



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 25 February 2020

Site visit made on 25 February 2020

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/W/19/3236430

Land at Hill View, Icomb, Gloucestershire GL54 1JB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Hadaway against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02796/FUL, dated 23 July 2018, was refused by the Council by notice dated 13 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is construction of new residence (NPPF paragraph 55).
-

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for construction of new residence at Land at Hill View, Icomb, Gloucestershire GL54 1JB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/02796/FUL, dated 23 July 2018, subject to conditions 1) to 17) on the attached schedule.

Preliminary Findings

2. There is no dispute that the site is in the countryside in policy terms, and that development would be contrary to Local Plan Policy DS4 which states that open market housing will not be permitted outside principal and non-principal settlements unless it is in accordance with other policies that expressly deal with residential development in such locations.
3. The scheme was promoted on the basis of meeting the provisions in paragraph 55 of the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework. This provided for an exception to the statement that planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of new isolated homes in the countryside, where the design was of exceptional quality or an innovative nature. That exception is now to be found in paragraph 79e) with altered wording.
4. The meaning of the word 'isolated' in that context was the subject of the 'Braintree' judgments¹ which the High Court Judge determined should be given its ordinary objective meaning of '*far away from other places, buildings or people; remote*'. The Appeal Court Judge stated that this 'simply connotes a dwelling that is physically separate or remote from a settlement' and observed that there is no definition in the Framework of a 'settlement' and no specified minimum number of dwellings or population. Whether a proposed new

¹ Braintree District Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government & Others [2017] EWHC 2743 (Admin) of 15 November 2017, and subsequently in the Court of Appeal judgment of 28 March 2018

dwelling is, or is not, 'isolated' in this sense will be a matter of fact and planning judgment for the decision-maker in the particular circumstances of a particular case.

5. The Council determined the case as being for an isolated new home and confirmed that view at the Hearing. Mr Leay for local residents claimed that the site and hence the dwelling is not isolated as determined by 'Braintree' and cited a recent Appeal Decision which determined that a site in North Norfolk was not isolated (Ref; APP/Y2620/W/19/3236740, dated 3 February 2020). Paragraph 8 of that Decision describes a site that has development on each of the 4 roads surrounding the area and which was described in representation over the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as being adjacent to other buildings in the village. The Inspector's planning judgment on the facts of the site and its situation was that the site should not be considered isolated.
6. There is no settlement boundary to Icomb, but the Conservation Area boundary is near but not touching the eastern edge of the site, while 350m from the site of the proposed house would be at or about the centre of the designated Area and the nearest corner of the site would be closer still. There is a dwelling downhill from the site and the main bulk of built form is in the lower lying area to the east. The proposal would preserve the conservation area and its setting.
7. Unlike the description of the situation at North Norfolk, there are no other buildings, much less dwellings, to the other sides of the site, and not for some distance either, and whilst the visual effect of the proposals will be tested in the main issue, the site has a limited close range zone of visual influence, broadening with distance but also lessening in effect as a result. There are limited places where the built form of the village and that of the dwelling would appear together.
8. Based on these facts, the planning judgment in this case is that the site and the dwelling should be considered isolated in terms of paragraph 79 and that the proposal should be tested against the exception provided for in sub-paragraph e).
9. It was explained at the Hearing that the reference in the Officer's Report to the existing use being that of a gypsy and traveller site concerned only a small area of the south-west corner, the remainder being shown as blue-edged land on that application. Policy H7 of the Local Plan safeguards such sites where there is a need, but the Council explained that whilst the updated Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment identified a need for 3 pitches, significantly more pitches have been allocated or granted permission as windfall sites, and hence there is no objection to the change of use.

Main Issue

10. This is whether the proposal reaches the standard of design sought in Framework paragraph 79e) for an isolated dwelling in the countryside, and this analysis will take account of the location within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the landscape character of the area.

Reasons

11. Local Plan Policy EN2 on the design of the built and natural environment, states that development will be permitted which accords with the Cotswold Design Code as set out at Appendix D, and that proposals should be of design quality

that respects the character and distinctive appearance of the locality. Policy EN4 concerns the wider natural and historic environment and states that development will be permitted where it does not have a significant detrimental impact on the natural and historic landscape (including the tranquillity of the countryside) of Cotswold District or neighbouring areas. Proposals will take account of landscape and historic landscape character, visual quality and local distinctiveness. They will be expected to enhance, restore and better manage the natural and historic landscape, and any significant landscape features and elements, including key views, the setting of settlements, settlement patterns and heritage assets. The Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is the subject of Policy EN5 and conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape, its character and special qualities will be given great weight.

