainfall. It is reasonable to rely on the expertise of AW when considering whether they have been installed in appropriate locations. The monitors have been in place, in part, during a period of very dry weather but

² Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 7-001-20220825

there were nevertheless several rainfall readings including at least five prominent rainfall events.

22. An interim flow monitoring report was prepared by AW on the 26 May 2022, and this made several initial observations. In particular, there was no indication that the chamber surcharging submerged the sensors, which are positioned between one and two meters below cover level, that there is no strong correlation between rainfall and pipe surcharge and that only a small proportion of properties may directly connect surface water into the system. Although only initial observations, they tend to support AW's position of there being a low risk of sewer flooding. A meeting between Mr Eves and AW, including the author of the interim report, took place to discuss the findings of the flow monitoring on 10 August 2022. No concerns were raised by AW despite monitor 86153 indicating chamber surcharging 222 times and pipe surcharging 492. It was confirmed that some reinforcement of the network would be required, but this is not immediately necessary.
23. Thus, AW's comments from November 2022 raising 'no objection' need to be considered in the context that they were acutely aware of local concerns and had been investigating them. These technical investigations had not yielded any reservations in respect of the appeal scheme. I therefore afford AW's informed comments significant weight.
24. Furthermore, the lack of objection from AW needs to be considered in the context that it would make little sense for them to allow additional wastewater connections to a system that is currently over capacity or would become so. This is because addressing any capacity issues would subsequently fall to them to resolve. Indeed, the Planning Practice Guide³ explains that conditions can be imposed on a permission to phase connections until any necessary infrastructure works have occurred. If AW had doubts about the dry or wet weather capacity of the sewer system, then they could have recommended the imposition of conditions preventing occupation until such upgrades took place.
25. Moreover, LPC explained that although the appellant has a right to connect, AW also has the power to resist a connection if it would be prejudicial to the network. It therefore follows that AW could have recommended that the proposed development connects to manhole 7501 if it was concerned about capacity from a connection at Bartlow Road. In this respect, a connection to manhole 7501 had already been identified as technically possible through the previous approval of details reserved by Condition 11.
26. Plans provided at the hearing appeared to demonstrate that some of AW's records are inaccurate because wastewater flows from Lonsdale are entering the foul system. It was also suggested that some properties in Bartlow Road discharge roof water directly to the foul sewer and are billed by AW for doing so. The proposition being that if this is the case, it would only take moderate amounts of rain falling on the roofs of a handful of such properties for the headroom capacity identified by PFA Consulting to be used up. However, the bills were not provided and nor was it demonstrated that the properties in Bartlow Road do in fact discharge into the foul sewer. The appellant suggested that they could be discharging directly into highway drains.

³ Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 34-020-20140306

27. Notwithstanding the comments from the appellant on this matter, if regular discharging was occurring to a system with inadequate capacity, then there would be extensive historic evidence of flooding occurring during prominent rainfall events. In this respect, a table provided by LPC and titled 'sewer flooding history' includes only two entries. The first was dated 17 July 2009 but relates to a highway drain. The second is undated and refers to sewer flooding at Granta Vale and Lonsdale. No further details are provided. Some representations from residents of the village refer to repeated flooding⁴ and concerns about manholes surcharging, but they lack detail about the causes.
28. The report by Create Consulting refers to three other incidents prior to 2021, but again precise details are not provided. Similarly, the author of the report concedes that the incident on the 26 December 2021 was potentially not related to rainfall. Four other prominent rainfall events were recorded by the flow monitoring, but there is no evidence before me of subsequent flooding.
29. Alternatively, AW indicated at the committee meeting in September 2021 that their records of sewer flooding generally related to blockages rather than a general lack of capacity caused by surface and ground water entering the system. Substantive evidence is not before me to indicate that AW are seeking to somehow suppress the reporting of such events or that there would be a benefit to them disguising evidence of the system being over capacity and flooding. On the contrary, AW has an emerging strategic objective in a Draft Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan to reduce, by 2050, the amount of surface water in Linton's system by half.
30. As a result, limited evidence has been provided to demonstrate that sewer flooding has historically been a regular occurrence. This reduces the weight I attached to the report from Create Consulting, as the findings were based on the premise that there had been regular occurrences of sewer flooding. In reaching this view I acknowledge that some residents may be put off reporting flood events due to implications this could have for insurance premiums or selling their home. Nevertheless, I must base my findings on the evidence that is before me and in this regard, there is little evidence that sewer flooding events are occurring but not being formally reported.
31. Much stall has been placed on the flood event in July 2021, which resulted in an initial pause being placed on the determination of planning applications in Linton. This was clearly a traumatic event that significantly affected several households. Photographs and testimonies provide detailed evidence that the sewer system flooded because of this event. Indeed, the subsequent report into the flood event identified misconnections and ingress of flood water into the sewer as issues in the Lonsdale, Bakers Lane, Bartlow Road and Finchams Close area. Nevertheless, the report also explains that the event was highly unusual due to specific factors that included the highest ever recorded rainfall in Linton falling onto dry ground.
32. In addition, there was a failure of a partially constructed surface water drainage system at a development site that was then under construction. The failure of this system resulted in surface water being pumped directly into the foul system. The pumping took place after the worst of the rain had subsided, but it is possible that the amount of residual water in the system was still

