



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by **O Marigold BSc DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/W/25/3365685

Morden Mill And Farmhouse, Morden Park Corner, Dorset BH20 7DJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Smartin Developments Limited against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref is P/FUL/2023/02064.
 - The development proposed is enabling residential development of 16 dwellings to facilitate restoration of listed farmhouse and mill building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for enabling residential development of 16 dwellings to facilitate restoration of listed farmhouse and mill building at Morden Mill And Farmhouse, Morden Park Corner, Dorset BH20 7DJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/FUL/2023/02064, subject to the conditions in the attached Schedule.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Smartin Developments Limited against Dorset Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Background and Preliminary Matters

3. I have taken the address of the site from the Council's Decision Notice, which is more concise than that used in the application form. The appellant has used the same address in the appeal form and so I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced as a result.
4. The site lies within the South East Dorset Green Belt, and consists of fields and land associated with Morden Mill and Morden Mill Farmhouse. These date from the 18th century and were expanded in the 19th century. Both buildings are Grade II listed. The proposal seeks to erect 16 dwellings to enable the restoration of the Farmhouse and Mill.
5. Two alternative planning obligation unilateral undertakings under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 have been submitted by the appellant, both dated 10 July 2025. These make provision for the delivery of the works to restore the former Mill building and refurbish the Farmhouse, and to make an off-site ecological payment. One of the undertakings also includes a clause that a viability review will be undertaken on practical completion of the new dwellings, to make an affordable housing contribution if viable. The Council has commented on the undertakings, and I shall consider these matters below.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- whether the proposal would comply with the Council's strategy for housing distribution, including in respect of access to services and facilities,
- whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies, including its effect on openness,
- whether the proposal would make adequate provision to mitigate for the loss of on-site habitats,
- other considerations, including the effects of the proposal on heritage assets as enabling development, housing land supply, and affordable housing provision, and
- whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by the other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Strategy, Services and Facilities

7. The site is located in countryside, with only sporadic development in the area. Policy V1 of the Purbeck Local Plan (PLP), adopted July 2024, and its supporting text, provides the Council's spatial strategy for sustainable communities in the area. This seeks to ensure that local housing needs can be met in suitable, accessible locations.
8. The appeal site is not within or adjoining a settlement boundary, or on an allocated site and there is no dispute that the site is isolated. The Transport Assessment identifies that the nearest bus stops are served by only one daily service, to and from a college. Moreover, access to the stops would require walking along the A35. This is a busy, single-carriageway road which, in the vicinity of the appeal site, is undulating and has no pavement or streetlighting. As a result, the A35 would be a difficult and unsuitable means of travel from the site by foot or bicycle, especially in inclement weather or for those with limited mobility.
9. Opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural locations. Some people occupying the dwellings may drive to Wareham railway station as part of a multi-modal trip. Even so, most would be heavily reliant on private vehicles, as would their visitors and deliveries, who may not be able to use the proposed vehicle charging points.
10. The Framework seeks to promote walking, cycling and public transport use, and the reliance of future occupiers on private vehicles would ultimately cause environmental harm, failing to contribute to a cumulative reduction in harmful greenhouse gas emissions or to an improvement in air quality and public health.
11. The proposal does not fall within the other circumstances where housing is supported by Policy V1. Framework paragraph 84 makes clear that isolated homes

should be avoided unless, amongst other things, they would constitute appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets. I will consider such benefits below. However, for the reasons given, the proposal would not comply with the Council's strategy for housing distribution, including in respect of access to services and facilities. Accordingly, it would conflict with PLP Policy V1.

Green Belt

12. Paragraph 153 of the Framework makes clear that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Such circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
13. Framework paragraph 154 confirms that all development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless an exception applies. It is common ground that none of these exceptions apply here. That said, the Framework also states at paragraph 155 that the development of homes should not be regarded as inappropriate where its criteria are all met, for example in respect of grey belt. However, regardless of the other criteria, for the reasons already given the proposal would not be in a sustainable location and so would conflict with Framework paragraph 155(c). It would therefore constitute inappropriate development.
14. A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land open. The site of the proposed dwellings currently consists of undeveloped countryside. The proposal would introduce a large number of new buildings to the site, together with the associated gardens, driveways, access roads and residential paraphernalia.
15. The design and layout of the buildings is intended to reflect the rural character of the area, with for example some dwellings appearing as converted agricultural buildings, as having grown organically over time. The Council acknowledges that this would be a benefit of the proposal. Nonetheless, spatially, the development would give the site a much more built-up form. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment acknowledges that there would be localised views of the development from a Public Right of Way, at viewpoint 4, albeit of moderate effect.
16. As a result, the proposal would cause a permanent reduction in the openness of the site. For these reasons, I conclude that it would result in significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt. It would also encroach into the countryside formed by the site, conflicting with one of the Green Belt purposes identified at Framework paragraph 143.
17. PLP Policy V2 is referred to in the Council's first reason for refusal. That said, the policy only relates to the amendment of Green Belt boundaries on land elsewhere in the Local Plan area. As a result, it is not directly relevant to the proposal before me, and so I find no conflict with the policy.
18. Nevertheless, for the reasons given, in accordance with Framework paragraph 153, I give substantial negative weight to the harm caused to the Green Belt, including to its openness. The parties dispute whether the benefits of the proposal would amount to the very special circumstances required to justify it, including in respect of the Green Belt. I shall consider this below.

