



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 1 – 3 August 2023

Site visit made on 3 August 2023

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI DMS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P1425/W/23/3318089

Land between The Broyle and Round House Road, Ringmer, East Sussex BN8 5GD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ashill Regen against the decision of Lewes District Council (the Council).
 - The application Ref LW/22/0255, dated 31 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of 53 no dwellings (mix of houses and flats) and associated landscaping, car parking, access and ancillary works (amended description - reduction in number of units, removal of third-storey from flats, additional car parking, removal of street lighting).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of 53 no dwellings (mix of houses and flats) and associated landscaping, car parking, access and ancillary works at land between The Broyle and Round House Road, Ringmer, East Sussex BN8 5GD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref LW/22/0255, dated 1 April 2022, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule attached to this decision.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Ashill Regen against Lewes District Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary matters and main issues

3. Ringmer Parish Council (RPC) appeared at the Inquiry, having sought and been granted Rule 6 party status¹.
4. The Inquiry sat as a face-to-face event on the dates given above. The closing statements of all three parties were provided subsequently in writing, with the appellant given a further opportunity to make final points. The costs correspondence and finalised list of suggested conditions were provided within the same timescale.
5. A planning obligation by deed of agreement between the appellant, the Council and East Sussex County Council (ESCC), made under section 106 of the Town

¹ Rule 6(6) of Town and Country Planning Appeals (Determination by Inspector) (Inquiries Procedure)(England) Rules 2000

and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 agreement), was completed on 16 August 2023. I cover this later in the decision.

6. An Inquiry case management conference (CMC) was held on 23 May 2023. By this time, further information had been provided by the appellant over surface water management, biodiversity net gain and protected species. This addressed refusal reasons 3 and 4 of the Council's original decision. Based on the remaining two refusal reasons, the CMC established the main issues in the appeal to be:
 - The effect of the proposal on the local economy, in respect of employment space;
 - Whether the housing scheme proposed is of an acceptable design.
7. Following cross examination on its planning evidence, the Council announced at the Inquiry that it was no longer seeking to defend either refusal reason and was therefore withdrawing its objection to the appeal proposal. RPC maintained its objection to the scheme based on these main issues and other concerns, which I deal with below.

Site and surroundings

8. Ringmer is a settlement situated within countryside just outside the town of Lewes. The B2192 provides its spine, with most development to either side. There is a satellite to the main village comprising the discrete development at Broyleside². This includes the Broyle business centre which occupies a triangular area extending from the junction of The Broyle (B2192) and Laughton Road (B2124). The 53 homes proposed would occupy greenfield land immediately beyond this. This site is enclosed by the business centre on two sides and the housing off Laughton Road at Round House Road on a third. To its far side is further undeveloped countryside. This housing would be served by a new access onto the B2192. This would be taken at a point just beyond the Caburn Enterprise Park, which the appeal site abuts to the north. There would be footway links to the south onto Round House Road, which would also serve as vehicular access for three of the dwellings.

Relevant planning policy and history

9. The relevant development plan policies are those of Local Plan Parts 1³ (LLP1) and 2⁴ (LLP2) and Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan⁵ (RNP). The LLP1 defines Ringmer village as a Rural Service Centre; at the fourth tier in the settlement hierarchy due to its good range of shops and services and capacity for some growth. Broyleside is categorised a Local Village, at the sixth tier, as it has few services beyond its substantial employment area.
10. The RNP has allocated land for development, which is included in the policies map adopted with the LLP2⁶. The allocations relating to the proposal require clarification. The land providing an access to the B2192 falls outside the defined planning boundary in the adopted policy map. However, it is indicated in the RNP and is not a matter of contention between the parties.

² Alternatively written as Broyle Side

³ Lewes District Local Plan Part 1 Joint Core Strategy 2010 - 2030 – May 2016.

⁴ Lewes District Local Plan Part 2 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies – February 2020.

⁵ Ringmer to 2030 – A Neighbourhood Plan for Ringmer 2010 - 2030 May 2016.

⁶ Policies Map – Inset 4 Ringmer – adoption copy.

