



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 10 June 2026

Site visit made on 10 June 2026

by H Faulkner BSc (Hons) MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6005705

Land adjacent to Lynt Road, Inglesham, Swindon SN6 7QX.

- 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 Mr A Godfrey against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is S/25/0910/RACH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 14 residential units (Use Class C3) with associated infrastructure.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of 14 residential units (Use Class C3) with associated infrastructure at Land adjacent to Lynt Road, Inglesham, Swindon SN6 7QX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S/25/0910/RACH, dated 25 July 2025 subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The address on the application form referred to the site as 'Street Record, Lynt Road' which differs from the address on the decision notice. I am satisfied that the information included with the application made the location of the site sufficiently clear. As the address on the notice is a clearer description of the site address, I have used this in the banner heading and Decision above. This approach was agreed with the parties at the Hearing.
3. The Council notified interested parties of the appeal and the Hearing in a letter dated 23 March 2026. However, upon reviewing this correspondence prior to the Hearing, it did not contain all the relevant information required under the Procedural Guide: Planning Appeals – England¹, including the absence of a deadline for the submission of comments and sufficient detail to enable parties to decide whether to submit or withdraw representations. Consequently, a further letter was issued on 3 June 2026 to provide the necessary information. Interested parties then had adequate information regarding the Hearing itself to allow it to proceed. A further deadline of 24 June 2026 was set for the submission of comments; however, no additional representations were received.
4. Prior to the Hearing the appellant provided a signed legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the S106) with contributions towards bus shelters and a Resident Travel Welcome Pack which includes measures such as a voucher for bus travel, cycle and home delivery vouchers. Following discussions at

¹ [Procedural Guide: Planning appeals-England. For appeals relation to applications date on or before 31 March.](#)

the Hearing in relation to the administration fee, an updated version was submitted after the Hearing, dated 17 June 2026, and this is a material consideration.

5. It came to light prior to the Hearing that the street scene elevation drawing submitted with the application and appeal did not accurately reflect the proposal. Drawing P111A submitted with the application showed one of the bungalows in a mirror of what was intended. Whereas the site layout plan and other elevations depicted the development correctly. This matter was discussed at the Hearing and the Council stated that they did not object to the drawing being substituted. Given the minor nature of the change and the fact that the detail was correct in all the other drawings I do not consider that anyone would be prejudiced by this drawing being accepted and therefore the drawing has been accepted as part of the appeal.
6. Drawing no. P104 Rev C was referenced on the Council's decision notice. However, at the Hearing the Council accepted that this was an error and that the revision number should have been P104 Rev D. The difference between the drawings relates to the alignment of the footpath. It is clear from the comments from the Council's Highway Officer and the Officer report that the application was determined based on the more recent revision. I am satisfied that the plan formed part of the original application. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:
 - whether the appeal site is in an appropriate location for housing, having regard to the requirements of local and national policy; particularly accessibility in terms of public transport, pedestrian and cycling opportunities; and
 - the effect of the proposal on designated heritage assets including the Upper Inglesham Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings.

Reasons

Location of development

8. Policy SD2 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 (LP) sets out the spatial strategy for the distribution of development, directing new housing to Swindon and to settlements commensurate with their size and role. Development outside defined settlement boundaries can be supported where specific criteria are met.
9. It is common ground between the parties that the appeal site lies outside of a defined settlement boundary and that the proposal does not meet any of the exceptions set out in Policy SD2. As such it does not align with the spatial strategy for the distribution of development. However, the policy does not preclude development outside of settlements, it is also not isolated and has some limited accessibility to nearby settlements and services. As a result, I attach moderate weight to this conflict.
10. In considering the implications of this conflict, it is necessary to assess whether the site nevertheless performs acceptably in terms of accessibility, having regard to Policies SD1 and TR2.
11. Policy SD1 seeks to ensure that development is accessible by walking, cycling and/or public transport. The inclusion of "and/or" indicates that development may be

considered acceptable where it demonstrates accessibility by one or more of these modes, rather than requiring all to be equally achieved.