On-site Habitats

19. The Council's second reason for refusal refers to the absence of a suitable legal agreement to secure a financial contribution to mitigate against the loss of on-site habitats. Such mitigation works would involve the creation of off-site ecological enhancement works consisting of grassland and a habitat pond for non-priority species. The submitted planning obligations make provision for such a financial contribution.
20. The Council confirms that each of the planning obligations would overcome their concerns in this respect. Having regard to the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (CIL), I am satisfied that the contribution is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, is directly related to the proposal and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to it.
21. It follows that I find no conflict with PLP policy E10, which requires that appropriate measures are put in place to mitigate disturbance to wildlife habitats. Moreover, the proposal would include biodiversity enhancements within the site, to which the Council attributes moderate positive weight, a view I share.

Other Considerations

Heritage Assets

22. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that I have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed buildings and their settings, or any features of special architectural or historic interest. Section 72 of the same Act requires that I pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Morden Conservation Area (CA), within which the site lies.
23. As well as the Mill and Farmhouse, the site includes curtilage listed buildings in particular a stable block, now converted into two dwellings. The buildings within the site contain a large amount of surviving historic fabric, including machinery and their layout. They are attractive, including burnt header brick detailing and use of segmental arch heads over openings. The buildings also have group value, with their association adding to the understanding of their history, character and function. The setting of the buildings includes fields and countryside which contribute to the overall significance of the listed buildings.
24. The CA hereabouts is predominantly wooded, with a discrete network of small-scale fields giving an intimate and enclosed landscape. As such, its significance is its rural character. The proposal would result in new built development. However, its design and layout would have a rural appearance, and dense vegetation would help to screen it. The development would result in additional movements of traffic and people through the site. That said, the close proximity of the busy, noisy A35 limits the level of tranquillity and rurality experienced within the site. The Council does not object to the proposal on grounds of the character and appearance of the CA, and I similarly conclude that it would be preserved.
25. In respect of the listed buildings, there would be a reasonably large physical separation between them and the housing development. Moreover, the proposal would lead to the enhancement of the listed buildings, ensuring that repairs to them take place, and bringing them back into working order. These already have

the benefit of planning permission and listed building consent¹, implemented by the conversion of the stable block to residential use. The Council does not dispute that the proposed development is the minimum necessary to viably overcome the agreed conservation deficit caused by the works, and that a suitable delivery plan would be secured.

26. It follows that the proposal would result in a heritage-related public benefit of the conversion and preservation of the listed buildings. Framework paragraph 212 makes clear that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. Consequently, the proposal would not harm the listed buildings or their settings and so would accord with the Act. Indeed, I give its enabling benefits substantial positive weight in the planning balance.

Housing Land Supply

27. Framework paragraph 11 makes clear that where Development Plan policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless, amongst other things, the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a strong reason for refusal. This is known as the tilted balance.
28. The Council may well not be able to benefit from the transitional provisions of Framework paragraph 232. This permits non-compliance with the most up to date local housing need figure, but only for a period of five years from the Local Plan adoption date. However, Framework paragraph 233 makes clear that the position of an Annual Position Statement (APS) will stand until its expiry date.
29. Dorset has an APS which found a five-year land supply, and this does not expire until 31 October 2025. Accordingly, the tilted balance does not apply. In a recent appeal at Marnhull, Dorset², the Inspector assessed another proposal for housing without applying either Framework paragraph 232 or the tilted balance, notwithstanding an invitation to do so in a Statement of Common Ground.
30. Nevertheless, the proposal would result in the delivery of an additional 16 dwellings. I understand that the Marnhull appeal related to a site close to a village expected to take growth. Even so, the decision identified a very serious level of housing need in Dorset and the absence of a relevant strategy to deal with this. The proposal before me would support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. As such, even on a level balance of planning considerations, this represents a benefit of substantial positive weight.