11. The housing itself occupies two development plan allocations. The northern part falls within all the land shown as an extension to EMP7; Broyle Business Park. The remainder to the south occupies an undeveloped part of RNP site RES11. This is the Lower Lodge Farm allocation of 30 dwellings and comprises the recently completed housing on Round House Road. Adjacent and to the east of the planned extension to EMP7 is the smaller allocation of RES25. This is the Lower Lodge Farm exception site, allocated by RNP for around 8 affordable dwellings.
12. Broyle Business Park and its allocated extension are shown in blue on the adopted policies map, referring to RNP Policy 5.1 for employment. This policies map also shows RES11 and RES25 for residential development, with separate red boundaries and common red hatching. All the built parts of the appeal proposal would fall within sites EMP7 and RES11. Parts of rear gardens and boundary planting along the eastern side of the proposal would intersect with a relatively small part of RES25.
13. The southern part of the appeal scheme would occupy undeveloped land north of Round House Road. In respect of relevant planning history, this was outside the red line of the completed Round House Road housing permission⁷. The application referred to this as land for further housing, anticipated to be brought forward by the community land trust. However, this area is within the general housing allocation of RES11 and separate from the RES25 Lower Lodge Farm exception site, both as shown on the adopted proposals map.
14. The appeal site is contiguous with an earlier outline planning permission for a village care centre and 16 affordable housing units, including a new access from the B2192⁸. The permitted care home facility occupied the EMP7 employment allocation and the 16 units were shown served off Round House Road and within the area referred to above; within the RES11 general housing allocation and outside the RES25 exception site.

Reasons

The effect of the proposal on the local economy, in respect of employment space.

15. To encourage economic development and regeneration in the District, LLP1 Core Policy 4 seeks to identify sufficient sites in sustainable locations to provide for a flexible range of employment space to meet current and future needs. It also seeks to safeguard existing employment sites from other competing uses unless there are demonstrable economic viability reasons for not doing so. This might include a demonstrated lack of developer interest. The supporting text in paragraph 7.45 requires robust economic viability evidence for changing use of an employment site and at least 12 months of active and continuous marketing, including advertising, to show any lack of developer or occupier interest.
16. To ensure that there are sufficient suitable employment sites available to support economic growth throughout the planning period, Policy 5.1 of the RNP seeks to retain or develop for employment use the major business sites in the parish, including EMP7, unless unviable or necessary to achieve environmental gains.

⁷ Council reference LW/15/0542

⁸ Council reference LW/18/0880

17. These local policies comply broadly with paragraph 81 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) over the weight given in planning decisions to supporting economic growth and productivity. Also relevant is NPPF paragraph 122 over decisions needing to reflect changes in the demand for land. Where there is no reasonable prospect of an allocated use coming forward, and in advance of making appropriate updates to the plan, paragraph 122 requires alternative uses be supported where contributing to meeting an unmet need for development in the area. There is an acknowledged unmet need for housing land in the District as the Council can currently demonstrate only a 3.02-year supply⁹, substantially less than the 5 year amount required under NPPF paragraph 74.
18. Both local policies require viability evidence to support the loss of the EMP7 employment allocation to an alternative use. The appellant's viability evidence tested an industrial, an office and a mixed use scheme. All showed a substantial negative site value and demonstrated each to be currently unviable. Viability is not an exact discipline. However, neither the Council or RPC provided their own viability evidence to challenge that submitted by the appellant. Based on the inputs applied to the assessments, which conservatively assumed both a nil benchmark land value and an available access, I am satisfied the appellant has demonstrated the employment use of the EMP7 allocation to be unviable.
19. In respect of demand, RNP Policy 5.1 actually acknowledges that the sites it lists provide more than sufficient new employment land in major sites to meet the anticipated level of demand over the plan period. Indeed, the published evidence base for the RNP employment allocations¹⁰ gave due weight to the views of commercial property specialists. These found no evidence that speculative new build developments on greenfield sites were economically viable in the economic climate, or for the foreseeable future. Economic conditions then, in 2014, were significantly better than now. Therefore, I accept the appellant's case that such proposals would currently be even less viable.
20. Later on, in March 2019 and during preparation of LLP2, the EMP7 extension was excluded from the employment land supply, as the Council considered there to be no evidence of its improved deliverability. More recently, the appeal site was considered as part of wider land off Laughton Road in the February 2022 Interim Land Availability Assessment¹¹. This anticipated no employment floorspace yield from the site.
21. The Lewes District Economic Needs Assessment¹² (LENA) was published in April 2023, as evidence for the Council's emerging local plan. The LENA found a net additional need for up to 9,818m² of office floorspace over the plan period to 2040, and a modest decline in net need of 18,829m² of industrial floorspace. It recommended safeguarding a specified number of existing, well-performing office and industrial spaces across the district. This did not include the EMP7 Broyle Business Centre extension, where the LENA found no obvious planning

⁹ Lewes District (Outside of the South Downs National Park) Five Year Housing Land Supply (2023-2028) Annual Position Statement at 1st April 2023 Published May 2023

¹⁰ Evidence base for the allocation of Employment sites in the RNP – Ringmer to 2030, Appendix A.

