

Application No: 15/1126C

Location: HIVERLEY, MACCLESFIELD ROAD, TWEMLow, CHESHIRE, CW4 8BP

Proposal: Demolition of existing house and stables and construction of new dwellings.

Applicant: Mrs Andrea Jackson

Expiry Date: 08-Jun-2015

### **REASON FOR THE REPORT:**

The proposal is a small scale major application that is required to be determined by Committee under the Council's scheme of delegation.

### **SUMMARY:**

The proposal is situated within the Open Countryside and is therefore contrary to development plan policies PS8 and H6 (Open Countryside) and therefore the statutory presumption is against the proposal unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The most important material consideration in this case is the NPPF which states at paragraph 49 that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, which has been accepted in recent appeals.

The proposal is considered to be sustainable both locationally and in the context of the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainability. It will assist the Council's 5 year housing land supply position by utilising a previously developed site and will promote economic growth. It is the view of officers that these considerations outweigh the site's conflict with adopted local plan. Furthermore, it is considered that any harm arising from these issues would not be substantial or demonstrable, and therefore the presumption in favour of development, under paragraph 14 of the NPPF applies.

The proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on Jodrell Bank, highways and residential amenity. Subject to amended plans, the affordable housing requirement would be met by the proposals through on site provision. The design and layout is also considered to be acceptable and will respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal will be acceptable in terms of its impact on ecology,

trees and landscape. It will also assist in meeting local housing needs subject to conditions and a S106 agreement to mitigate the relevant impacts.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

APPROVE subject to conditions and S106 Agreement.

#### **PROPOSAL:**

The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing house and stables and the erection of 10 houses at the property referred to as 'Hiverley', Macclesfield Road, Twemlow.

#### **SITE DESCRIPTION:**

The application site is located at the very eastern edge of the rural settlement of Twemlow, adjacent to Macclesfield Road. The site is largely screened by an existing hedgerow and a number of trees, located around a pond within the southern part of the site.

The site hosts a large detached two-storey dwellinghouse fronting Macclesfield Road and a number of stables towards the rear of the site. It sits amongst a loose cluster of properties situated on the south and northern side of Macclesfield Road near to its junction with Forty Acre Lane.

The application site is located outside of the infill boundary line for Twemlow and is within Open Countryside as designated in the adopted Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review (2005).

#### **RELEVANT HISTORY:**

None

#### **NATIONAL & LOCAL POLICY**

##### **National Policy:**

The National Planning Policy Framework establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Of particular relevance are paragraphs 7, 14, 17, 34, 47, 49 and 55.

##### **Development Plan:**

The Development Plan for this area is the adopted Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review (2005), which allocates the site within Open Countryside under Policy PS8.

The relevant Saved Policies are: -

- PS8 Open Countryside
- NR4 Non-statutory sites
- GR1 New Development
- GR2 Design
- GR3 Residential Development
- GR5 Landscaping
- GR9 Accessibility, servicing and provision of parking
- GR14 Cycling Measures
- GR15 Pedestrian Measures
- GR17 Car parking
- GR18 Traffic Generation
- NR1 Trees and Woodland
- NR3 Habitats
- NR5 Habitats
- H2 Provision of New Housing Development
- H6 Residential Development in the Open countryside
- H13 Affordable Housing and low cost housing

The relevant saved Local Plan policies are consistent with the NPPF and should be given full weight.

### **Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version (CELP)**

The following are considered relevant material considerations as indications of the emerging strategy:

- Policy SD 1 Sustainable Development in Cheshire East
- Policy SD 2 Sustainable Development Principles
- Policy SE 1 Design
- Policy SE 3 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- Policy SE 5 Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland
- Policy SE 9 Energy Efficient Development
- Policy IN 1 Infrastructure
- Policy IN 2 Developer Contributions
- Policy PG 1 Overall Development Strategy
- Policy PG 2 Settlement Hierarchy
- Policy PG 5 Open Countryside
- Policy SC 4 Residential Mix

### **Supplementary Planning Documents:**

Interim Planning Statement: Affordable Housing (Feb 2011)

### **CONSULTATIONS:**

#### **Highways:**

No objection subject to condition

#### **Environmental Protection:**

No objection subject to conditions / informatives relating to hours of construction / piling, dust control, and air quality measures.