Affordable Housing

31. PLP policies H11 and H12 relate to affordable housing, although the latter policy relates to rural exception sites which do not include the proposal. Nevertheless, as a scheme for new residential development, provision for affordable housing would normally be required under Policy H11. This anticipates circumstances where viability may prevent affordable housing provision. In this case, the Council accepts the viability evidence of the appellant that to require this would make the proposal unviable, defeating its heritage enabling purposes. Despite a local

¹ LPA references 6/2019/0664 and 6/2019/0665

² Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/W/24/3353912

housing need survey, the Council also does not object to the mix of dwelling sizes, and I see little reason to take a different view.

32. The appellant has provided two planning obligations, one of which includes a viability review clause, so that if completion has not taken place within four years, and a surplus subsequently arises, a financial contribution would be paid towards affordable housing. The Delivery Statement secures delivery before this date, but it is always possible that events could result in delays.
33. The Planning Practice Guidance³ makes clear that review mechanisms are a tool to strengthen a Council's ability to seek compliance with relevant policies over the lifetime of the project. However, it also makes clear that plans should set out circumstances where review mechanisms may be appropriate. No evidence is before me to suggest that the Development Plan sets out such circumstances. As a result, I conclude that there is no requirement for a viability review clause, and so I shall make my decision based on the planning obligation that does not include this requirement. This matter is therefore neutral in the planning balance.

Other Benefits

34. The proposal would generate social and economic benefits, for example through the provision of construction jobs, more children for local schools, and expenditure within local shops and services by the occupiers of the additional houses. These would represent additional benefits of modest weight.

Other Matters

Habitat Regulations

35. The site is located within 5km of parts of the Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site, which is part of the Dorset Heaths Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Its qualifying features include Dartford warblers, nightjars, woodlark, hen harrier, merlin, sand lizards and smooth snakes. The site is also within an area where development could affect the Poole Harbour SPA, which includes Common Shelduck, Pied Avocet, Black-tailed Godwit, Mediterranean Gull, Common Tern, Little Egret, Eurasian Spoonbill and waterfowl. The conservation objectives for these areas include maintaining or restoring the extent, distribution, structure and function of qualifying natural habitats and species.
36. The evidence before me is that these areas are under significant pressure from an increase in the level of human recreation, a disturbance of bird species, adverse effects on air quality from additional traffic, and the build-up of nitrates from wastewater and human sewage, all resulting from new development. The proposal and its additional dwellings would result in a further increase in human activity within the areas of influence, thus adding to the impacts on the protected sites.
37. The SAC, SPAs and Ramsar site are protected pursuant to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 as amended (the Habitats Regulations). For the reasons given above, alone and in combination with other development, a likely significant effect on the SAC, SPAs and Ramsar site from the proposal cannot be ruled out. Consequently, in accordance with the Habitats Regulations and as competent authority for this appeal, I must undertake an Appropriate Assessment.

³ Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 10-009-20190509

38. In respect of the Dorset Heathlands SPA and Ramsar site, mitigation has been developed in the form of Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM), such as raising awareness of the value of the protected sites and for ongoing monitoring. For the Poole Harbour SPA, mitigation has been established through the purchasing of nitrate credits. Both forms of mitigation seek to meet the conservation objectives by reducing recreational pressure, and achieving nitrogen neutrality.
39. In respect of the heathland, mitigation is provided from financial contributions towards SAMM. This would be collected via the CIL process. In respect of Poole Harbour, the appellant has provided a nutrient budget calculator which demonstrates that mitigation in the form of nitrate credits purchased from Natural England would be appropriate. The purchasing of credits can be secured by means of the planning condition suggested by the Council.
40. The Council and Natural England have confirmed that the use of CIL and a condition respectively would be acceptable. In undertaking the Appropriate Assessment, the information before me indicates that the mitigation would reduce the impact of the proposal on the integrity of the SPAs, SAC and Ramsar site to a de minimis level. It would therefore accord with the Habitats Regulations. It follows that this matter is neutral in the planning balance.