¹¹ Lewes District Council Interim Land Availability Assessment (LAA) Appendix 3 Site Assessment Outcomes February 2022

¹² Lewes District Economic Needs Assessment Final Report– AECOM, April 2023.

constraints but referred to its lack of demonstrable market attractiveness and hence deliverability.

22. The employment evidence at the time of the Council's decision included reports for the appellant by Cushman and Wakefield¹³ and Searls Land¹⁴ and responses to these on its behalf by Chilmark Consulting. The overall conclusion of Chilmark was that, on balance, there was enough employment space available in Ringmer and the wider area to satisfy existing and future demand.
23. I also agree that the site is landlocked insofar as not being directly adjacent to the public highway. Development therefore requires either the construction of a lengthy road leading in from the B2192 or use of third party land to gain access through Caburn Enterprise Park. This casts further doubt over the viability of new-build employment development. It is likely that, for the same reason, the approved care facility has not come forward and is now approaching the end of its three year commencement period.
24. The RPC evidence refers to the April 2023 employment pipeline study¹⁵ prepared for Locate East Sussex. This was produced at the same time, and by the same consultants, as the LENA. This shows that Lewes has the lowest amount of employment land in the pipeline for future development. However, this is evidence of future supply and does not contradict the LENA findings over the appeal site's lack of market attractiveness.
25. RPC refer to current employment opportunities emerging in Ringmer, at or next to other RNP employment allocations. I note the activity on sites adjacent the A26 and the successful agricultural diversification at Bridge Farm, Barcombe Mills, which is bringing forward workshop accommodation. Of these examples, the Gorrings' auction house proposal has not found accommodation within an allocated site, and so is seeking consent for development on land immediately outside.
26. However, these examples do not overturn the evidence as a whole, which is that employment land supply is broadly meeting existing and future demand. I am satisfied that there is no reasonable prospect of a viable greenfield employment development on the allocated extension to EMP 7, thus supporting its use for housing. Virtually all the remainder of the appeal site is already within the RNP RES11 market housing allocation. Therefore the proposal would have no materially harmful effect on the local economy, in respect of removing allocated employment space, and complies with LLP1 Core Policy 4, RNP Policy 5.1 and NPPF paragraphs 81 and 122.

Whether the housing scheme proposed is of an acceptable design.

27. The proposed housing would be contained by existing development along three sides and not protrude further than this into the adjacent countryside. Rather it would provide a rounding-off to the built up edge of the village. In this context, the housing would also reflect the contemporary form and design of that along Round House Road. Design quality is to a large extent a subjective matter. However, I do not share the criticism by RPC over the unimaginative, repetitive

¹³ Employment Report - Land at Lower Lodge Farm, Ringmer, East Sussex, BN8 5NN January 2022 and Response to Chilmark Consulting Review of Note of Employment Report (May 2022) of 16 June 2022.

¹⁴ Lower Lodge Farm, Laughton Road, Ringmer Marketing Summary REF: LW/18/0880 - outline permission for care village and 16 affordable homes.

¹⁵ East Sussex Employment Land Pipeline Final Report Locate East Sussex - AECOM April 2023

nature of the scheme. In my view the house designs take their cue from the good quality architecture along Round House Road, with simple pitched roof forms and unfussy contemporary design. There is a range of typologies proposed. Rather than the allegedly harmful 'pattern book' approach, I find a satisfactory degree of coherence in the bespoke designs, reinforcing and completing the sense of place established by the existing housing.