**Jodrell Bank:**

No objection subject to a condition requiring the incorporation of electromagnetic screening measures into the development.

**United Utilities:**

No objection provided that the site is drained on a separate system with foul water draining to the public sewer and submission of a surface water drainage scheme.

**Environment Agency:**

No comment

**VIEWS OF THE TWEMLOW PARISH COUNCIL**

Object on the grounds that:

*“The development is setting a precedent for a cul- de- sac development, the residential properties along the A535 in Twemlow only lend themselves to ribbon development. Although a restricted speed of 30 mph this is still an extremely dangerous and busy road. The parish has statistics to enforce this comment as does Cheshire East.*

*The rural parish is still a through route for large HGV's leaving the M6 at junction 18 travelling north and the extra traffic leaving this development, close to a bend, will again impact of the amount of accidents we already encounter.*

*The sustainability must be questioned, the local primary school is full and the secondary school has the added pressure of five new large housing developments in Holmes Chapel and recently one on our direct border (Saltersford Farm) which it seems opportunistic developers has a given a miscalculation to future school places. The indicators are already proving in accurate; there are now the school places are at the limit for the next year 7.*

*We have local doctor services that have been already stretched.*

*Yet a small development, this again is putting more unnecessary pressure on Holmes Chapel and Goostrey by opportunists trying to destroy a rural hamlet which already has its housing supply fulfilled. We must question the housing need first. The Parish Council was recently misled by although a different need, by the requirement of affordable housing in the area which was inaccurate”.*

**REPRESENTATIONS:**

Representations have been made by 5 properties objecting to this application on the following grounds:

- The site is in Open Countryside outside of the infill boundary line
- Proposal does not comply with local or national planning policies
- Site is not in a sustainable location
- Local bus services are poor
- No pavements in vicinity of site
- Section of road is an accident blackspot
- Traffic impact
- Noise impact from increased number of residents and traffic
- Impact on amenity during construction
- Infrastructure cannot cope with more house (drainage . Water pressure / electricity supply)
- Loss of privacy, sunlight / daylight and overlooking
- Increased noise, vibrations and pollution
- The design of the development is out of keeping
- Housing too dense for the area and does not follow building line
- Houses are too large
- Loss of trees, vegetation and impact on landscape
- Impact on protected species
- Impact on the operation of the Jodrell Bank Telescope
- Inaccuracies in submissions

#### **APPRAISAL:**

The key issues are:

Principle of Development

Design Considerations

Affordable Housing

Trees & Landscape

Highways

Residential Amenity

Ecology

Jodrell Bank

CIL – S106 Obligations

Planning Balance

#### **Principle of Development**

The site lies in the open countryside as designated in the Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review, where policies H6 and PS8 state that only development which is essential for the purposes of agriculture, forestry, outdoor recreation, essential works undertaken by public service authorities or statutory undertakers, or for other uses appropriate to a rural area will be permitted.

Sec.38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications and appeals must be determined “*in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise*”. The most important consideration in this case is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

One of the NPPF's 12 key principles is to '*encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed*'. This is reiterated in para 111 of the NPPF. This states that Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (Brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. As well as replacing the existing dwelling, this proposal seeks to redevelop the existing stables at the site. In determining a number of appeals, Inspectors have held that stables and the curtilage associated with them (where there are structures and / or associated fixed surface infrastructure) falls within the definition of previously developed land cited within Annex 2 of the NPPF.

Thus, whilst the proposal represents a departure from adopted local plan policy, Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that "*due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)*". Policies PS8 and H6 do not contain the exception as laid down in paragraph 111 and as such, in this case the NPPF takes precedence.

