



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2025

by **N Bromley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1840/W/24/3346488

**Land east of Stratford Road and north of Mickleton Road,
Honeybourne WR11 7PN**

- 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 Deeley Homes, Mr JP & Mrs MJ Miller against the decision of Wychavon District Council.
 - The application Ref is W/23/00919/OUT.
 - The development proposed is outline planning application (including details of means of access) for up to 40no dwellings with associated infrastructure.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for outline planning application (including details of means of access) for up to 40no dwellings with associated infrastructure at Land east of Stratford Road and north of Mickleton Road, Honeybourne WR11 7PN, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref W/23/00919/OUT, subject to the conditions in the schedule below.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was submitted in outline, with all matters reserved except for access. Moreover, the only element of access being considered is the site's entry / exit point to the existing road network. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis, treating all submitted plans and drawings as illustrative unless related to access.
3. The appeal site address in the banner heading above is taken from the original planning application form. However, I have included a postcode for clarity.
4. The Council's Statement of Case includes a Landscape Hearing Report (LHR) by Landscape design Matters LLP, dated 24 July 2024. While the appellants raise concerns about whether the LHR should be accepted, they have had an opportunity to comment on it. I am satisfied that no party has been prejudiced in this regard and I have taken the LHR into account in determining this appeal.
5. My attention has been drawn to the emerging South Worcestershire Development Plan (the emerging plan). However, the main parties identify in a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) that the emerging plan is not at an advanced stage. As such, I attach limited weight to the emerging plan.
6. During the appeal the Council has confirmed that following a change to the Council's latest Housing Land Supply position they withdraw the reasons for refusal and objections to the proposed development.

Main Issues

7. Having regard to the representations from Honeybourne Parish Council (the Parish Council), local residents and interested parties, the main issues are:
- whether or not the proposal would be a suitable location for residential development having regard to the spatial strategy of the development plan,
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and
 - whether or not the proposed development would increase the risk of surface water flooding.

Reasons

Location in the countryside

8. The appeal site comprises an undeveloped field, located adjacent to but outside the settlement boundary of Honeybourne. Therefore, the site lies within the open countryside.
9. Policy SWDP 2 of the Worcestershire Development Plan (Adopted 2016) (the DP) sets out that development within the open countryside will be strictly controlled and will be limited to certain types of development. The proposed development does not meet any of the listed exceptions set out in Policy SWDP 2(C).
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal is contrary to the Council's development plan strategy for housing and would thereby conflict with Policy SWDP 2 of the DP.

Character and appearance

11. As an agricultural field, the appeal site has a rural character, but its proximity to the northern edge of the village and the existing housing, as well as the railway line and commercial premises tempers the rural setting of the site.
12. The site falls within the Saintbury Grounds Village Claylands Landscape Type in the Worcestershire County Council Landscape Character Assessment, 2012, (LCA). The LCA identifies the character type as, amongst other things, open, gently rolling agricultural landscapes characterised by an ordered pattern of hedged fields and discrete rural villages connected by a network of minor roads.
13. The proposed development would introduce a sizeable amount of built development onto undeveloped, open land, which would be visible from a number of public vantage points, including medium to longer distance views within the surrounding landscape. As a result, there would be visual harm to the landscape.
14. However, to some degree, the proposal would continue the existing residential development to round off this part of the settlement up to the railway line. It would also not extend further beyond the existing housing on Mickleton Road. As a result, the development would, in part, benefit from being viewed within the context of the adjacent housing and the level of encroachment of built development into the landscape would be modest.
15. The illustrative layout demonstrates that the density of development on the land is comparable to neighbouring new build residential development nearby.

Furthermore, while the illustrative layout does not reflect the linear form of development within the village, it shows that there is opportunity for generous areas of open space on the site boundaries that would soften the appearance of the proposed development. The final layout, to better reflect the pattern of existing housing within the village, could be secured at the reserved matters stage.