28. There is particular criticism of the row of identical large detached homes running along the western edge of the site. However, such homogeneity is not indicative of poor design. This part of the development would anchor the scheme along the planted buffer zone separating the site from the unattractive industrial buildings on the adjacent land. The gardens here would be to the sides of each house, screened by roadside walling and landscaping. As the illustrations show, this arrangement would provide a spacious and attractive rhythm to the street scheme.
29. The scheme layout would be quite regimented and of a medium density. A more spacious arrangement would clearly have been preferred by RPC. However the proposal appropriately makes effective use of a site that rounds off development in this location. The built housing adjacent are generally within somewhat deeper plots, but these appear incidental to that site backing onto a lower lying wooded area. Otherwise, the appeal scheme broadly reflects the prevailing grain of development. The density proposed falls squarely within the required 20 – 30 dwellings per hectare set by LLP1 Core Policy 2 for village development and would be appropriate to the contained nature of this site.
30. The Council withdrew its specific concerns over four of the proposed units having tandem car parking spaces. Such an arrangement raises no policy conflict, features anyway in the neighbouring Round House Road development and causes no material harm. The RPC has detailed concerns over the amount and location of car parking. However, this is not the kind of low-density scheme where it can reasonably be expected that each dwelling has ample parking within the purview of its plot. It is a moderate density scheme with a mixture of dwelling sizes, some flats and quite small gardens. The scheme has compromised over parking provision, in a situation where the RNP standards require more spaces than those of the local highway authority.
31. A lower density scheme would have given scope for more parking, including less along the streets. However this has to be balanced against making effective use of land. The issue of scheme density raises similar concerns over the amount of green infrastructure, communal open space and child's play area provided. Much of the green infrastructure would be incidental to accessing the site from the B2192 and buffering the housing from the adjacent industry, rather than being more integral to the development. However, the scheme does not fall short of any adopted standards in regard to these matters. I consider the open space to be sufficient and the play spaces adequate in size and location to comply with LLP2 Policy DM16.
32. Quite clearly the scheme would not offer future occupiers the same environment as a more spacious, lower density scheme. The scheme provides a mix of dwelling types ranging from smaller flats at one end of the scale to large detached houses at the other. These address differing requirements in respect of household sizes and affordability. However, all types and sizes of accommodation would provide acceptable living conditions, including in regard

to noise from the adjacent business park. On balance, I find the scheme to be of a suitably high standard of design. It would thereby satisfy LLP1 core policies 8, 10 and 11, LLP2 policies DM15, DM16, DM25 and DM27 and NPPF paragraphs 8, 92, 124 and 130.

Other Matters

33. RNP Policy 8.11 requires that new development be permitted only when effective mains drainage and sewerage systems are provided and can be accommodated within the capacity of the Ringmer sewage works. RPC and many interested parties are understandably concerned over this further housing exacerbating incidences of untreated sewage entering the watercourse feeding into Glynde Reach. However, this is a matter addressed by separate legislation. This proposal relates to a site already designated for development and where permission has previously been granted for a village care centre and 16 affordable housing units. Southern Water has confirmed it can provide foul sewage disposal to service this proposal. There are no planning grounds to resist this proposal over a lack of foul sewerage capacity.
34. Similar arguments apply to capacity of other elements of infrastructure, including schools and medical services. These factors are not sufficient grounds to embargo development in Ringmer on an allocated site where the proposal has been found to comply with policy.
35. This proposal would bring about benefits, but not those of the permitted care facility in relieving pressure on hospital beds. However, this extant permission remains unimplemented and is shortly to expire. There is clear evidence of it not being viable on this site. The appeal proposal has to be judged principally on its own merits. The permitted scheme is a factor to which weight is given. However, it does not alter the policy applying to this site, which the appeal proposal complies with.
36. With regard to relative car dependency, the shops and services in the main village would be a long walk from the appeal site. Cycling to these might not be the most attractive option along a busy main road. A provisional route for the Ringmer-Broyleside cycleway has been identified but there is no scheme in place for this proposal to legitimately contribute towards. There is a bus service serving the site. The site is allocated for development, where the proposal would be policy compliant and a residential permission has already been granted. There are no substantiable grounds for finding the proposal to be unacceptable owing to a high dependency on private car travel.
37. The Ashill scheme would provide a policy compliant amount of affordable housing, including 25% as First Homes required under Government policy. It would result in no material loss of affordable housing potentially provided by the RES25 exception site allocation, as this largely falls outside the area covered by this proposal. The allocations are as shown in the RNP and the more recent LLP2 policy map. These are plainly unaltered by a reference made in a planning application to future community land trust housing. Neither are allocations defined by the development brief appended to the RNP, addressing the wider Lower Lodge Farm. The adopted policy map is definitive rather than being of a generally indicative nature. Therefore, the objections made by RPC over the loss of an allocated exception site are unfounded.