12. In this case, opportunities for walking would be limited. Although Inglesham is identified as a settlement, it contains very limited services and facilities, and future occupiers would not be able to meet day-to-day needs on foot from the appeal site. Although there are opportunities for recreational walking within and around the village, this does not equate to functional access to employment, education, healthcare or shopping.
13. In respect of cycling, it would be physically possible to travel to the closest settlements of Lechlade-on-Thames and Highworth, however, the nature of the surrounding road network, including the A361, would be unlikely to encourage use by all but the most confident cyclists. It was accepted that more vulnerable users, including school children, would be unlikely to cycle along these routes. Consequently, cycling cannot reasonably be regarded as a realistic or attractive alternative to the private car for a significant proportion of journeys.
14. The appeal site is near to bus stops on the A361, served by routes including the 64 service connecting to Swindon via Highworth, as well as the 76 and 77 providing links to nearby settlements. This provides opportunities for some journeys to be undertaken by public transport. For example, it would be possible to commute to employment in Swindon and there is also a bus service to a nearby secondary school.
15. However, the benefits of this provision are tempered by the limited frequency and coverage of those services, particularly in evenings and at weekends. This would restrict the flexibility with which they could be relied upon for a full range of day-to-day trips. As a result, future occupiers would be likely to continue to rely on the private car for most journeys.
16. Doubts have been raised regarding whether the bus route to Swindon will be retained in the future, as it currently has financial support as a service and has not operated consistently in the past. I accept that there is uncertainty in this respect and that it is unlikely that the service will be significantly improved. However, the evidence before me does not indicate that the service will cease in the near future, and I have therefore assessed the proposal on the basis of the existing provision.
17. Given the above in the context of Policy SD1, although there are limited opportunities for walking and cycling, it is possible to access the site via public transport. Whilst the public transport services to the site have their limitations, I also acknowledge that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) recognises that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas. In this context I find the level of public transport to be acceptable and as such the proposal would not conflict with policy SD1.
18. Policy TR2 includes a number of elements with part (a) requiring development to be located and designed to reduce the need to travel and to encourage the use of sustainable transport alternatives, particularly walking and cycling, and provide the potential to maximise bus travel. It is this element of the policy that is in dispute. It was common ground that there is no conflict with the other elements of the policy. Therefore, the key considerations relate to accessibility and transport choice.
19. The Framework seeks development that ensures sustainable transport modes are prioritised, taking account of the type of proposal and its location. It adds that

development should give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements and second, so far as possible, to facilitating access to high quality public transport.

20. The proposed development includes a footpath link to the bus stops, together with financial contributions secured through the S106 obligation towards upgraded bus shelters and a Resident Travel Welcome Pack. These measures would improve the attractiveness and usability of public transport provision and therefore attract some weight in favour of the proposal. However, they would not overcome the fundamental limitations arising from the frequency, coverage and convenience of the service.
21. Similarly, measures such as travel vouchers, cycle incentives and encouragement of home delivery services may provide some limited benefit in influencing travel behaviour. The provision of home offices may also facilitate home working and reduce the need to commute. However, given the underlying locational constraints of the site, there is no certainty or likelihood that such measures would result in a meaningful or sustained reduction in reliance on the private car. I therefore afford these measures limited weight in respect of compliance with Policy TR2.
22. Development should take opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes; however, the scope to do so varies by location. There is no requirement for all journeys to be undertaken by non-car modes, and some reliance on private vehicles is inevitable, particularly in rural areas, although the extent of this reliance remains an important consideration.
23. The nearest settlements offering a range of services are Lechlade-on-Thames and Highworth, located approximately 1.9 miles and 2.5 miles from the site respectively. These distances are relatively close and whilst they might be beyond what would reasonably be expected for regular walking and cycling trips, journeys by car would be short.
24. Drawing these matters together, whilst I find no conflict with Policy SD1, the site's location would result in many day-to-day journeys being undertaken by car. As such, the development would not reduce the need to travel and would therefore conflict with Policy TR2.
25. Overall, whilst the proposal would not conflict with Policy SD1, as the site is accessible by public transport, this does not in itself render the location sustainable. The proposal remains inconsistent with Policy SD2 as it lies outside any defined settlement boundary and does not accord with the spatial strategy. Furthermore, whilst journeys would often be short, there would remain a reliance on private vehicles such that the proposal would conflict with Policy TR2, albeit to a limited extent.
26. However, in terms of accessibility the extent of that harm is moderated by the availability of public transport and the relatively short distances to nearby settlements containing services and facilities.