⁴ For example, correspondence replicated at Appendix 2 of LPC's statement refers to 3 instances of sewerage rising from a manhole in 14 years.

higher than usual. I have seen nothing of substance to demonstrate it is common industry practice to design a wastewater system to have the capacity to deal with such an untypical event. As such, the failure of the system on that occasion is not compelling evidence that the existing system generally lacks capacity or would do so with the appeal scheme connected to Bartlow Road.

33. In summary, the evidence before me relating to the capacity of the system when accounting for surface and ground water ingress/discharge is imperfect. Nevertheless, AW probably factored surface/ground water infiltration into their capacity calculations. In any event, AW confirmed in November 2022 that they had no objection after reviewing the available evidence, including flow monitors and LPC's appeal statement. Moreover, the evidence of historic sewer flooding and its causes is imprecise. On balance, it is not robust enough to justify me departing from the expert advice of the statutory sewerage undertaker.
34. In conclusion, the evidence before me indicates that the sewer system is appropriate for dry weather conditions. It also suggests there is capacity to accommodate some regular infiltration, and possibly discharge, by surface and ground water. The system may struggle with extreme weather events, but the probability of an event like that from July 2021 reoccurring is very low. As a result, the proposed development, with Condition 11 varied, would not result in a wastewater connection into an inadequate sewer system. Accordingly, it would not harmfully increase the risk of flooding. The implication being that the appeal scheme would not harm living conditions, result in pollution or harm to the water environment and therefore a conflict with Policies CC/7, CC/9 or HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan would not occur⁵.

Other Matters

35. LPC are of the view that application S/1963/15/OL has not been lawfully commenced because 'access' was a reserved matter which has not been approved. If this is the case, then the planning permission would have lapsed. A condition cannot be varied under s73 in such circumstances.
36. However, I have carefully considered the legal advice obtained by the appellant in respect of this matter and share the conclusions set out therein for the reasons given. In summary, the permission, including the reserved matters approval, requires interpretation due to ambiguities. When undertaking such an exercise, a reasonable interpretation of the permission would confirm that 'access' was approved by the Council at either the outline stage or alternatively during the consideration of the reserved matters. Thus, the permission has not lapsed and therefore the approved housing, which is outside the settlement boundary, can lawfully proceed. During the hearing, the Council confirmed that it shared this view and has not instigated any enforcement proceedings.

Planning Obligation and Conditions

37. The original outline application was supported by a planning obligation. There is no dispute between the parties that the original obligations are still necessary. Thus, a new obligation has been completed to ensure that the new standalone planning permission created by me allowing this appeal is bound by the previous obligations.

⁵ At the hearing the Council confirmed that the reference to Policy CC/8 in the reason for refusal was an error

38. The Council and appellant agree that the conditions imposed on application S/1963/15/OL still meet the relevant tests. However, some of the details reserved by condition have already been approved. As a result, the wording of the conditions has been altered to reflect this. Moreover, some conditions need not be reimposed because they relate to the submission of reserved matters or the commencement of development, both of which have occurred.
39. The housing mix was fixed and approved as part of the approval of reserved matters and therefore a condition in this respect is unnecessary. As the technical details of the proposed foul sewer connection have been set out and are supported by AW, it is unnecessary to impose a period of monitoring.
40. Given the advanced progress of development works, it is no longer possible to undertake archaeological investigations. However, I was advised at the hearing that archaeological investigations took place in accordance with an approved scheme. As a result, the archaeological condition need only secure the publication of a report and it being logged with an archive.

Conclusion

41. The proposed development, with Condition 11 varied, would adhere to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal is allowed.

Graham Chamberlain
INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Robert Gillespie BA(Hons) MRTPI
Rachel Bird BA(Hons) MPLAN MRTPI
Tina Shiebert (Solicitor)
Graham Eves CENG MICE MCIHT
Christopher Hamilton

Impact Planning Services Ltd
Impact Planning Services Ltd
Dickins Shiebert
PFA Consulting
Abbey Developments

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Elisabeth Glover, Principal Planning Officer
Phil McIntosh, Interim Delivery Manager

South Cambridgeshire District Council
South Cambridgeshire District Council

INTERESTED PARTIES

Katherine Kell MA Cantab (Engineering)
Corrie Newell BA Arch Hons RIBA ARB IHBC
Marrie Mannasi BSc Aeronautical Eng
Cllr Henry Batchelor
Cllr Geoff Harvey MA (Cantab) Eng

Linton Parish Council (Planning Chair)
for Linton Parish Council
Linton Parish Council (Chair)
District Councillor
District Councillor (Planning Vice
Chair)