38. The highway network can accommodate the additional vehicles generated and the proposal gives rise to no overriding highway safety concerns. Surface water drainage and flood risk can be satisfactorily addressed. With respect to the loss of agricultural land, the site is not currently farmed and already allocated for development in the adopted plan. Disruption from construction activities would be temporary and adverse impacts could be mitigated through an approved Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

Planning obligations

39. Various obligations are made in the S106 agreement. These provide for the 21 on-site affordable dwellings (including 25% as First Homes) and a residual payment *in lieu* for off-site provision. A financial contribution is secured towards kerbside recycling facilities. There is an obligation to provide the on and off-site biodiversity mitigation required of the proposal.
40. There is a commitment to a transport contribution, towards the cost of real time information signs at nearby bus stops. Another covers entering into an agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980, for providing the required on and off site access works. These include the main entrance from the B2192 and bus stop infrastructure measures. A contribution covers Traffic Regulation Order costs, and those incurred progressing consultations for the required bus stop clearways provided for. There is also an obligation to contribute towards an improved bus service.
41. On the evidence submitted, I conclude that all of the obligations made in the S106 agreement meet the tests in Regulation 122(2) of the CIL Regulations 2010¹⁶, as set out in NPPF paragraph 57. I consider each to be a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, b) directly related to the development and c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Planning balance

42. Planning law requires that this appeal be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise¹⁷. I find the proposal to accord with the development plan when considered as a whole and material considerations, in respect of any adverse impacts of the scheme, would not indicate otherwise than to allow.
43. It is not necessary to take this conclusion any further and to consider the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 11 of the NPPF. If this were necessary, then the Council's lack of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites would deem policies most important for determining the appeal to be out-of-date. This would serve only to tilt the planning balance further in favour of approval, given that any adverse impacts of this scheme would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against NPPF policies as a whole.

¹⁶ Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010

¹⁷ Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Conditions and conclusion

44. Specific conditions are necessary to ensure the proposal is acceptable. I have considered those suggested by the parties against the tests required in NPPF paragraph 56. Those required to be discharged prior to the development commencing had the appellant's prior agreement. The section 106 agreement already covers the access to the development from the B2192, to be subject of a s278 agreement, as well as the provision of off-site and on-site biodiversity. I have therefore addressed the necessity for further conditions in the light of this.
45. Conditions are necessary to apply the standard three year time limit for commencement (1) and specify the drawings on which this decision is based (2). To ensure safe and adequate access to the new homes, a condition addresses the estate infrastructure serving these, and secures unobstructed visibility at the site entrance (3). To ensure the construction proceeds in an environmentally acceptable manner, a condition requires compliance with an approved CEMP (4).
46. To protect the countryside character and wildlife, a condition requires an external lighting plan to be agreed (5). A condition is needed to ensure each dwelling has adequate car parking and storage for cycle and waste bins. Such details may secure the dimensions, surfacing and gradients required for the parking spaces (6). In the interests of character and appearance, a condition requires approval of external finishes and materials (7). To encourage the uptake of sustainable travel modes, a condition secures the implementation of an agreed Travel Plan (8).
47. For certainty, I have applied a number of conditions addressing biodiversity, although not the full range suggested. The objectives of both a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and an Ecological Design Strategy can be secured through the on-site mitigation required by the completed S106 obligation and a landscaping condition. Three specific conditions are necessary, however, to allow the development to proceed under the Lewes District Licence for great crested newts (9, 10, 11). A condition is necessary to secure a 10% biodiversity net gain (12), and where delivered off-site this is provided for through the S106 obligation. There is no objection in principle over surface water drainage, based on the submitted details. However, a standard wording condition covers implementation of the required measures (13). Permitted development rights are removed for additional hard surfacing beyond that approved, necessary to assist in the control of surface water run-off (14).
48. Standards conditions address archaeology (15, 16). A condition secures the phased delivery of the four children's play areas (17). Another condition addresses any unanticipated contamination encountered during construction (18). In the interests of reducing carbon footprint and water use, a condition requires approved measures to be incorporated or installed (19). A condition ensures adequate landscaping, in the interests of the appearance of the development and biodiversity (20). Finally, a condition governing acceptable noise levels in the approved dwellings is required (21). Subject to these conditions, and for the reasons explained, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Jonathan Price INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Victoria Hutton of Counsel, instructed by Will Edmonds of Montagu Evans