### **(i) Housing Land Supply**

Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that Council's identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements.

This calculation of Five year Housing supply has two components – the housing requirement – and then the supply of housing sites that will help meet it. In the absence of an adopted Local Plan the National Planning Practice Guidance indicates that information provided in the latest full assessment of housing needs should be considered as the benchmark for the housing requirement.

The current Housing Supply Position Statement prepared by the Council employs the figure of 1180 homes per year as the housing requirement, being the calculation of Objectively Assessed Housing Need used in the Cheshire East Local Plan Submission Draft.

The Local Plan Inspector has now published his interim views based on the first three weeks of Examination. He has concluded that the council's calculation of objectively assessed housing need is too low. He has also concluded that following six years of not meeting housing targets a 20% buffer should also be applied.

Given the Inspector's Interim view that the assessment of 1180 homes per year is too low, we no longer recommend that this figure be used in housing supply calculations. The Inspector has not provided any definitive steer as to the correct figure to employ, but has recommended that further work on housing need be carried out. The Council is currently considering its response to these interim views.

Any substantive increase of housing need above the figure of 1180 homes per year is likely to place the housing land supply calculation at or below five years. Consequently, at the present time, our advice is that the Council is unable to robustly demonstrate a five year supply of housing land. Accordingly recommendations on planning applications will now reflect this position.

## **(ii) Open Countryside Policy**

Countryside policies in existing local plans can be considered as consistent with NPPF and are not housing land supply policies in so far as their primary purpose is to protect the intrinsic value of the countryside in accordance with paragraph 17 of the NPPF– and thus are not of date, even if a 5 year supply is not in evidence. However, it is acknowledged that where the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply, they may be out of date in terms of their geographical extent, in that the effect of such policies is to restrict the supply of housing. They accordingly need to be played into the planning balance when decisions are made. Where appropriate, as at Sandbach Road North, conflict with countryside protection objectives may properly outweigh the benefit of boosting housing supply.

Therefore, the proposal remains contrary to Open Countryside policy regardless of the 5 year housing land supply position in evidence at any particular time and a judgement must be made as to the value of the particular area of countryside in question and whether, in the event that a 5 year supply cannot be demonstrated, it is an area where the settlement boundary should be “flexed” in order to accommodate additional housing growth.

Consequently, the main issues in the consideration of this application are the sustainability of the site and whether any adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits in terms of housing land supply.

## **(iii) Sustainability**

In addressing sustainability, Members should be mindful of the key principles of the National Planning Policy Framework. This highlights that the principal objective of the planning system is to contribute to sustainable development. As the Planning Minister states in his preamble:

*“Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves don’t mean worse lives for future generations. Development means growth. We must accommodate the new ways by which we will earn our living in a competitive world.”*

Paragraph 34 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that developments that generate travel movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised.

The site is located on the easterly edge of the rural settlement of Twemlow. Recent appeal decisions within the vicinity of the site have held that in locational terms, including the adjoining site ‘Hiverley Cottage’) it is not isolated. The Inspector stated that:

*“Although the site is in a rural area it is close to the IBL of Twemlow Green village. Both local and national planning policy encourages sustainable travel choices by modes other than the private car. There is access to a circular bus service, school and college buses and there is a restaurant close by. The site is about 2 km walking/cycling distance from Goostrey, where there is a primary school post office and surgery and is located on the A535, some 3 km from Holmes Chapel which also has a range of services. These larger settlements are defined as Local Service Centres in the emerging CELP and both have a railway station; the Goostrey Railway Station is about*

*1.2 km from the site. There are also a number of job opportunities locally in Goostrey and Holmes Chapel and at Jodrell Bank Observatory and Terra Nova School, which are respectively about 2 and 2.5 km away”.*

On this basis, the Inspector concluded that the ‘future occupiers of the adjoining development would be able to access local services and facilities either walking/cycling and despite poor pedestrian links, services and facilities would be within very short journeys by car’. The site subject of this application is next door and therefore in light of the conclusions drawn by the Inspector, it is considered that this site is also sustainably located.