16. In addition, although the site exhibits some features of landscape value, including the existing hedgerows, the indicative landscape masterplan demonstrates that existing hedgerows on the site boundaries could be retained. Additional soft landscaping, including tree planting on the peripheries of the site could also be achieved. This would soften the appearance of the development and filter some views of the new dwellings within the landscape. As such, the site's contained nature and proximity to housing would limit the scheme's adverse landscape effects.
17. A Public Right of Way (the PRow) runs diagonally through the site, which would be subsequently diverted. Inevitably, adverse visual effects would materialise for PRow users who would have a more urbanised experience. However, these adverse effects would be highly localised in an area where influences of built development are already commonplace.
18. Overall, the introduction of up to 40 new dwellings and the domestication of the site would result in a noticeable encroachment of built development onto the land, which would result in visual change to the landscape. Although this would be tempered by the scheme's location between the village and the railway, and by the opportunity for soft landscaping shown on the illustrative plan. In this context, for the reasons given, I attach modest weight to the identified harm.
19. Consequently, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such it would not accord with Policy SWDP25 of the DP and Policies H4, H5 and H8 of the Honeybourne Neighbourhood Plan (the NP), which together and amongst other things, requires new development to conserve and enhance the natural beauty and amenity of the area and not adversely affect landscape character.

Drainage

20. The site lies in Flood Zone 1 which represents the lowest risk of flooding from rivers or the sea. The submitted site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) also confirms that the risk of fluvial flooding is low.
21. The FRA includes a surface water drainage strategy for the proposed development and an indicative site drainage plan has been submitted. The drainage information proposes an on-site 'Storage Attenuation Pond' with restricted outfall to the existing watercourse located adjacent to the side boundary. Swales are also proposed as part of the drainage strategy.
22. While there are concerns about the location of the attenuation pond, no technical objections have been lodged by the Council, and on the evidence before me, there is a reasonable prospect of a satisfactory surface water drainage scheme being delivered and maintained through a suitably worded planning condition. In the context of this development and the level of information provided, this approach would be in accordance with the objectives of the Framework and the relevant

guidance of the national Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG), which seeks decision takers to approach proposed development in a positive and creative way.

23. Consequently, for the reasons given and on the evidence before me, I conclude that the proposed development would not increase the risk of surface water flooding. Therefore, the proposal would not conflict with Policy H11 of the NP, or Policies SWDP 28 and SWDP 29 of the DP, which seek, amongst other things, surface water for new development to be managed through sustainable drainage measures and flood attenuation areas should be located outside of flood zones and surface water outlines to ensure that the full capacity is retained.

Other Considerations

Accessibility to services

24. The site is within walking distance of the services and facilities of Honeyborne, which is defined as a 'Category 1 settlement' under the settlement hierarchy of the DP. There are bus stops near to the appeal site. Honeyborne also has a railway station, and the appeal site would offer a genuine choice of transport, and some services and facilities are available locally and not all trips would require the use of the car. Therefore, the proposal would help to support the nearby community following the occupation of the development. The development would also offer a genuine choice of transport and help to prioritise sustainable transport modes, as supported by the Framework. The construction phases would also provide social and economic benefits to local services.

Housing supply and affordable housing

25. The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable sites for housing. Indeed, at 1.1 years, in my opinion this is a severe shortfall.
26. Therefore, there is a demonstrable need for new housing and although recent housing developments have expanded the village and the housing allocation set out in the NP is being delivered, Honeybourne is a Category 1 settlement which is identified in the development plan as being suitable for growth.
27. The proposed development would deliver up to 40 dwellings and within the context of the existing shortfall it would make an important contribution to boosting housing supply in the area. The development of a greenfield site could also be delivered relatively quickly due to its size.
28. The completed S106 Agreement demonstrates that 40% of the housing would be affordable and provided on site. The affordable housing would contribute to the current unmet need.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

29. The development demonstrates that at least 10% BNG can be achieved, primarily through habitats and hedgerows. An ecological enhancement plan could also be secured for the site and SUDS features can be incorporated into a landscaping and biodiversity enhancement scheme.