She called

Will Edmonds, BA Hons Dip TP MRTPI - Partner, Montagu Evans

Andrew Halfacree, BSc MRICS - Director of Flude Property Consultants

Tom Draper, MArch BSc RIBA ARB Director, Stitch architects

Andrew Smith, BSc (Hons), MSc, CMLI of Fabrik

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Jack Barber of Counsel, instructed by Ms Helen Monaghan, Solicitor LDC

He called

Marc Dorfman, Senior Special Advisor Planning, LDC

Ms Helen Monaghan, Solicitor, LDC

RULE 6 PARTY

Cllr. John Kay, Vice Chair Planning RPC

Cllr. Linda Grange, RPC

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Cllr. Emily O'Brien, LDC

Cllr. Margaret Crompton, RPC

Max Pengelley, Chair of Ringmer Area Community Land Trust

Mr J D Robins, Ringmer resident

Mrs E Robins, Ringmer resident

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS (ID)

ID 1 Opening submissions on behalf of appellant

ID2 Opening submissions on behalf of LDC

ID3 Opening submissions on behalf of RPC

ID4 Statement by Mr J D Robins

ID5 Statement by Mrs E Robins

ID6 Submission by Max Pengelley, Chair RACLT

ID7 Submission by Cllr. Margaret Crompton, RPC

ID8 Submission by Cllr. Linda Grange, RPC

ID9 Agreed itinerary for unaccompanied site visit

Richborough

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

PLAN TYPE	DATE RECEIVED	REFERENCE	REV.
Site location plan	08/04/2022	21243-STCH-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1001	-
Existing site plan	08/04/2022	21243-STCH-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1002	-
Proposed site layout	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1020	P02
S106 – Plan no 2 Tenure mix plan	31/07/2023	21243-STCH-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1027	-
Proposed site layout - Typologies	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1022	P02
Proposed site layout - Parking layout	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1023	P02
Proposed site layout - Illustrative site plan	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1024	P02
Proposed site layout - Site allocations plan	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1025	P03
Proposed site layout - Photovoltaic layout	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-XX-ZZ-DR-A-1026	P02
Flat Blocks A + B - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-FA-ZZ-A-DR-1100	P02
Flat Blocks A + B - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-FA-ZZ-A-DR-1101	P02
Flat Blocks A + B - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-FA-ZZ-A-DR-1102	P02
Flat Blocks A + B - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-FA-ZZ-A-DR-1103	P02
Flat Block A - Section	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-FA-ZZ-A-DR-1104	P02
2 Bed Terrace Building A - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-TA-ZZ-A-DR-1120	P01
2 Bed Terrace Building A - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-TA-ZZ-A-DR-1121	P01
2 Bed Terrace Building A - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-TA-ZZ-A-DR-1122	P01
2 Bed Terrace Building A - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-TA-ZZ-A-DR-1123	P01
2 Bed Terrace Building A - Sections	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-TA-ZZ-A-DR-1124	P01
2 Bed Terrace Building B - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-TB-ZZ-A-DR-1130	P01
2 Bed Terrace Building B - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-TB-ZZ-A-DR-1131	P01
2 Bed Terrace Building B - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-TB-ZZ-A-DR-1132	P01

PLAN TYPE	DATE RECEIVED	REFERENCE	REV.
2 Bed Terrace Building B - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-TB-ZZ-A-DR-1133	P01
2 Bed Terrace Building C - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-TC-ZZ-A-DR-1140	P01
2 Bed Terrace Building C - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-TC-ZZ-A-DR-1141	P01
2 Bed Terrace Building C - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-TC-ZZ-A-DR-1142	P01
2 Bed Terrace Building C - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-TC-ZZ-A-DR-1143	P01
2 Bed Semi Detached Type A - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SA-ZZ-A-DR-1150	P01
2 Bed Semi Detached Type A - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SA-ZZ-A-DR-1151	P01
2 Bed Semi Detached Type B - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SB-ZZ-A-DR-1160	P01
2 Bed Semi Detached Type B - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SB-ZZ-A-DR-1161	P01
2 Bed Semi Detached Type B - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SB-ZZ-A-DR-1162	P01
2 Bed Semi Detached Type B - Sections	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SB-ZZ-A-DR-1163	P01
3 Bed Semi Detached Type C - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SC-ZZ-A-DR-1170	P01
3 Bed Semi Detached Type C - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SC-ZZ-A-DR-1171	P01
3 Bed Semi Detached Type C - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SC-ZZ-A-DR-1172	P01
3 Bed Semi Detached Type C - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SC-ZZ-A-DR-1173	P01
3 Bed Semi Detached Type D - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SD-ZZ-A-DR-1180	P01
3 Bed Semi Detached Type D - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SD-ZZ-A-DR-1181	P01
3 Bed Semi Detached Type D - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SD-ZZ-A-DR-1182	P01
3 Bed Semi Detached Type D - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-SD-ZZ-A-DR-1183	P01
3 Bed Detached Type A - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-3A-ZZ-A-DR-1200	P01
3 Bed Detached Type A - Elevation - Timber clad treatment	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-3A-ZZ-A-DR-1201	P01
3 Bed Detached Type A - Elevation - Hung tile Treatment	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-3A-ZZ-A-DR-1202	P01

