



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 5 March 2024

Site visit made on 5 March 2024

by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C1435/W/23/3334439

Land East of Rosemead, Horebeech Lane, Horam TN21 9EA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Welbeck Strategic Land IV LLP against the decision of Wealden District Council.
 - The application Ref is WD/2022/1694/MAO.
 - The development proposed is the erection of up to 46 residential dwellings including 35% affordable housing. All matters are reserved except for access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for the erection of up to 46 residential dwellings including 35% affordable housing, with all matters reserved except for access, at Land East of Rosemead, Horebeech Lane, Horam TN21 9EA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WD/2022/1694/MAO, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matters

2. The application is made in outline with details of access submitted for approval. However, all other details relating to appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale are reserved for later consideration.
3. Prior to the Hearing the appellant submitted 3 additional explanatory letters relating to highways, drainage, and landscape. During the Hearing, an additional document relating to the physical extents of Horam and Marle Green was also submitted by an interested party. The main parties had opportunity to review these documents and make comment during the Hearing. These documents do not materially alter the development but rather seek to clarify various elements. Their inclusion would not therefore prejudice any other parties, and I have considered them within this decision.
4. Pursuant to section 106, a draft unilateral undertaking (UU) was submitted. This aligns with the heads of terms outlined in the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) and during the Hearing the Council agreed it was acceptable. However, the UU was not completed prior to the closing of the Hearing and a period of 2 weeks to submit the completed and signed document was requested. In this instance, the justification given for the delayed submission was acceptable. It has duly been received and considered with this decision.

5. During the Hearing, the Council confirmed that the reference to Policy DC18 of the Wealden Local Plan (LP) in the decision notice was in error. The correct policy should have been LP Policy EN18. It is also noted that since the submission of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated in December 2023. The main parties were given opportunity to comment on both these changes and so they have been referenced in this decision.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are whether the appeal site is a suitable location for the proposed development having regard to relevant local strategic policies; and the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area and wider landscape.

Reasons

Local strategic policies

7. At the Hearing, the main parties agreed that the relevant strategic policies are LP Policies GD2, EN18 and DC17, and policy WCS6 of the Wealden District Corse Strategy (CS). These policies set out how residential development in the rural areas of the district should be considered. CS Policy WCS6 directs new residential development to within the service, local service, and neighbourhood centres, including Horam. LP Policies GD2 and DC17 seek to resist development beyond the development boundaries of those centres unless the proposal is in accordance with other specific policies.
8. The main parties agree that the appeal site is outside of any development boundary, is unallocated within the development plan and the proposal does not accord with any other allocation or strategic policies. With nothing before me to the contrary, the proposal does not therefore comply with CS Policy WCS6 and LP Policies GD2 and DC17.
9. LP Policy EN18 seeks to resist the loss of open areas and undeveloped gaps within settlements which contribute to the character or amenities of that locality. As the appeal site is not considered within the development boundaries of Horam and it has not been satisfactorily shown that it is within any other settlement, I do not consider this policy to apply in this situation.
10. Nevertheless, the appeal site is not a suitable location for the proposed development as the proposal would fail to comply with the relevant local strategic policies namely CS Policy WCS6, and LP Policies GD2 and DC17.

Character and appearance

11. The appeal site is located to the east of Horam, close to the junction between Horebeech Lane and Laundry Lane (hereon called the HL junction), which runs along one side of the site. Between the appeal site and Horebeech Lane is a row of 2 storey dwellings¹. On the opposite side of the appeal site is a residential property 'Cauldebec' and a series of reasonably large barn style buildings. The final side of the broadly rectangular site adjoins Rosemead Place, a newly completed residential development.

¹ These properties are known as Horebeech, Alberdene, Cauldavon, Dewlyn, Southoaks, and Shipton Brigg, though it is noted Shipton Brigg is accessible from Laundry Lane.