Designated Heritage Assets

27. The appeal site lies adjacent to, but outside, the Upper Inglesham Conservation Area (CA). It is common ground that the site lies within its setting. There are also several nearby listed buildings.
28. In accordance with section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, special regard must be given to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their settings.

29. The Framework sets out that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource which should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Stating that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and any harm to their significance should require clear and convincing justification. Where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
30. Policy EN10 of the LP reflects the Framework, seeking to sustain and enhance the historic environment, including designated heritage assets and their settings. Proposals affecting heritages assets should where appropriate enhance their significance and setting, with any harm being weighed against the public benefits.

Significance of the Conservation Area

31. The significance of the Upper Inglesham CA derives from its historic development as a rural hamlet, with a clustered arrangement of buildings that reflect different phases of its evolution. The historic core contains several listed buildings, including farmhouses and cottages constructed primarily of local stone, which illustrate its agricultural origins and architectural development over time.
32. The character of the CA is defined not only by these historic buildings, but also by their relationship with surrounding open land, paddocks and fields, which reinforce its rural qualities and allow its origins as an agricultural settlement to be readily understood. This includes the loose grain of development at its edges and the contrast between the historic core and later, more limited modern additions.
33. The setting of the CA, including the surrounding agricultural land, contributes to its significance by allowing this rural character and historic evolution to be appreciated. However, there are elements within the CA boundary, including more recent housing and the A-road, which make a limited or negative contribution to that significance.

Effect of the Proposal on Significance

34. The appeal site currently comprises an undeveloped agricultural field located to the south of the CA, contributing to its rural surroundings within which the historic core is experienced. As such, the land forms part of the setting of the CA and plays a role in its significance by maintaining the perception of the settlement as a small rural hamlet set within open countryside.
35. The proposed development would introduce residential built form on the site, resulting in a degree of encroachment into the rural setting. This would alter the perception of the settlement edge, particularly in closer views from adjacent routes, with additional night-time lighting further contributing to this change. While it would be visible from the adjacent lane at the site entrance, there are no important or recognised views from within the CA in which its significance is appreciable that would be materially affected.
36. The site is well contained by established hedgerows and trees, with further planting and areas of open space proposed along its boundaries. This would soften the visual impact of the development and maintain a degree of separation between the proposal and the more sensitive parts of the CA. Furthermore, there are no key or designated views from within the CA across the site in which the significance of the heritage asset is best appreciated.
37. Taking these factors into account, whilst there would be some erosion of the rural setting, the proposal would not undermine the ability to understand the historic form

and development of the village. I therefore find that the proposal would result in a limited degree of harm to the significance of the CA through its setting. This harm would be less than substantial, at the lower end of the scale.

Listed Buildings

38. I have also considered the effect of the proposal on nearby listed buildings, including Manor Farm, Middle Hill Farm, Lynt House, Old Lynt Farmhouse and the K6 telephone box, all of which are Grade II listed.
39. Manor Farm, Middle Hill Farm and Old Lynt Farmhouse derive their significance primarily from their age, architectural form and historic function as part of the agricultural development of the settlement. Their settings are experienced largely within the historic core of the village and in association with nearby buildings and farmstead groupings, rather than the appeal site.
40. Lynt House is a larger historic dwelling of some architectural interest, whose significance is also informed by its historic association with agricultural land and its position within the settlement. Although land to the south may historically have formed part of its wider holding, the construction of the A-road and intervening development has largely severed that relationship. As a result, the contribution that the appeal site makes to its setting is limited.
41. The K6 telephone box derives its significance from its iconic design and historic interest, as well as its contribution to the traditional street scene within the village. Its significance is experienced in proximity and within the immediate streetscape, rather than in any relationship with the wider countryside to the south.
42. Given the intervening built form, the A-road and limited intervisibility, the appeal site does not form part of the setting in which these listed buildings are experienced in any meaningful way. The proposed development would not therefore negatively affect the contribution made by their settings to their significance.
43. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would preserve the setting and significance of the listed buildings, in accordance with section 66(1) of the Act and paragraph 212 of the Framework.