PLAN TYPE	DATE RECEIVED	REFERENCE	REV.
3 Bed Detached Type A - Elevation - Sections	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-3A-ZZ-A-DR-1203	P01
3 Bed Detached Type B - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-3B-ZZ-A-DR-1210	P01
3 Bed Detached Type B - Elevation - Timber clad treatment	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-3B-ZZ-A-DR-1211	P01
3 Bed Detached Type B - Elevation - Hung tile treatment	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-3B-ZZ-A-DR-1212	P01
3 Bed Detached Type B - Sections	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-3B-ZZ-A-DR-1213	P01
3 Bed Detached Type C - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-3C-ZZ-A-DR-1220	P01
3 Bed Detached Type C - Elevation	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-3C-ZZ-A-DR-1221	P01
3 Bed Detached Type D - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-3D-ZZ-A-DR-1225	P01
3 Bed Detached Type D - Elevation	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-3D-ZZ-A-DR-1226	P01
4 Bed Detached Type A - Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-4A-ZZ-A-DR-1230	P01
4 Bed Detached Type A - Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-4A-ZZ-A-DR-1231	P01
4 Bed Detached Type B- Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-4B-ZZ-A-DR-1240	P01
4 Bed Detached Type B- Floor plans	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-4B-ZZ-A-DR-1241	P01
4 Bed Detached Type B- Elevations	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-4B-ZZ-A-DR-1242	P01
Street Elevation 01 & 02	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-XX-ZZ-A-DR-1250	P02
Street Elevation 03 & 04	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-XX-ZZ-A-DR-1251	P02
Street Elevation 05 & 06	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-XX-ZZ-A-DR-1252	P02
Street Elevation - Round House Road	16/12/2022	21243-STCH-XX-ZZ-A-DR-1253	P01

3. No development shall commence until full constructional, surfacing and drainage details of all the estate roads, footways, parking bays and incidental areas of hardstanding have been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The development shall proceed in accordance with the details approved and no dwelling occupied until these are put in place to extend from that property to the B2192. No dwelling shall be occupied until the required visibility splays of 2.4m by 215m have been provided at the site access to the B2192. These visibility splays shall thereafter be retained as approved and kept free of any obstructions over a height of 600mm.

4. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall include:
- the anticipated number, frequency and types of vehicles used during construction;
 - the routing, access, turning and parking of vehicles during construction;
 - hours of construction activities and deliveries;
 - details of the loading, unloading and storage of plant, materials and waste;
 - measures to manage on and off site flood risk during construction;
 - wheel washing facilities and other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway;
 - mitigation of noise, vibration and dust impacts arising out of the construction;
 - temporary site buildings, security hoarding, protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs;
 - a scheme for the protection of the retained trees (the tree protection plan) and the appropriate working methods (the arboricultural method statement);
 - a risk assessment of construction activities potentially damaging to ecology and biodiversity, biodiversity protection zones and the location and timing of sensitive works when an ecological clerk of works or specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works;
 - responsible persons and lines of communication;
 - a pre-commencement condition survey of the immediate surrounding highway network.

The approved CEMP shall be implemented and adhered to prior to and throughout the entire construction period.