Locational factors and the carbon footprint associated with car borne travel are an important aspect of sustainability. However, the Framework advises that there are three interdependent dimensions to sustainable development, these being economic, social and environmental. These include, meeting general and affordable housing need, reducing energy consumption through sustainable design, and assisting economic growth and development, which this proposal will help to do.

There is an economic benefit to be derived from the construction of the scheme. A housing development of this size would bring the usual economic benefit to the closest shops, services and amenities and would potentially provide local employment opportunities in construction and the wider economic benefits to the construction industry supply chain. There would be some economic and social benefit by virtue of new resident’s spending money in the area and using local services in the nearby service centres. Affordable housing is also a social benefit for which there is an identified need.

Having regard to the current housing land supply, the fact that this site is sustainably located, the economic growth and social benefits are considered, on balance, to outweigh the conflict with local plan policy. Consequently, the adverse impacts are not considered to be significant or demonstrable and as such the principle of the development is found to be acceptable.

## **Design Considerations**

The proposed development would comprise of an access road running north into the site which would then turn 90 –degrees to the east where the development would terminate on a cul-de-sac. Owing to the dense screen planting at the front of the site, and its layout with development extending north away from the frontage with Macclesfield Road, the development would not be overly prominent from this viewpoint. The units towards the rear of the site have been amended so they are smaller in size and scale to ease the transition with the countryside beyond. The impact on the visual appearance of the site and the area would therefore be minimised.

The units themselves would be varied in terms of their size, scale and architectural detail. This would introduce some variation amongst the house types and would aid visual interest. Subject to the use of good materials (secured by condition) the appearance of the scheme would be acceptable in this rural context. As such, the scheme is found to be acceptable in design terms.



## **Trees and Landscape**

The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) demonstrates that the internal area of the development could be accommodated with limited arboricultural impacts. The trees identified for removal are mainly ornamental. The trees to the east of the pond, which are protected by Tree Preservation Order (TPO) should not be directly impacted.

With respect to hedgerows, it is proposed to 'claw back' the road side hedge to accommodate the visibility splays identified in the transport note. The 'claw back' means translocation or dragging back. The success of hedge translocation cannot be guaranteed and there are trees present in the area which would restrict access. However, the agent has submitted an updated arboricultural impact assessment which confirms that in this case, the establishment of the translocated hedge would be effective. On this basis, it is not considered that a refusal could be sustained.

Housing development on this site would obviously change the character of the site itself; however, given the context and the proximity to the development making up the settlement of Twemlow, the proposal would not have any significant impacts on the character of the wider landscape or have any significant adverse visual impacts. As such, subject to protection measures and a detailed landscaping scheme, which can be secured by condition, there are no landscape or tree issues.

## **Highways**

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure (HSI - Highways) has examined the application and confirmed that the proposed access strategy is acceptable and that the junction design and geometry meets required standards. The proposed off-street parking provision is in accordance with CEC minimum parking standards for residential dwellings.

In terms of traffic generation, the commuter peak hour and daily traffic generation associated with the development proposals would not be expected to have a material impact on the operation of the adjacent or wider highway network. In light of this, the HSI is satisfied with the scheme having regard to matters of highways safety. As such, the scheme is deemed compliant with Local Plan Policy GR9.

## **Residential Amenity**

Policy GR6 (Amenity and Health) of the Local Plan advises that the proposal should not have a detrimental impact upon neighbouring amenity by way of loss of privacy, loss of light or visual intrusion.

The proposed layout would allow sufficient separation to be achieved between the proposed dwellings and the property comprising of 'Hiverley Cottage' to the west. The separation achieved would be 18 metres between the west facing elevation of the nearest unit and the east elevation of 'Hiverley Cottage' which faces the site. This would exceed the 5 metre separation between the existing property at 'Hiverley'. As such, the impact would be less than at present and as there are no primary windows within the east elevation of this neighbour, there would be no material harm by reason of loss of light or visual intrusion. Any overlooking

of the rear garden at 'Hiverley Cottage' would not be sufficient to sustain a refusal as there would be a minimum separation of 18 metres.