Planning Obligation

30. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 and paragraph 58 of the Framework set a number of tests for planning obligations: they must be

necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, be directly related to the development, and be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

31. A signed s106 agreement (the s106) has been submitted with the appeal. The s106 seeks to secure obligations related to affordable housing (AH), on-site open space, as well as financial contributions towards school transport, education, healthcare, built sport, formal sports and off site public open space.
32. The scheme proposes 40% of the homes to be AH, in line with Policy SWDP15 of the DP. The submitted s106 agreement proposes 69% rented, 25% first homes and 6% intermediate tenures. This has been agreed by the main parties and on the evidence before me I have no reasons to disagree with the agreed proportions of AH.
33. The NHS Herefordshire & Worcestershire Integrated Care Board sought a contribution of £24,000 to mitigate the impact on primary healthcare. It is suggested that the contribution could fund new and additional premises or infrastructure and / or an extension to existing premises or improved digital infrastructure and telehealth facilities. While I am satisfied that it could provide improved health infrastructure, there is no clause within the s106 to secure that the contribution is spent on local infrastructure. As such, it has not been demonstrated that it would provide the required additional infrastructure and be directly related to the scheme. For these reasons, it is not CIL compliant, and it does not meet paragraph 58 of the Framework.
34. Other obligations require contributions towards built sport, formal sports and off site public open space. The built sport contribution would be directed towards improvements to facilities at Evesham Leisure Centre. A maintenance contribution would be directed towards formal sports and off site public open space at Honeybourne Sports/Rec Ground/Club. An obligation to secure on-site public open space is also necessary. These obligations would provide benefits for the wider community, as well as mitigating the impact of a development of this scale.
35. I conclude that the s106 includes the provision of infrastructure, which is necessary, directly required and fairly and reasonably related in scale to this development. Aside from the health care contribution, I am satisfied that each of these obligations fall within the provisions of Regulation 122(2) of the CIL Regulations and paragraph 58 of the Framework.

Other Matters

36. I acknowledge that there were a number of representations, including those by the Parish Council, in respect of the proposal, which in addition to the main issues included concerns relating to the amount of housing permitted in Honeybourne, the loss of agricultural land and the need to grow food, the effect on climate change, noise and disturbance to living conditions of neighbouring properties, strain on utilities and local clubs and societies. These factors are not in dispute between the main parties and were largely addressed in the Councils planning committee report, with the Council concluding that there would be no material harm in these regards. No substantiated evidence has been submitted that leads me to any different view. Given my findings above, the suggested conditions by the Council and the completed s106, I have found none offer justification to dismiss the appeal.

37. Highway safety issues have also been cited as a concern, particularly due to increased traffic generation, but the Council and the relevant highway authority have raised no objection, subject to appropriate conditions which are included in the schedule. I have no reason to form a different view.
38. Concerns are also raised about other fields being developed. However, I have assessed the proposal before me on its merits and having regard to the specific circumstances of the appeal site and all other material considerations. Accordingly, my decision should not set a precedent.
39. Comments have been made that the proposal would result in the loss of a view: the Courts have held that the loss of a view is not a material planning consideration.

Planning Balance

40. The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. In these circumstances paragraph 11(d) of the Framework states that the policies most important for determining the application are out of date, and planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole.
41. In terms of adverse effects, the proposed development is outside the settlement boundary and is in conflict with the locational aspects of Policy SWDP 2 of the DP. There would also be harm to the character and appearance of the area, thus failing to comply with Policy SWDP 25 of the DP and Policies H4, H5 and H8 of the NP. There would also be additional strain on health infrastructure, but the effect would be limited in the context of the development proposed. However, for the reasons identified I attach modest weight to the identified harm.
42. The delivery of 40 houses, including affordable housing, would support the Government's objective of boosting the supply of new housing. Particularly a site such as this which has good links to services and facilities, as well as public transport opportunities. The construction of 40 new houses would also provide significant economic and social benefits without significant environmental harm.
43. The NP was adopted on 30 April 2020; thus it became part of the development plan within the last five years. In these instances, paragraph 14 of the Framework states that in situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
44. Therefore, as conflict with the neighbourhood plan under five years old is '*likely*' to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, the Framework paragraph 14 does not therefore say that such conflict will always outweigh the benefits. However, no specific guidance is given as to the instances where the benefits would outweigh any NP conflict and so that must be a matter of planning judgement.
45. At 1.1 years the short fall of housing land supply is severe and to my mind this is so great as to mean that, along with the other benefits listed above and mindful of the relatively modest conflict with the policies of the NP, this scheme is an instance

where the conflict with the NP is outweighed by the significant benefits of this development.