12. There is a Public Right of Way (PROW) which runs diagonally across the appeal site between the HL junction, where it emerges from between the fenced boundaries of 2 residential properties, and a stile in the north-east corner of the site (hereon called the NE stile). Beyond the NE stile is an area of woodland surrounding 2 ponds, and the PROW leads into the adjacent fields and onto Vines Cross Road.
13. The appeal site itself is separated into paddocks with a mix of low fencing. This continues along the boundary with the rear of the Horebeech Lane facing properties and includes some areas of planting. The other boundaries are lined with mature and relatively dense hedging. There is a modest incline in the topography of the appeal site leading from the HL junction up towards the NE stile where the ground then falls away relatively steeply into the adjacent fields before rising to Vines Cross Road and beyond that the High Weald National Landscape (NL)².
14. It is acknowledged that historically the appeal site has not been developed and would have formed part of the wider countryside setting of Horam creating a buffer between it and the NL. However, it cannot be discounted that since the development of Rosemead Place the appeal site has been spatially isolated from this wider setting. Consequently, the site's character is more of an incidental paddock within edge of settlement development rather than as part of a clearly defined 'green frame' around Horam, as described by the Inspector in the Old Orchard appeal³.
15. The appeal site is set back behind existing properties when viewed from Horebeech Lane. Therefore, any development on it would be significantly screened and read in the context of the existing development facing the lane along with Rosemead Place. Consequently, the effect the proposal would have on the appearance of Horebeech Lane would not be so significant as to constitute harm.
16. The appearance of the part of Laundry Lane which abuts the appeal site is that of a reasonably enclosed road with verges and high hedges on either side. It has been illustrated that the hedges between the road and site could be enhanced, and development drawn back from the boundary. Nevertheless, it is appreciated that it would be likely roof tops could be seen over the hedge. However, a considered layout which ensured a reasonable set-back position for new dwellings in relation to Laundry Lane and included suitable intervening landscaping could ensure this impact would be minimised. Therefore, the proposal would not significantly alter the semi-enclosed and green nature of this part of the lane.
17. During my site visit, I noted the transition in views from the PROW when traversed from the HL junction towards the NE stile. The main changes being from the narrow view between garden fences into the semi-enclosed appeal site, with views limited to the surrounding development; and then as the ground rises glimpsed views of the wider landscape through the trees around the ponds beyond the appeal site, until the view finally opens out across to the NL from the NE stile. The proposal would keep the PROW in its current location, and I am satisfied the proposed creation of a linear park along its length within the appeal site could retain these incremental changes in view and would not

² As of November 2023, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty were rebranded as National Landscapes.

³ APP/C1435/W/22/3297371 and found on the opposite side of Horebeech Lane to Rosemead Place.

- harm the outlook towards the NL from the NE stile. The proposal would also not harm the overall rural character of the PROW when considering the proportionally limited stretch that would be affected in relation to its full length.
18. Therefore, in relation to the appeal site's immediate setting I do not find its development would be so harmful as to undermine the verdant setting of Horam and am satisfied with suitable layout, design and landscaping a development of up to 46 dwellings could be accommodated on site. Nevertheless, it is also important to assess the impact of the proposal on the wider landscape.
 19. Due to the existing surrounding development, hedged boundaries and trees, the appeal site is not overly visible. The clearest views of any part of the site are through the trees next to the NE stile when travelling towards the site along the PROW. However due to the land fall across the site, if development is set back from this corner, which is shown as possible on the illustrative plans, its visual impact would be less intrusive than the surrounding existing development. Specifically, on either side of the appeal site, around Cauldebec and on Rosemead Place. Both these developments are in more dominant positions on the higher ground and provide partial screening of the site which is mainly set behind them when viewed from this direction.
 20. It is clear when looking back at the appeal site from the edge of the NL that, due to the elevated position, any development on the appeal site would be more visible than from the PROW approach the NE stile. However, the parts of the appeal site that would be visible would only represent a small proportion of the built development already noticeable and would be read in the context of a mix of buildings within a rolling countryside setting. This is due to the intervening trees and hedgerows, and the wider views which include Rosemead Place, the buildings around Cauldebec, and the various buildings along Vines Cross Road.
 21. Therefore, with the development appropriately set back from the northern boundary, adequate intervening landscaping specifically around the north-east corner, and a considerate design of the nearest dwellings to this side of the site, the proposal of up to 46 dwellings could be accommodated without being so impacting as to constitute harm to the wider landscape, specifically the setting of the NL.
 22. It is acknowledged that there are concerns in relation to the proposal constituting coalescence between Horam and the rural settlement of Marle Green. In my mind, from the evidence before me, including that given at the Hearing and my observations on site, Marle Green is a loosely defined, ribbon development of sporadic houses along the road also called Marle Green which runs into the HL junction. It is appreciated that the postal addresses of the properties between the appeal site and Horebeech Lane refer to Marle Green. Nevertheless, both visually and spatially there is little separation between the properties on Horebeech Lane and Horam since the development of Rosemead Place. Therefore, when viewed from the HL junction back towards Horam there is almost continual development along the north side of the road.
 23. Equally the positioning of Laundry Lane creates a definable limit to the development. Thus, the spaciousness on the other side of Laundry Lane would not be affected and this is more relevant to the setting of Marle Green than the appeal site. Therefore, the proposal would not further reduce the gap between

Horam and Marle Green as it would be set back behind the existing Horebeech Lane properties and would not extend beyond Laundry Lane.