John Wood
Frances Armes
Neil Bates
David Champion
Helen Lawrence-Faulds
Liz Smith

Local Resident
Local Resident
Local Resident
Local Resident
Local Resident
Local Resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT OR AFTER THE HEARING

- AW drainage asset plans from 1985 and 2021
- Extract from Draft Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan by AW
- Revised list of suggested planning conditions
- Linton flow monitoring report by R Lyon, May 2022
- Comments from the Council, appellant and LPC on the above
- Comments from LPC on the suggested conditions

Schedule of Planning Conditions

1. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the details and drawings of reserved matters as approved under S/2501/19/RM dated 15 November 2019.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - B.12,870a (Location Plan)
 - UDS32001-500-2000-1402
 - 101 Revision A
3. The hard and soft landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved under S/1963/15/CONDF dated 13 August 2021.
The landscape works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
If within a period of five years from the date of the planting, or replacement planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted, or destroyed or dies, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.
4. Visibility splays shall be provided on each side of Bartlow Road in accordance with the measurements shown on drawing numbers 101 Revision A and E17-085-176 P5 prior to the occupation of the dwellings served from that access. The splays shall be kept clear from obstruction over a height of 600mm and thereafter maintained.
5. The Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the details approved under S/1963/CONDI dated 31 August 2021 and the timescales indicated in table 10 of the approved Residential Travel Plan, The Poppyfields Linton – Abbey New Homes 2021 submitted on 6 July 2021.
6. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the details contained within documents Phase 2 Geoenvironmental Assessment Report (MLM Group, 07.08.2017) and Phase III Site Investigation & Risk Assessment Report (ST Consult, 16 November 2017, project reference: JN1030), as approved under S/1963/15/COND9 dated 20 February 2021.
If, during remediation works, any contamination is identified that has not been considered in the remediation method statement, then remediation proposals for this material shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Remediation shall be undertaken in accordance with the method statement.
7. Prior to the first occupation of the development the approved Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage mitigation shall be installed as per the details allowed under appeal APP/W0530/W/21/3267791 dated 8 November 2021. The scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans and retained thereafter.

8. The foul drainage connection to serve the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with either of the following drainage strategies:
 - i) Drawing numbers E17-084-141 C13 and E17-084-131 C7 which depict the means of a pumped connection for the southern site to the existing public sewer between manholes 1501 and 2501 and a gravity connection for the northern site to the existing public sewer at manhole 2503.
 - ii) Drainage to manhole 7501 in accordance with details approved under S/1963/15/CONDE dated 17 September 2021.Prior to the occupation of any dwelling a connection to the public sewer for that dwelling in accordance with either of the drainage strategies shall be provided.
9. No construction work and or construction related dispatches from or deliveries to the site shall take place other than between the hours of 08.00 to 18.00 on Monday to Friday, 08.00 to 13.00 hours on Saturdays and no construction works or collection / deliveries shall take place on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.
10. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the Waste Management and Minimisation and Refuse Strategy (WMMFS) approved under S/1963/15/COND13 dated 20 October 2020. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the occupation of any building and shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are approved in writing by the local planning authority.
11. During the construction phase of development, the management of airborne dust including wheel washing shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the Air & Dust Pollution Site Procedures approved under S/1963/15/COND14 dated 11 January 2021.
12. The construction programme shall be implemented and undertaken in accordance with the details approved under S/1963/15/CONDB dated 21/05/2021.
13. Prior to first occupation of the development, acoustic mitigation shall be installed in accordance with the details set out within the acoustic noise assessment reference RP01-19487 dated 9 December 2019 prepared by Cass Allen and approved under S/1963/15/COND16 dated 20 January 2021 and thereby retained for the lifetime of the development.
14. Prior to the first occupation of the development ecological compensation, enhancement and restoration shall be implemented in accordance with the Ecological Design Strategy approved under S/1963/15/CONDD on 21 May 2021 and all features shall be retained in the manner approved thereafter.
15. The remaining development construction shall be carried out in accordance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan approved under S/1963/15/CONDC on 21 May 2021.
16. Prior to occupation of the last dwelling hereby approved, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by local planning authority;
 - (i) An Archaeological Excavation Report including archaeological analysis;

- ii) An archive report and the preparation of site archive for deposition at the Cambridgeshire Archive facility, or another appropriate store approved in writing by the Planning Authority.
17. External lighting shall only be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the details approved under S/1963/15/COND20 dated 29 October 2020. The approved lighting scheme, or suitable like-for-like replacement, shall remain in place for the lifetime of the development. No additional external lighting shall be installed without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.
18. Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling the renewable energy strategy to serve that dwelling shall be implemented in accordance with the details approved under S/1963/15/COND21 dated 29 October 2020.
19. Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling the provision and location of fire hydrants to serve that dwelling shall be implemented in accordance with the details approved under S/1963/15/COND22 dated 29 October 2020.

End of Schedule