Conditions

46. A comprehensive list of conditions is included in the SoCG in the event of the appeal being allowed, some of which I have amended for the sake of clarity and precision. I have also had regard to the Framework and the PPG. In addition to the conditions set out in the main issues, for the avoidance of doubt, conditions should be imposed concerning the commencement of the permission and the submission of reserved matters. For this reason, the scheme should be in accordance with the access details shown on the submitted drawings.
47. Having regard to highway safety, prior to the occupation of the development, works to create the highways access, visibility splays, as well as safety improvement works and the pedestrian crossing and footway facilities on Stratford Road need to be implemented. The design, delivery and management of foul and surface water drainage should be secured for all areas of hardstandings within the plots and the road network within the site. The prior approval of a residential travel plan before occupation of the development is required to promote sustainable methods of transport.
48. In order to avoid adverse effects in relation to highways matters and to neighbouring living conditions during the construction phase, a construction management plan needs to be submitted for approval prior to works commencing on site. To protect neighbouring living conditions a restriction on construction hours is also necessary.
49. So as to provide acceptable living conditions for prospective residents of the proposed development, a condition would be necessary to secure the submission and approval of an acoustic report, and the implementation of any noise mitigation measures identified as being needed due to the proximity of the development to the railway line.
50. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area and the biodiversity on the site, the prior approval of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and a Biodiversity Gain Plan, are necessary. Likewise, to conserve the biodiversity of the area, a condition requiring the prior approval and specification of external lighting is necessary so that external spillage of lighting is avoided.
51. To support the delivery of low carbon / renewable energy a condition is reasonable and necessary and should be submitted with or before the submission of reserved matters.
52. In the interests of the archaeological integrity of the site, a condition is necessary to secure an archaeological evaluation. A mitigation works programme for the site should inform the layout of the scheme and should be submitted with the reserved matters.
53. A condition which secures the reporting of unexpected ground contamination is required to prevent risk to the environment and to protect the living conditions of future occupants of the development.

54. Conditions were also suggested concerning land and slab levels, landscaping works, details of screen walls, fences, surface treatments to drives, cycle and footways. Whilst these may well need to be controlled by condition, if that is to occur, I consider it should take place under the reserved matters.

Conclusion

55. For the above reasons, the appeal should be allowed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR

Richborough

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 3 years 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) Unless otherwise amended under the conditions below, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, numbered: 4416-01 rev D and 22-113-SK01 rev D.
- 5) The development hereby approved shall not commence until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include:-
 - a. Measures to ensure that vehicles leaving the site do not deposit mud or other detritus on the public highway;
 - b. Details of site operative parking areas, material storage areas and the location of site operatives' facilities as required;
 - c. The hours that delivery vehicles will be permitted to arrive and depart, and arrangements for unloading and manoeuvring;
 - d. Routing of delivery vehicles to avoid Mickleton Road which is unsuitable for HGV traffic;
 - e. Traffic management measures for construction vehicles on Stratford Road to include temporary signage by agreement with Highways and the use of a banksman to oversee all vehicular manoeuvres;
 - f. Measures to demonstrate that those immediately affected by the construction works will be kept informed and due consideration and courtesy will be shown to the local community.

The measures set out in the approved CMP shall be carried out and complied with in full during the construction of the development hereby approved.

- 6) The development hereby approved shall not commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan for Biodiversity (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP: Biodiversity shall be based on the recommendations made in section 5.2. of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Wharton dated 03 April 2023 and additional up-to-date survey information, as appropriate, and shall include the following:
 - a. Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities;
 - b. Identification of "biodiversity protection zones";
 - c. Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction, including, but not restricted to, detailed badger and herpetofauna method statements;

- d. The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features;
- e. The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present;
- f. Responsible persons and lines of communication;
- g. The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person;
- h. Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP: Biodiversity shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details.

- 7) With or before the submission of Reserved Matters, a Biodiversity Gain Plan (the BGP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The BGP shall be based on baseline assessments and habitat enhancements measured through the latest Defra metric and shall thereafter be implemented in full as approved.
- 8) With or before the submission of Reserved Matters, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (the LEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The content of the LEMP shall be based on the recommendations made in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, ref. 230104 1609 PEA FINAL ISSUE, by Wharton dated 3 April 2023, and shall be guided by the approved landscape scheme and BGP (approved under condition 7 above) and maintain this after implementation. The LEMP shall include:
 - a. Details (type and location) of wildlife boxes and refugia;
 - b. Description and evaluation of the features to be managed;
 - c. Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
 - d. Aims and objectives of management;
 - e. Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
 - f. Prescriptions for management actions;
 - g. Preparation of a work schedule, including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period and for a minimum of 30 years thereafter;
 - h. Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan; and
 - i. On-going monitoring and remedial measures.