With regard to the proposed units within the site, the relationship between the proposed dwellings and spacing would be acceptable and would achieve a satisfactory standard of amenity for the future occupants. As such, the scheme is deemed to accord with policies GR6 and SPG2.

## **Ecology**

The application is supported by an updated Extended Phase 1 Habitat assessment. The Council's Nature Conservation Officer (NCO) has confirmed that the application site supports a number of habitats including grasslands, hedgerows, and trees/woodland belts. The grassland habitats on site are of limited nature conservation value and the majority of the existing hedgerows and the site pond and associated habitats would be retained as part of the proposed development.

With respect to other species, no evidence of Great Crested Newts was recorded during the submitted surveys and would not be reasonably likely to be present or affected by the proposed development. No evidence of roosting bats or barn owls was recorded within the existing buildings on site and none of the trees on site appear to have potential to support these species. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development would not harm species protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

## **Affordable Housing**

The Interim Planning Statement on Affordable Housing advises that the Council will require the *"provision of an appropriate element of the total dwelling provision to be for affordable housing on all unidentified windfall sites of 0.2 ha or 3 dwellings or more in all settlements in the rural areas with a population of less than 3,000 population"*. It goes on to state that *"the general minimum proportion for any site will normally be 30%"*.

Whilst, the recent Written Ministerial Statement by the Department for Local Government and Communities (DCLG) introduced a threshold beneath which affordable housing contributions should not be sought, this has now been the subject of challenge in the judgment in *R (on the application of West Berkshire District Council and Reading Borough Council) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* [2015]).

The IPS states that sites in rural settlements with a population below 3,000 will be required to provide 30% affordable housing if the site is for 3 or more units, or greater than 0.2 hectares in size. The IPS also states that the desired split between tenures is 65% social/affordable rent and 35% intermediate, this is based on the evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (SHMA) 2013.

The site falls within the Holmes Chapel Rural sub-area for the purposes of the SHMA update 2013. This identified a net requirement for 17 affordable homes per annum for the period 2013/14 – 2017/18. This equates to 10x 2bd, 7x 3bd general needs units and 2x 1bd and 4x 2bd older persons accommodation. The SHMA identified an over-supply of 4+bd units. In addition to this information taken from Cheshire Homechoice, shows there are currently 3

applicants who have selected the Twemlow lettings area as their first choice. These applicants require 1x 1bd, 1x2bd and 1x3bd units.

Consequently, there is an identified need. Following discussions with the applicant, the proposal will provide the required provision which will require the receipt of amended plans. Such amended plans will ensure that the affordable units are the size required to meet the identified need. This will be reported to Members by way of an update. Subject to this, the proposal accords with relevant policy.

### **Jodrell Bank**

In the absence of any objection from the University of Manchester, subject to appropriate conditions, it is not considered that a refusal on the grounds of the impact on Jodrell Bank could be sustained.

### **S106 contributions Levy (CIL) Regulations:**

Policy IN1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version, advises that the Local Planning Authority should work in a co-ordinated manner to secure funding and delivery of physical, social, community, environmental and any other infrastructure required to support development and regeneration.

In order to comply with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 it is now necessary for planning applications with legal agreements to consider the issue of whether the requirements within the S106 satisfy the following:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

The Council's Statagic Housing Officer, has advised that the proposed development will need to address a need for affordable housing by providing 3 units on site. Without such, the scheme would exacerbate the need for affordable housing. Thus, the affordable housing requirement is necessary to meet an identified need and accords with the Council's IPS, and is directly and reasonably related to the scale of development.

Subject to this, the scheme would be in compliance with the development plan and Policy IN1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version. The S106 recommendation is compliant with the CIL Regulations 2010.