24. Thus, for the reasons given above the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the local area and wider landscape. Consequently, it would comply with LP Policies EN1, EN2, EN8 and EN27, as far as they seek to reduce the impact of new development on the surrounding environment, the existing settlement pattern, the landscape including areas on the fringe of adjacent statutorily designated landscapes, and with regard to good design.

Other Matters

25. The reason for refusal on the decision notice refers to 2 policies not directly related to the main issues, CS Policies WCS14 and WCS9. CS Policy WCS14, is an overarching policy requiring compliance with other policies in the local plan. As the proposal does not comply with the strategic policies set out in the first main issue it would therefore fail to comply with CS Policy WCS14.
26. CS Policy WCS9 provides, in exceptional circumstances, for rural exception affordable housing. During the Hearing, the Council confirmed this was attached to the reason for the refusal because the proposal does not fall into this exception. However, in this case, as the proposal would provide a mix of affordable and market housing and the appellant has not sought permission for a rural exception scheme, this policy is not applicable.
27. There are two emerging development plan documents, the emerging Local Plan (eLP) and the Horam Neighbourhood Plan (eHNP). The eLP would allocate the appeal site for housing whilst the eHNP would allocate the site as a local green space within the local settlement gap. It is clear there is a level of conflict between these emerging policies. Nevertheless, neither document is far enough along the adoption process to be given anything other than very limited weight which, in this instance, would not outweigh the weight given to the adopted development plan policies within the main issues.
28. It was brought to my attention that some road users drive over and not around the mini roundabout at the entrance into Rosemead Place. There are concerns from interested parties that the additional traffic the proposal would generate could exacerbate this problem. However, the Local Highway Authority are satisfied the proposed use of this access and the increase in traffic would not harm the safety of road users and there is no substantive technical information before me to conclude differently. Furthermore, the inappropriate use of the public highway is policed by other regularity bodies.
29. The issues with foul drainage during the construction of Rosemead Place and the particularly wet nature of the appeal site after rain is also acknowledged. Nevertheless, the proposal is supported by adequate information to persuade me that proper foul and surface water drainage can be achieved via detailed design and dealt with by condition.
30. Interested parties have also stated that the appeal site is well-used for exercise and dog walking. There is nothing before me which identifies that beyond the route of the PROW there is any lawful right for the public to use the appeal site. Consequently, as the proposal would maintain the PROW along its existing route, it would retain the lawful public access to the appeal site.

Planning obligations

31. Having reviewed the UU and am satisfied it would secure the obligations set out in the SoCG. On the evidence before me the obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, and directly, fairly, and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. It follows that as the UU is fully executed the obligations secured will sufficiently mitigate against any harm in relation to housing mix, facilities for future occupants, and the intensification of use of the local transport and recreational services.

Habitat Regulations

32. The appeal site is in proximity to the Ashdown Forest which is both a Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). In accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (Habitat Regulations), as the competent authority it is necessary I consider whether the proposal would likely have a significant effect of the SPA and SAC.
33. The SPA is important due to the concentration of Dartford warblers and European nightjar. These are ground nesting birds which can be severely impacted by recreational use causing habitat damage and nest disturbance. However, the evidence before me shows that recreational use of the SPA comes from those living within 7km of it. The Council confirm the appeal site is beyond the 7km buffer and there is unlikely a pathway of effect for recreational disturbance. With nothing before me to the contrary I am therefore satisfied the proposal would not have a likely significant effect on the SPA.
34. **The SAC's importance derives from the** presence of European dry heath, North Atlantic wet heath, and great crested newts. These species are sensitive to air quality which can be impacted by increases in population. However Natural England (NE) was consulted in relation to the eLP, which according to the Council would deliver 14,288 homes and 22,500 m² of business floorspace. NE concluded that such quantum of development would not affect the integrity of the SAC. Therefore, I am satisfied that the substantially smaller quantum of development proposed would not have a likely significant effect on the SAC, and there is nothing before me to conclude otherwise.