12. Paragraph 170 of the Framework requires decisions to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, among other measures, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and at paragraph 172 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
13. The Council cited 2 Reasons for Refusal, the first being that the proposal was considered not to meet the requirements of paragraph 79e) of the Framework to justify an isolated new dwelling in the open countryside. The second was that by virtue of the design and materials it would not be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, with particular reference to the amount of glazing and the limited use of local stone. The Statement of Common Ground agreed that aspects of the glazing concerns had been overcome, and it is the case that revised drawings show a greater use of Cotswold stone. Having regard to the 'Wheatcroft principles', the revised drawings listed in paragraph 9 of the Statement of Common Ground are those on which this Decision is based. This single main issue will however consider all aspects of the design and its relationship with the surroundings.
14. Before embarking on the analysis, it is noted that the scheme was subject to appraisal by the South West Design Review Panel on 3 occasions, in July 2017, February 2018 and lastly in November 2018. The Panel commended the constructive and thoughtful way in which the appellant had responded to their comments and suggestions at each stage. The third assessment concluded that the scheme had by that stage reached the requirements of paragraph 79 of the Framework. It is noted also that the Chair of that Panel attended the Hearing in a personal capacity as an architect, in support of the scheme. Paragraph 129 of the Framework in the section on achieving well-designed places states that in assessing applications, regard should be had to any recommendations made by Design Review Panels.
15. One further observation concerns the credentials of the design team with successful projects and a clear passion for design, and for this project in particular, which came over strongly at the 'round-table' discussion around the model. Those credentials and the attention to detail shown to-date gives comfort that were permission to be granted, the promised quality of the scheme would be delivered on-site.
16. Paragraph 79e) states that one of the circumstances for the development of an isolated home in the countryside is that the design is of exceptional quality, in

that it is truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. These elements will be considered separately.

Being truly outstanding.....reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas

17. The proposal is more than just a building and the role of the landscape architect has been central to the location of the house and other elements within the site and the design of the immediate surroundings to the building. The site slopes west down to east and the building responds to that terrain, and to the fact of the existing vehicular entrance being at the higher level. The approach drive would be long and narrow, terminating visually at a tree, containing views other than down an avenue part-way along towards the pond.
18. More utilitarian functions would be clustered at the road entrance, so that when the approach opens out into a courtyard parking area exposing the long, low natural stone entrance façade, the feeling would be on an understatement, with no real idea of the site's wider context, the courtyard being enclosed by the garage block, the front house wall and a wall shielding a private stepped garden. The limited openings at the entrance position would allow only filtered views when close-to.
19. The full impact of the location and view would emerge on entering the house and the Gallery with the slot down to the lower level and matching rooflight above, would give onto a colonnade facing east with a planted roof terrace accessible from the study. This space with the solid wall behind would be dramatic and exciting and would blur the boundary between inside and out.
20. Similar care has gone into the design of the other internal spaces, and their relationship with the immediate surroundings and the longer views. The south-end and its lower level would be cellular and small scale, with limited openings, while the north-end at the projecting lower level would be more open and free-flowing through Kitchen, Dining area and Drawing Room, with extensive glazing. Whilst planning may well be more concerned with the external appearance and the relationship with the surroundings, the judgement of exceptional quality, and the highest standards in architecture must go beyond that consideration and it is the case here that the internal spaces and how they have been designed to address the external areas immediately outside the various rooms and uses would be of the highest standard.
21. The same rigorous approach to the client's brief and the nature of the site is evident in the external massing of the various parts and the relationship with the terrain is particularly evident. Although there has been criticism of the length across the site, and the building is long for its depth, the visual effect would be of an articulation of planes, some projecting and some recessed, with the colonnade given further modulation, and the orientation means that for much of the day there would be a play of shadows enlivening the elevation and breaking-up the appearance of a single length; drawing 201D gives a clear indication of that attractive effect.
22. The conclusion is that the design, including the landscaped setting and the disposition of other minor buildings, would be truly outstanding, and to the

extent that the requirement to 'reflect' the highest standards in architecture implies something not wholly radical, the proposal would be well-mannered, drawing on tried and tested themes from contemporary residential buildings.

23. With regard to helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas, the appellant has submitted a Unilateral Undertaking that commits to a strategy for reasonable access for students and others, along with a web-site to publicise the design and track the construction process. A balance would need to be struck due to the nature of the access roads and the amount of parking available, and the web-site is of particular note in allowing a more virtual experience.
24. However, there can be no substitute for the actual experience of a building, and the strategy would meet the requirement to help raise standards of design generally and in rural areas in particular. The proposal demonstrates that good contemporary design can be appropriate in this rural area and that vernacular styles or pastiche are not inevitable, provided the quality of the design and design process is of the highest order.