5. The development shall not be occupied until an external lighting strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All external lighting shall be installed and thereafter maintained in accordance with the strategy.
6. No dwelling shall be occupied until the related spaces for the parking and manoeuvring and the storage of cycles and waste/recycling bins have been provided in accordance with details which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These spaces shall thereafter be retained for these approved uses and no other.
7. Prior to the application of any external finishing (including window and door frames), a full schedule of external materials and samples to be used on the development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule and samples.
8. No dwelling shall be occupied until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Travel Plan shall thereafter be implemented as approved.
9. No development hereby permitted shall take place except in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Council's Organisational Licence (WML-OR112, or a 'Further Licence') and with the proposals detailed on plan "Land Between the Broyle and Roundhouse Road: Impact Plan for great crested newt District Licensing (Version 2)", dated 25th July 2023.

10. No development hereby permitted shall take place unless and until a certificate from the Delivery Partner (as set out in the District Licence WML-OR112, or a 'Further Licence'), confirming that all necessary measures regarding great crested newt compensation have been appropriately dealt with, has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority and the authority has provided authorisation for the development to proceed under the district newt licence.
11. No development hereby permitted shall take place except in accordance with Part 1 of the Great Crested Newt Mitigation Principles, as set out in the District Licence WML-OR112 (or a 'Further Licence') and in addition in compliance with the following:
 - works to existing ponds onsite may only be undertaken during autumn/winter, unless otherwise in accordance with the Great Crested Newt Mitigation Principles.
 - works which will affect likely newt hibernacula may only be undertaken during the active period for amphibians.
 - capture methods must be used at suitable habitat features prior to the commencement of the development (i.e., hand/destructive/night searches), which may include the use of temporary amphibian fencing, to prevent newts moving onto a development site from adjacent suitable habitat, installed for the period of the development (and removed upon completion of the development).
 - amphibian fencing and pitfall trapping must be undertaken at suitable habitats and features, prior to commencement of the development.
12. No part of the development shall be occupied until a Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP), to ensure that there is a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG) within a 30 year period as a result of the development, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The net biodiversity impact of the development shall be measured in accordance with the DEFRA biodiversity metric as applied in the area in which the site is situated at the relevant time and the BMP shall include:
 - Proposals for the on-site biodiversity net gain and for off-site biodiversity net gain to achieve the required off-site net gain provision;
 - A management and monitoring plan for on-site BNG, including 30 year objectives, management responsibilities, maintenance schedules and a methodology to ensure the submission of monitoring reports in years 2,5,10,15,20,25 and 30 from commencement of development, demonstrating how the BNG is progressing towards achieving its objectives, evidence of arrangements and any rectifying measures needed;
 - A management and monitoring plan for all off-site BNG, including 30 year objectives, management responsibilities, maintenance schedules and a methodology to ensure the submission of monitoring reports in years 2,5,10,15,20,25 and 30 from commencement of development, demonstrating how the BNG is progressing towards achieving its objectives, evidence of arrangements and any rectifying measures needed;

The development shall be implemented in full accordance with the requirements of the approved BMP.

13. No development shall take place until details of the implementation, adoption, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage system shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Those details shall include: a timetable for its implementation; and a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the effective operation of the sustainable drainage system

throughout its lifetime. The sustainable drainage system shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

14. Notwithstanding the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no further areas of hardstanding shall be provided other than those expressly authorised by this permission.
15. No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for archaeology shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
16. No development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 16.
17. No dwelling shall be occupied until details of the phased provision, equipping and future maintenance and management of the four children's play areas shall have been agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The four children's play areas shall thereafter be provided as approved.
18. Any contamination that is found during the course of construction of the approved development that was not previously identified shall be reported immediately to the local planning authority. Development on the part of the site affected shall be suspended and a risk assessment carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Where unacceptable risks are found remediation and verification schemes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These approved schemes shall be carried out before the development is resumed or continued.
19. No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall commence until a report has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority, to include full details of all renewable/carbon saving/energy (including vehicle charging points) and water efficiency measures to limit consumption to 110 litres per person per day to be incorporated into the scheme.

All measures approved shall thereafter be provided prior to the occupation of any individual dwelling and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.
20. No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall commence until a scheme for landscaping based on the principles of the approved landscaping masterplan shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

All hard landscaping and means of enclosure shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme prior to first occupation of the development. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved scheme of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the first occupation of the building or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.
21. All residential premises shall be designed in accordance with BS8233:2014 'Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings' to attain the following noise levels: daytime noise (07:00 – 23:00) - living rooms and bedrooms - 35 dB LAeq (16hr); outdoor amenity - 55 dB LAeq (1hr); night time noise (23:00 – 7:00) bedrooms - 30 dB LAeq (8hr)

--END---