Other Issues

41. Vehicular access to the site would be achieved from the A35. Evidence in respect of speed surveys, access and visibility details and a road safety audit has been submitted. Subject to conditions, this was sufficient to satisfy the Highway Authority that the access and the increase in traffic using it would be safe. I see little reason to take a different approach. No substantive evidence is before me to suggest that the proposal would provide inadequate vehicle parking.
42. The proposed houses would be within low-risk flood zone one, but the access goes through an area at risk from flooding. A drainage strategy has been proposed which responds to comments from the Environment Agency and the Local Lead Flood Authority. The Council has confirmed that the strategy would ensure that the development would be safe throughout its lifetime, and subject to conditions I share that view. These issues are therefore neutral in the planning balance.

Conditions

43. The Council has provided a list of conditions, which I have assessed and where necessary amended, having regard to the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. A condition requiring adherence to the approved plans is necessary for certainty.
44. For the reasons already given, a condition requiring the purchasing of nitrate credits is necessary, to ensure no harm to habitats or the protected sites. A Construction Traffic Management Plan is necessary in the interests of highway safety and the living conditions of nearby occupiers. A Construction Environmental Management Plan and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan are required to avoid harm to the environment and biodiversity. Pre-commencement conditions are necessary because these Plans will affect how work takes place at an early stage.

45. A pre-commencement condition is similarly required for a detailed design for the surface water management scheme, to ensure no adverse effects from flooding. To ensure that development takes place in accordance with the tree protection measures, and with the Arboricultural Method Statement, including prior to works taking place, a pre-commencement condition is needed in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
46. To ensure no adverse effects from flooding, conditions requiring details of the surface water management scheme, maintenance and management of flood mitigation works and a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan are necessary.
47. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, details of external materials and windows and doors are required, as are details of soft landscaping. Boundary treatments and refuse storage facilities are necessary for the living conditions of future occupiers and the character and appearance of the area. In the interests of future occupiers' living conditions, and biodiversity, no external lighting shall be installed unless agreed.
48. In the interests of highway safety, development shall take place in accordance with the approved access and visibility splay details, to a suitable level above the carriageway, with the access road being completed to binder course before any other development takes place, and with entrance gates set back. For the same reason and to ensure the free flow of traffic, details of any electric gates is necessary before their installation.
49. A condition limiting water use will also aid nutrient neutrality and ensure the efficient use of water. To avoid additional effects on the Green Belt, to maintain the rural appearance of the development, and to ensure adequate living conditions of future occupiers, it is necessary to remove permitted development rights for enlargements to the dwellings, or for additional outbuildings.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

50. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that applications for planning permission, and therefore appeals, must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
51. I have found that the proposal would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets. As such, it would benefit from the exception provided by Framework paragraph 84(b) which otherwise seeks to avoid the development of isolated homes. Given the stance of the Framework, I give only limited weight to the harm caused by the poor location of the site to services and facilities, and to the conflict with PLP policy V1.
52. In assessing the proposal in the round, the harm by reason of Green Belt inappropriateness, and the other harm as identified above, would be clearly outweighed by the other considerations, such as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal. Therefore, despite the conflict with the Development Plan, the balance of material considerations indicate that planning permission should be granted, and the appeal should be allowed.

O Marigold INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 18-1018-LOC A, 21-1088 01/P8, 02/P2, 03/P2, 04/P2, 05/P2, 06/P2, 07/P2, 08/P2, 09/P2, 10/P2, 11/P2, 12/P2, 13/P2, 14/P2, 15/P2, CB-01/E.01/P1, CB-01/E.02/P1, CB-01/P.01/P1, CB-02/E.01/P1, CB-02/E.02/P1, CB-02/P.02/P1, CB-03/P.01/P1, CB-03/E.01/P1, CB-03/E.02/P1, GR-14 P.01 P1, GR-15 P.01 P1, GR-16 P.01 P1, ACLA/BMB 01, 18400-4-A1-AA.
- 3) No development shall commence until the necessary nutrient mitigation credits to mitigate the impacts of the development on the Poole Harbour Special Protection Area and Ramsar site have been secured from an accredited nutrient provider, and a copy of the Nutrient Credit Certificate demonstrating that purchase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 4) No development shall take place until a Construction Traffic Management Plan and programme of works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include construction vehicle details, a programme of construction works, timings of deliveries, abnormal load management, contractors' arrangements, wheel and vehicle cleaning, arrangements for the inspection of the highway serving the site, the signing of vehicle routes to the site, a route plan for all contractors and suppliers, and temporary traffic management measures, if necessary. The development shall thereafter be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan.
- 5) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Construction Environmental Management Plan, incorporating pollution prevention measures, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details and agreed timetable.
- 6) No development shall take place until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) has been submitted to and been approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. It shall include the features managed, ecological trends and constraints, aims and objectives, management options and prescriptions, a work schedule, the organisation responsible for implementation, ongoing monitoring and remedial measures and the mechanisms by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured, and contingencies or remedial action that would be taken if necessary. The approved LEMP must be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 7) No development shall take place until the detailed design for flood mitigation works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be based on the flood mitigation works detailed in Section 6 of the report: Hydraulic Modelling Report, by SLR Consulting Ltd, ref 410.065231.00001, rev 06 and dated 19/02/2024. The flood mitigation works shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development.
- 8) No development shall take place until the tree protection measures have been erected in accordance with BS5837:2012 and have been positioned as shown