Planning Balance

35. The Council's **current housing land supply is 3.83 years**, and as the appeal site is not within a protected area nor includes assets of particular importance, it would be necessary to apply paragraph 11d) ii) of the Framework. On that basis the conflict with CS Policy WCS6, and LP Policies GD2 and DC17, as policies which relate to housing supply, carries little weight.
36. In this context the proposal would provide up to 46 dwellings, 35% of which would be affordable housing and 5% custom and self-build plots. The Framework seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing and the proposal would exceed the minimum requirements in the Framework for affordable housing, a much-needed housing type within the area. This along with the capability of the proposal to provide biodiversity enhancements, economic benefits both with jobs during the construction stage and new occupants spending within the local area, energy efficient homes, and the improvements to the local transport system and recreational facilities secured by the UU, would represent the benefits of the proposed scheme. When considered in light

of the Council's current and continued housing supply deficit these benefits would attract significant weight.

37. It has been found that the proposal would not harm character and appearance, the SPA, and the SAC. No harm has also been found in relation to the objections raised by interested parties in terms of the roads, drainage, and public use of the site. In relation to the planning balance, however, an absence of harm is neutral neither weighing for or against the proposal.
38. Consequently, the adverse impacts of the proposal would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Conditions

39. Within the SoCG, the main parties have agreed a series of conditions. I have taken account of representations made on these during the Hearing and have considered them against the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. As a result, I have amended them for consistency and clarity, and in some cases simplified the wording and removed duplication.
40. Conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are imposed to ensure the proposal is carried out per the relevant statutory timeframes and approved details, including clarification of certain elements of the reserved matters, thus providing certainty of what has been approved and what is outstanding. To ensure the living conditions of occupants of nearby residential properties are not unduly impacted condition 8 sets out the hours of work. It is appreciated this is more onerous than that proposed. However, that proposed related to 'audible works' which is not a precise measurement and therefore would be unenforceable. The appellant has accepted this change.
41. Conditions 9 is necessary to ensure that any archaeological remains that may be present on site are not damaged by the proposed development. Conditions 10, 11, and 19 have been imposed in the interests of highway safety and providing suitable access for the proposal. I have imposed conditions 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 22 in the interests of ensuring that the site is developed in a way in which it will be safe for its intended end use and to ensure that the proposed development will not adversely affect the surrounding area. Condition 18 is necessary to ensure the proposal does not have a detrimental effect on ecology.
42. Conditions 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 are needed to be pre-commencement as it is fundamental to have these details agreed prior to any works beginning on the appeal site, and the appellant has agreed to this.

Conclusion

43. For the reasons given above the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no sufficiently weighted material considerations, including the Framework, which would indicate a decision otherwise. The appeal is, therefore, allowed.

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Damon Turner	Partner Welbeck Strategic Land IV LLP
Anthony Field	Landowner
Paul Carnell	Senior Associated Director Strutt and Parker BA(Hons), MA, MRTPI
Hashi Mohamed	Counsel Landmark Chambers
Vanessa Ross	Director Arc Landscape Design and Planning Ltd BA(Hons), BLA, MA, FLI

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Declan Redman	Senior Planning Officer Wealden District Council BSc(Hons), MA
Zakk Pursall	Technical Support Officer Wealden District Council

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Brian Arnott	Local resident
Andrew Billings	Parish councillor and member of Horam Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (HNPSG)
Jennifer Howells	Parish councillor
David Kemp	Local resident
Susan Lane	Parish councillor and member of HNPSG
David Marlow MRTPI	Local resident and member of HNPSG
Cornelie Osborne	Parish and Ward councillor

DOCUMENTS:

1. Letter from Vistry Group dated 8 February 2024
2. Technical Note: Transport Summary by Pell Frischmann dated 15 February 2024
3. **Landscape Response to Council's** Statement of Case by Arc Landscape Design and Planning Ltd dated 2 February 2024
4. Briefing Note: Horam and Marle Green extents by Susan Lane

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 1 year from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plan 6728 PL-01.
- 5) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out within **part 6 'Mitigation Measures and Ecological Enhancements' of the Ecological Appraisal dated 24 February 2021** and authored by Aspect Ecology Ltd. Once implemented the measure and enhancements shall thereafter be retained.
- 6) The reserved matters shall identify the location of the market and affordable dwellings and include a schedule of occupation for them. The development and occupation shall then be carried out in accordance with these details.
- 7) The reserved matters shall ensure all parking spaces measure at least 2.5m by 5m and all garages shall measure, internally, at least 3m by 6m.
- 8) Site preparation and construction phases shall take place only between 08:00 and 18:00 on Monday through to Friday, only between 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturdays, and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.
- 9) No development, including any ground works or demolition, shall take place other than in accordance with a programme of archaeological works set out within a written scheme of investigation which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 10) No development, including any ground works or demolition, shall take place other than in accordance with a Construction Traffic and Management Plan (CTMP) which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CTMP shall provide for all phases of the development and shall include, but is not limited to:
 - the anticipated number, frequency and types of vehicles used during construction;
 - the method of access, egress, and routing of vehicles during construction;
 - the parking of vehicles by site operatives and visitors;
 - the loading and unloading of plant, materials, and waste during construction;