Heritage Balance

44. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA. Great weight is given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, and I attach considerable importance and weight to that harm.
45. In accordance with paragraph 215 of the Framework, this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. These include the provision of 14 dwellings in an area with a shortfall in housing land supply, as well as the delivery of a mix of housing, including bungalows, which would meet identified local needs.
46. When these public benefits are weighed against the identified harm, I conclude that they are sufficient to outweigh it.
47. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would comply with Policy EN10 of the LP and the policies of the Framework relating to the conservation of the historic environment. The identified harm would not provide a clear reason for refusing planning permission under paragraph 11(d) of the Framework.

Other Matters

48. The proposal includes three self-build dwellings, and the Council is generally supportive of the self- and custom-build sector. However, there is no secured mechanism to ensure that the dwellings would be delivered in this manner. Although a condition was suggested at the Hearing by the appellant, to which the Council raised no objection, I do not consider this approach to be sufficiently robust. It would fail to meet the tests set out in paragraph 57 of the Framework in respect of precision and enforceability. A planning obligation, secured through a S106 agreement, would be the most appropriate mechanism to ensure that the development is delivered as self- or custom-build housing rather than as market housing. However, the submitted S106 agreement makes no reference to self-build provision. Consequently, I attach no weight to the self-build element of the proposal.
49. Concerns have been raised by interested parties in respect of highway safety. During the application process the Council raised concerns regarding highway safety matters. As a result, amendments to the proposals were made and the Council's highway team did not maintain any objections on highway safety grounds. Furthermore, the agreed conditions could ensure that the proposed highway works are completed. I am satisfied based on the evidence before me that the development would not give rise to any material highway safety concerns.
50. With regards to local infrastructure including water, sewerage and electricity it is reported that there are existing issues in the area. Comments on the application were made by Thames Water but did not raise concerns in respect of adequacy of provision. There is no evidence to indicate that a suitable supply would not be available and it is not for the proposal to rectify any existing issues in the area. Any matters in respect of electricity supply and provision would be for the electricity provider and does not form part of the assessment in respect of the appropriateness of a site for housing as part of this appeal. Whilst the appellant has suggested that they will make improvements, no specific details have been provided and I therefore give this limited weight.
51. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the site is at risk of flooding, and there is no compelling reason to suggest that flooding would pose an issue. The site is not located within an area of high flood risk, and a suitable drainage scheme could be secured by condition.
52. In terms of impact on neighbouring properties living conditions the Council did not express any concern in this regard. I am satisfied that there are sufficient separation distances between the nearest houses and the built development. The closest parts of the proposal including the footpath, community park and attenuation pond would not give rise to any harmful effects on living conditions.
53. The existing Public Right of Way close to the site would not be altered by the development. If there are existing maintenance issues this is a separate matter from this appeal.
54. With concerns raised in respect of boundary treatments, details can be considered as part of a landscaping condition.
55. With regards to light pollution a condition can be used to ensure that external lighting is appropriately planned with particular regards to wildlife such as bats.