The details shall also set out where the results of the monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met, how contingencies and / or remedial action identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved LEMP shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

- 9) With or before the submission of Reserved Matters, a scheme for a surface water drainage strategy for the development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall

include details of surface water drainage measures, including for hardstanding areas, and shall conform with the non-statutory technical standards for SuDS (Defra 2015) and the Flood Risk Assessment (c8349- FRA.01 February 2023). If infiltration drainage is not possible on this site, an alternative method of surface water disposal should be submitted for approval. If a connection to a sewer system is proposed, then evidence shall be submitted of the in-principle approval of Severn Trent water for this connection. The scheme shall include run off treatment proposals for surface water drainage. Where the scheme includes communal surface water drainage assets, proposals for dealing with the future maintenance of these assets shall be included.

The scheme should include proposals for informing future home owners or occupiers of the arrangements for maintenance of communal surface water drainage assets.

The approved surface water drainage scheme shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter maintained in accordance with the agreed scheme.

- 10) With or before the submission of Reserved Matters, full details of all foul water drainage systems to serve the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved drainage systems shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter.
- 11) Accompanying the Reserved Matters, a detailed Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) shall be submitted to the local planning authority. The AIA and AMS shall include details of trees to be retained and the methods for their protection. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 12) Accompanying the Reserved Matters, a report detailing the findings of the archaeological evaluation, and any mitigation works undertaken in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) by Groundworks Archaeology dated 20/06/2024 shall be submitted to the local planning authority, and the reserved matters layout shall be informed by the WSI and survey work.
- 13) Accompanying the Reserved Matters, details of renewable and / or low carbon energy generation measures shall be submitted to the local planning authority. The measures shall contribute to at least 10% of the predicted energy requirements of the development. The details to be submitted shall include:-
 - a. the overall predicted energy requirements of the approved development;
 - b. the predicted energy generation from the proposed renewable / low carbon energy measures; and
 - c. an implementation timetable for the proposed measures.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 14) No above ground works shall commence until an acoustic report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The report shall demonstrate that the internal and external amenity standards of BS8233:2014 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings (or any subsequent version) and WHO Guidelines for Community Noise (1999) can be achieved within the development. The report must include full details of any scheme of mitigation required to achieve this which if approved must be implemented in full and maintained in that way in perpetuity.
- 15) No above ground works shall commence until a scheme of works to create the highways access have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved works shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted.
- 16) No above ground works shall commence until a Highways Drainage Strategy (HAS) to prevent surface water entering the highway has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved HAS shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the first occupation of the development and shall be retained thereafter.
- 17) The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until visibility splays are provided from a point 0.6 metres(m) above carriageway level at the centre of the access to the application site and 2.4m back from the near side edge of the adjoining carriageway, (measured perpendicularly), for a distance of 48m to the west and 53m to the east, measured along the nearside edge of the adjoining carriageway as shown on Drawing No. 22-113-SK01 rev D. Nothing shall be planted, erected and / or allowed to grow on the triangular area of land so formed which would obstruct the visibility described above.
- 18) The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the pedestrian crossing and footway facilities at Stratford Road, as broadly shown on Drawing No. 22-113-SK01 Rev D have been fully implemented and are open for use by pedestrians.
- 19) The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the Stratford Road Safety Improvement Works, as shown on Drawing 22-113-SK01 Rev D have been implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 20) On first occupation of each dwelling the occupiers shall be provided with a residential Travel Welcome Pack promoting sustainable forms of access to the development that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 21) No external lighting shall be on site unless its nature and siting have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.
- 22) 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 [or relevant phase of development] is resumed or continued.

- 23) Construction work and deliveries to and from the site in connection with the development hereby approved shall only take place between the hours of 08.00 and 18.00hrs Monday to Friday and 08.00 and 13.00hrs on a Saturday. There shall be no demolition, clearance or construction work or deliveries to and from the site on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Richborough