- the storage of plant, materials, and waste during construction;
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding;
- the provision and utilisation of wheel washing facilities and other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway (including the provision of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders);
- a pre-condition survey, accompanied by a Local Highway Officer, of the existing highway, and how any damage to the highway by construction vehicles associated with the site will be identified and repaired;
- a scheme for the control of noise and dust;
- measures to manage flood risk, both on and off the site, during the construction phase; and
- details of public engagement both prior to and during construction works.

The development shall then be carried out in accordance with CTMP.

- 11) No development shall take place until details of the access serving the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

No dwelling shall be occupied until the access has been constructed in accordance with the approved details.

- 12) No development shall take place until details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the foul drainage system have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The foul drainage system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details, and prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted confirmation that there is capacity within the associated drainage network will be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Thereafter the system will be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

- 13) No development shall take place until details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the surface water drainage system have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include, but are not limited to:

- detailed drawings and hydraulic calculations. The hydraulic calculations shall take into account the connectivity of the different surface water drainage features. The calculations shall demonstrate that surface water flows can be limited to 4.3 l/s for all rainfall events, including those with a 1 in 100 (plus climate change) annual probability of occurrence;
- the detailed design of the outfall of the proposed drainage system and how it connects into the existing pond including cross sections and invert levels;
- how surface water flows exceeding the capacity of the surface water drainage features will be managed safely;

- how foul or contaminated surface water will be prevented from discharging into the ground waters and water courses;
- who will be responsible for managing all aspects of the surface water drainage system, including piped drains; and
- evidence of how these responsibility arrangements will remain in place throughout the lifetime of the development.

The surface water drainage system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details, and prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted evidence that the system has been constructed in accordance with the approved details will be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Thereafter the system will be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

- 14) No development shall take place until measures for the incorporation of water and energy efficiency within the development hereby permitted, including the promotion of renewable energy and sustainable construction, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The development shall then be carried out in accordance with these measures which will thereafter be retained.

- 15) No development shall take place until an Emissions Mitigation Assessment and an Air Quality Assessment, both including any necessary mitigation and a schedule of implementation, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the details of those assessments.

- 16) No works below ground level shall take place until an assessment of the risks posed by any contamination has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The assessment shall include, but is not limited to:

- a survey of the extent, scale, and nature of contamination;
- the potential risks to:
 - human health;
 - property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland, and service lines and pipes;
 - adjoining land;
 - ground waters and surface waters;
 - ecological systems; and
 - archaeological sites and ancient monuments; and
- if required, an appraisal of remedial options and identification of the preferred option including:
 - all works to be undertaken;
 - proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria;

- o timetable of works including the submission of any necessary notifications or verification reports to the local planning authority; and
- o site management procedures.

If the assessment identifies risk by contamination and remediation is required, this shall be undertaken prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted and in accordance with the approved details.

- 17) Notwithstanding the requirements of condition 16, any contamination that is found during construction of the development hereby permitted 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.
- 18) Notwithstanding the requirements of condition 5, prior to preparation of ground levels for construction an approved wildlife management plan shall be submitted to detail the Ecological Enhancements (EE) required by the Ecological Appraisal dated 24 February 2021 and authored by Aspect Ecology Ltd and shall include a schedule for the implementation and maintenance of the EE. The management plan shall then be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 19) No dwelling shall be occupied until the estate road to that dwelling has been constructed in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 20) No dwelling shall be occupied until a landscape implementation, management and maintenance plan has been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The landscaping shall then be carried out and maintained in accordance with approved details.
- 21) No works shall be undertaken to the trees and hedges, as identified on the Tree Constraints Plan LLD1815-ARB-DWG-001 Rev 01, or development within their root protection zones other than in accordance with arboricultural details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 22) No external lighting, security lighting or floodlights shall be installed other than in accordance with a scheme that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

END OF SCHEDULE