Planning Obligations

56. The appellant has provided a legal agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, which includes two obligations which would come into effect if planning permission were to be granted. I have considered the obligations in light of the Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (the CIL Regulations). These state that a planning obligation must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
57. The legal agreement facilitates financial contributions of £30,000 to provide two bus shelters at the bus stops near the site. It also includes a 'Resident Travel Welcome Pack' this includes a voucher for 6 months bus travel, a voucher towards the purchasing of cycling equipment and a voucher for home delivery shopping for one year.
58. Policy IN1 of the LP requires development to mitigate its infrastructure impacts and contribute, where viable, to the provision, maintenance and improvement of local and strategic infrastructure necessary to support sustainable growth. The Council accepts that the provision of bus shelters would comply with this policy. Although it affords more limited weight to the welcome pack incentives it was satisfied that the obligations meet the statutory test set out in Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations. I agree and have taken them into account in making my decision.

Planning Balance

59. It is common ground between the parties that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, with evidence indicating a supply of around 4.9 years with the appellant suggesting a lower figure. However, the precise extent of the shortfall is not determinative in this case. As such, paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is engaged, which presumes that permission should be granted unless protected policies provide a clear reason for refusal, or the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework as a whole.
60. I have found that the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance does not provide a clear reason for refusing the development.
61. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning decisions be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, the proposal conflicts with the development plan, in particular Policies SD2 and TR2. This conflict arises from the site's location outside a defined settlement boundary and the limited opportunity to minimise the need to travel, resulting in reliance on the private car for many day-to-day journeys.
62. In assessing the harm, I attribute moderate weight to the conflict with the spatial strategy, which seeks to direct development to the most sustainable locations. Although the site benefits from the presence of nearby bus services, offering some opportunity for travel by non-car modes, the limited frequency and coverage of these services, combined with constrained walking and cycling opportunities, mean that

future occupiers would be likely to rely on the private car for a significant proportion of their journeys.

63. While the proposal demonstrates a degree of compliance with Policy SD1 through its accessibility to public transport, this is insufficient to outweigh the identified conflict with the spatial strategy and associated transport policies. As such, the proposal represents a shortcoming in sustainability terms.
64. However, the site is not isolated and retains a degree of accessibility to nearby settlements. This factor moderates, but does not overcome, the fundamental conflict with the spatial strategy or the reliance on private car use identified above.
65. I therefore conclude that the harm arising from the location of the development is moderate. This harm attracts weight in the planning balance, given the conflict with the development plan and the objectives of the Framework in promoting sustainable patterns of growth.
66. The scheme would also result in limited harm to the CA, which is afforded great weight. Acknowledging that this is at the lower end of less than substantial harm and has been accepted as being outweighed by public benefits.
67. Set against the harm are the benefits of the proposal. The development would deliver 14 dwellings in the context of a shortfall in housing land supply. The Framework seeks to significantly boost housing delivery, and I attach substantial weight to this objective in the context of the identified shortfall. While modest in scale, the scheme would nonetheless make a meaningful contribution to addressing the shortage. Furthermore, the Framework recognises that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, are essential for Small and Medium Enterprise housebuilders to deliver new homes and are often built out relatively quickly.
68. The scheme would also provide a mix of housing, including bungalows, which would contribute towards meeting identified local housing needs. I attach moderate weight to this benefit.
69. The proposal would give rise to economic benefits during both the construction phase and through the spending of future occupiers. While these benefits are of limited weight individually, they nevertheless add to the overall positive effects of the scheme.
70. Environmental benefits would arise through biodiversity enhancements and the provision of open space and infrastructure improvements, including upgrades to bus stop facilities. These benefits would offer some localised improvements for both future occupiers and the wider community, and I attach moderate weight collectively to these factors.
71. Drawing these matters together, the proposal would give rise to moderate harm through conflict with the development plan, particularly in relation to the spatial strategy and reliance on the private car. However, this harm must be weighed against the substantial benefit of boosting housing supply, together with the additional benefits identified.
72. Overall, I find that the adverse impacts of granting permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. Consequently, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged and indicates that planning permission should be granted.