on the Tree Protection Plan ref: 18400-4. This shall be erected before any equipment, materials or machinery are brought onto the site for the purposes of development (including demolition). The protection shall be retained until the development is completed and nothing shall be placed within the fenced area, nor shall any ground levels be altered, or excavations made.

- 9) The development hereby approved shall take place in accordance with the Barrell Tree Consultancy Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) reference no.18400-AA2PB, including in respect of a site meeting, and should be overseen throughout the project in accordance with the pre-arranged supervision detailed in section 2.3 & 2.4 of the AMS by a suitably qualified and pre-appointed tree specialist.
- 10) No development except for flood mitigation works shall take place until a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, and including how surface water will be managed during construction, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the submitted details before the development is occupied.
- 11) No development shall take place except for flood mitigation works until details of maintenance and management of both the surface water drainage scheme and any receiving system has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. The details should include a plan for the lifetime of the development, the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangement to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.
- 12) The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include details of how any recommended measures will be implemented, and maintenance throughout its lifetime. The approved plan shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the development.
- 13) Prior to the development above damp-proof course level of any building hereby approved, details of all external facing materials for its walls and roofs shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the building shall take place in accordance with the approved materials.
- 14) Prior to the installation of any windows or external doors, a schedule and detailed drawings and sections of all new windows/doors in the development including the method of opening and the depth of the reveal from the face of the wall shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with such details as have been agreed.
- 15) The soft landscaping works detailed on approved drawing ACLA/BMB 01 must be carried out in full during the first planting season (November to March) following commencement of the development or within a timescale to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The soft landscaping shall be maintained in accordance with the agreed details. 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.

- 16) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, details of all proposed means of enclosure, boundary walls and fences to the site, shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be implemented in full accordance with the approved details.
- 17) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, details of facilities to be provided for the storage and removal of refuse from the premises shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These facilities shall be provided before the development is first occupied and shall be retained as such thereafter.
- 18) No external lighting shall be installed until details of the lighting scheme have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the lighting scheme shall be installed, operated and maintained in accordance with the agreed details.
- 19) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, the access, geometric highway layout, turning and parking areas shown on drawing number 01/P8 must have been constructed and made available. Thereafter, these must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and made available for the purposes specified.
- 20) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until the priority junction vehicular access works and associated visibility splay works detailed on drawings SALA-02 A and 215810/AT/CO1 E have been constructed.
- 21) Before the development hereby approved is occupied, the visibility splay areas shown on Drawing Number 215810/AT/CO1 E must be cleared/excavated to a level not exceeding 0.6 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway. The splay areas must thereafter be maintained and kept free from all obstructions.
- 22) No works shall commence on site other than those required by this condition until the first 20 metres of the proposed access road, including the junction with the existing highway, has been completed to at least binder course level.
- 23) Before the development hereby approved is occupied, any entrance gates must be set back a minimum distance of 20 metres from the edge of the carriageway, and hung so that the gates can only open inwards. Thereafter, the gates must be retained at their approved position, maintained and kept free from obstruction.
- 24) No electric gate shall be installed until details of it and a gate access management plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall provide its technical specification, the programme of inspection, service, maintenance and repair and that peak hours for these will be avoided, the suitability of the gate use by vehicles, times of opening and closing, automatic opening, power, override for emergency services, anti-crushing mechanism and signage. Gates shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and must be maintained and available for the purpose specified.

- 25) Details of measures to limit the potential consumption of wholesome water use by persons occupying each new dwelling, to 110 litres per person per day, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before each dwelling is occupied. The approved measures shall be implemented and maintained thereafter.
- 26) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification) no enlargement(s) of the dwellinghouses hereby approved, permitted by Class A and Class B of Schedule 2 Part 1 of the 2015 Order, shall be erected or constructed.
- 27) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification) no garages, sheds or other outbuildings permitted by Class E of Schedule 2 Part 1 of the 2015 Order shall be erected or constructed.

End of Conditions

Richborough