### **Planning Balance & Conclusions**

The proposal is contrary to development plan policies PS8 and H6 (Open Countryside) and therefore the statutory presumption is against the proposal unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The most important material consideration in this case is the NPPF which states at paragraph 49 that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be

considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

The development plan is not “absent” or “silent”. The relevant policies are not out of date because they are not time expired and they are consistent with the “framework” and the emerging local plan. Policy PS8, whilst not principally a policy for the supply of housing, (its primary purpose is protection of intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside,) it is acknowledged has the effect of restricting the supply of housing. Consequently the application must be considered in the context of paragraph 14 of the Framework, which states:

*At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.....For decision taking means:*

- *approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:*
  - n any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; or*
  - n specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.”*

It is therefore necessary to consider whether the proposal constitutes “sustainable development” in order to establish whether it benefits from the presumption under paragraph 14. The cases of Davis and Dartford have established that that “*it would be contrary to the fundamental principles of the NPPF if the presumption in favour of development, in paragraph 14, applied equally to sustainable and non-sustainable development. To do so would make a nonsense of Government policy on sustainable development*”. In order to do this, the decision maker must reach an overall conclusion, having evaluated the three aspects of sustainable development described by the framework (economic, social and environmental) as to whether the positive attributes of the development outweighed the negative in order to reach an eventual judgment on the sustainability of the development proposal. However, the Dartford case makes clear that this should be done simultaneously with the consideration of whether “*any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole*” as required by paragraph 14 itself and not on a sequential basis or as a form of preliminary assessment.

In this case, the development would provide market and affordable housing to meet an acknowledged shortfall by developing a previously developed site and would therefore make efficient use of brownfield land. The proposal would also have some economic benefits in terms of jobs in construction, spending within the construction industry supply chain and spending by future residents in local shops.

Balanced against these benefits must be the negative effects of an incursion into Open Countryside. However, this incursion and adverse impact would be limited and it is not considered that this is sufficient to outweigh the benefits in terms of housing land supply in the overall planning balance.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable subject to an amendments to accommodate 3 affordable units, the imposition of appropriate conditions and the necessary Section 106 obligations.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVE subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement making provision for:**

**Affordable Housing comprising:**

- **3 units on site 2 for social rented and 1 for shared ownership**

In order to give proper effect to the Committee's intentions and without changing the substance of the decision, authority is delegated to the Planning and Enforcement Manager, in consultation with the Chair (or in his absence the Vice Chair) of Northern Planning Committee, to correct any technical slip or omission in the wording of the resolution, between approval of the minutes and issue of the decision notice.

Should this application be the subject of an appeal, authority be delegated to the Planning and Enforcement Manager in consultation with the Chairman of the Northern Planning Committee to enter into a planning agreement in accordance with the S106 Town and Country Planning Act to secure the Heads of Terms for a S106 Agreement.

Application for Full Planning

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve subejct to a Section 106 Agreement and the following conditions

1. 3 year time limit
2. Development in accordance with amended plans
3. Access to be constructed with visibility splays of 2.4m x 95m prior to first occupation.
4. Contaminated land Phase 1 to be submitted
5. Electric vehicle charging points to be included for each dwelling
6. Landscape scheme and to be submitted
7. Implementation of landscaping
8. Accordance with submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment
9. Accordance with tree protection scheme / measures
10. Implementation of recommendations in Phase I Habitat Survey
11. Survey for breeding birds and protection during breeding season
12. Incorporation of features into the scheme suitable for use by breeding birds

13. Levels to be submitted to and approved
14. Details of drainage to be submitted. Only foul drainage connected to foul sewer
15. Jodrell Bank Electromagnetic screening measures to be included
16. Materials to be submitted to and approved
17. Detailed scheme for dust mitigation during demolition and construction to be submitted
18. Precise details of all boundary treatments within the site to be agreed
19. Removal of permitted development rights classes A-E



© Crown copyright and database right 2018. Ordnance Survey 100048046.