Conditions

73. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered in light of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. The Council and appellant agreed a range of conditions considered to be necessary in the event that planning permission was granted. These were discussed during the Hearing. I have amended the wording where necessary to ensure that the conditions meet the relevant tests of being necessary, relevant to planning and to the development, enforceable, precise and reasonable.
74. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and a condition specifying the approved plans, as these are required to provide certainty as to the development permitted and its implementation.
75. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to impose conditions requiring the submission and approval of external materials and a detailed landscaping scheme, together with implementation and replacement planting provisions, to ensure that the development integrates satisfactorily with its surroundings.
76. Conditions relating to access, highway works, parking provision and pedestrian connections are necessary in the interests of highway safety and to ensure appropriate accessibility to and within the site. These are required to be implemented prior to occupation to ensure that safe and suitable access arrangements are in place for future occupiers.
77. To manage flood risk and ensure satisfactory drainage, conditions are imposed requiring the submission and implementation of detailed surface water drainage schemes and their ongoing maintenance. Given the importance of these matters to the acceptability of the development, these conditions are necessary to ensure that the development does not increase flood risk on or off site.
78. Conditions are also required to safeguard biodiversity, including the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan, ecological surveys and mitigation measures, tree protection, ecological enhancements and lighting controls. These are necessary to ensure that protected species and habitats are not adversely affected and that biodiversity enhancements are secured.
79. Finally, conditions requiring the provision and long-term management of public open space are necessary to ensure that adequate amenity space is delivered and maintained for the benefit of future occupiers and in the interests of the wider environment.

Conclusion

80. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan but material considerations indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it.
81. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

H Faulkner

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Andrew Godfrey- Appellant

Mr Ranjit Sagoo BSc MSc MA Hons MRTPI – Agility Planning and Design

Mr Stephen Hawley IEng FCIHT FIHE MTPS CertMgmt (Open) – Firlands Transport Planning

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ralph Chakadya BSc (Hons), MSc - Senior Development Management Officer

Jo Plumridge – Graduate Planner

Tim Thomas – Lead Planning Policy Officer

Tony Garratt BA(Hons) PGDip (ArchCons) IHBC – Senior Conservation and Design Officer

Gerry Prodohl BSc – Principal Transport Manager

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE HEARING

1 Completed Unilateral Undertaking

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below:
 - Site Location Plan P101
 - Block Plan P102
 - Site Layout P104 rev. D
 - Proposed House Type A – Plot 9 and 13 P105-01 rev. E
 - Proposed House Type A – Plot 10, 12 and 14 P105-02 rev. E
 - Proposed House Type B – Plot 6 and 8 P106-02 rev. E
 - Proposed House Type B – Plot 5 and 7 P106-01 rev. E
 - Proposed House Type C – Plots 1, 2 3 and 4 P107 rev. F
 - Proposed House Type D P108 rev. D
 - Proposed Garages P109 rev. B
 - Street Scenes P111 rev. B
 - Building Massing and Site Parking Provision P110 rev. B
 - Transport Assessment 06.06.2025
 - Technical Note – Highways Nov 2025
 - Arboricultural Report Version 1.1
 - Refuse Vehicle Tracking Layout 2 rev. A
 - Phase 1 Preliminary Ecological Appraisal March 2025
 - Landscape and Ecological Enhancement Scheme 1
 - Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy 25026
 - Archaeological Desk-based Assessment (2022) Report No 2279
 - Archaeological Evaluation (2024) Report No 2433
 - Proposed Drainage Strategy 25026-C003
 - Topographical Survey 189-0320
3. No development above slab level shall take place until details and samples of all external materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
4. No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicular access has been laid out and constructed in accordance with details to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
5. No development (other than that required to form the access) shall take place until the first 30 metres of the site access, including the junction with the existing highway and associated visibility splays, has been constructed to at least binder course level.
6. No dwelling shall be occupied until the footway connecting the site with the A361, including dropped kerbs and tactile paving on both sides of the A361, has been implemented in accordance with the approved details, as shown on drawing numbered P104 Rev D and thereafter maintained unless and until adopted as publicly maintainable.

7. No dwelling shall be occupied until the highway works set out in drawing no. 10794/201 [enclosed within the Technical Note – Highways Appraisal, dated November 2025] have been undertaken and certified complete to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
8. No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicular parking and turning facilities including garages have been provided in accordance with the submitted plan [drawing no. P104 Rev D]. Those areas shall thereafter be retained for parking and turning of vehicles.
9. No development above slab level shall take place until a scheme of landscaping to include a planting schedule and time table of works, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the positions, species and crown spread of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, detailing those to be retained. The approved scheme shall be implemented as per the approved timetable.

All planting shall be carried out in the first planting season following first occupation or completion of the development, whichever occurs sooner. Any trees or plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged within five years shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

10. Prior to the commencement of development (including site clearance and delivery of materials) details of tree and hedgerow and Tree Protection measures during the works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Tree and hedgerow protection measures will include temporary fencing for the protection of hedgerows in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations. Any alternative fencing type or position not in accordance with BS 5837:2012 will be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the start of development.

The root protection fencing will define the works exclusion zone around hedgerows and trees. Activities liable to be harmful to hedgerows and trees are prohibited within this exclusion zone, unless agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The approved hedgerow and tree protection measures will remain in place until the completion of development.

11. No dwelling shall be occupied until a scheme for the long-term management and maintenance of the onsite public open space has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The provision of the open space shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved strategy.
12. No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, in accordance with the approved drainage strategy 'Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy – Lynt Road, Swindon, Ref: 25026-C1000, Revision P1, 24 June 2025', has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall include, but not be limited to:

- Evidence that the proposed flows from the site will discharge at or below greenfield runoff rates, or as close as practical for any areas that have been previously developed;
- Details of how the drainage scheme has incorporated SuDS techniques to manage water quantity and maintain water quality in accordance with best practice guidance including the latest SuDS Manual C753;
- Detailed drainage plan showing the location of the proposed SuDS and drainage network with exceedance flow routes clearly identified;
- Details to demonstrate the SuDS Scheme has been designed in accordance with best practice guidance including the latest SuDS Manual C753;
- General arrangement, which should be coordinated with the landscape proposals and the masterplan;
- Manhole Schedules;
- Detailed drainage calculations for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus climate change to demonstrate that all SuDS features and the drainage network can cater for the critical storm event for its lifetime;
- Details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion;
- Any drainage systems offered for adoption will be designed to Design and Construction Guidance (previously Sewers for Adoption) and/or SBC standards as part of the detailed design and relevant technical approval processes.

13. No dwelling shall be occupied until a surface water drainage maintenance scheme for the site, in accordance with the approved maintenance regime 'Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy, Chapter 7 – Lynt Road, Swindon, Ref: 25026-C1000, Revision P1, 24 June 2025', has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be maintained in accordance with the approved details.

14. Development shall not commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following:

- a) Summary of potentially damaging activities
- b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones"
- c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (these may be provided as a set of 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 on site to oversee works.
- 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.

15. As close as practicable and no earlier than three months prior to commencement of development, an additional badger survey report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Should the position, in so far as it relates to badgers, have changed from that originally reported when the application was submitted, the new survey report should incorporate a revised badger mitigation plan.

Prior to first occupation a report prepared by an appropriately qualified and experienced ecologist demonstrating the implementation of the badger mitigation/enhancement measures, as set out in the badger survey report, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

16. No development above ground level shall commence until details of integrated swift nesting boxes on each dwelling (ratio of 1 nest brick per house) shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Photographs of the integral boxes in their installed locations plus context photographs are to be submitted to Swindon Borough Council and to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation. They are to be retained in that manner thereafter.
17. No works above ground level shall commence until a detailed lighting scheme, developed in accordance with established guidance (e.g. Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Professionals (2023) Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night), has been drafted and agreed with the Local Planning Authority. The Sensitive Lighting Strategy will demonstrate that the proposed lighting will not impact upon ecological networks and/or sensitive features. Thereafter the agreed lighting scheme shall be implemented. All external lighting shall be installed strictly in accordance with the specifications and locations set out within the Lighting Strategy and thereafter retained.