As an alternative, being innovative

25. The Design Review Panel describe this aspect as being a requirement, and it is not, although they found the approach to habitat creation among other things to be innovative, and there are such elements proposed. It would be perverse to design a new house of this quality, and budget, without its thermal and technical performance being excellent. There are however limited truly innovative features and achieving the goal of innovation should not be at the expense of the architectural design goal which has been significantly surpassed. There is nothing wrong with this approach and this is allowed for in the alternative within paragraph 79e).

Significantly enhancing its immediate setting

26. The south-west corner of the site had been in use as traveller pitch and the remainder was the blue edged land. Representation for local residents tell of difficulties encountered from the use, but apparently more particularly the occupant, over the care of animals and the land. Whatever the causes, the land to the south is somewhat degraded with suburban features and planting of the laurel hedging. The 'meadow' to the north is natural in character and appearance but does not have the appearance of either farmed land or grazing.
27. The house has been designed to sit within the topography and would not impose itself on it, being subsumed within the backdrop of hedging in most of the identified views. The scheme is more than just the house, and the remediation of the land and the landscaping scheme would introduce appropriate planting and maintenance measures so that as a holistic proposal, the immediate setting would be enhanced. It is the case that much of the remediation and landscaping enhancements could be achieved by a willing landowner irrespective of the house being developed, but in this case they are more than just mitigation for the effects of the house, and the quality of the house design deserves to be seen.

Being sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

28. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment shows that 3 broad locations for the house within the site were considered, number 1 being to the road, south-

- end of the site, and this was discounted as not taking advantage of the views although it was acknowledged to have existing buildings and hardstanding, and hence a low visual impact. Number 3 was to the far north end on the highest ground and was considered to have a high visual impact for that reason.
29. The chosen site equates only in part to area 2, as the house extends outside the ringed area, towards the less favoured area 3. The ringed area was the preferred location due to being sheltered, within a gentle fold and for being at the heart of the site.
30. The analysis of these 3 broad locations does not negate the decision to deviate northwards from the 'preferred location', and the design of the house has responded appropriately to the topography. That location has allowed a more thoroughgoing enhancement of the southern area, and still retains sufficient of the natural 'meadow' to the north. One of the key considerations in this respect is the delineation of the domestic curtilage, and revised drawing S108E indicates a tightly drawn green line around the terraces and a little to the north of the main block, with separate areas at the folly and the secret garden. That would avoid the risk of domestic paraphernalia extending over the site, and that degree of control is essential, notwithstanding the appellant's stated intentions, as the dwelling is likely to be in place for a long time, and there is, quite rightly, no intention to limit occupation to named persons.
31. The site falls within Character Area 15: Farmed Slopes as identified in the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Landscape Strategy and Guidelines. The site displays many of the Key Features for the character area, although it is noted that one of those is numerous historic parklands sited to take advantage of wide panoramic views over productive farmland, so the area is not just farmland. The Strategy and Guidelines identify isolated development such as new single dwellings as a local force for change, having various potential landscape implications. The strategy is stated as avoiding development that will intrude negatively and which cannot be successfully mitigated; opposing new housing unless what is now paragraph 79 applies and the proposal conserves and enhances the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It was agreed at the hearing that there is no general preclusion of such dwellings, including 79e) proposals, from being built in the Area, and that would apply to the Farmed Slopes character area; the submitted document does not seek only dwellings with an essential need.
32. Looking in more detail at the Farmed Slopes implication and strategy, whilst the development of a building on an undeveloped site would be change, the quality of the design does not result in a visual intrusion or suburban form, and the domestication of the landscape would be avoided by the restriction on curtilage. The size of the site and the landscape proposals do avoid the appearance of a 'mini parkland' and larger parklands are a stated feature. The sense of openness has been maintained, the impact of development on views to and from the Farmed Slopes has been carefully considered, and the landscaping scheme does utilise appropriately sized native trees.
33. An important consideration is the effect of the proposal with regard to dark-skies and the Farmed Slopes forming a dark backdrop to the vale, together with concerns over 'glint' from the glazed areas in daylight. Two Reports are to hand, both from ARUP, '*Light Obtrusion*' and '*Sunlight Reflection*'. In the former, various control strategies are promoted to reach the conclusion that,

based on the assessment of the analysis carried out against policy, as well as 'GN01: Guidance Note for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011', the harm identified in the second Reason for Refusal is not considered to occur. The Council did not provide an evidence-based objection while the Report did provide an evidential basis to counter the Reason for Refusal.

34. With regard to reflection or 'glint' the Report concluded that having regard to the timing, duration and extent of any potential reflections from the development, coupled with mitigating factors such as the low-rise architecture, tree planting and probable annual cloud cover, the development would have no detrimental visual impact in terms of glint and glare of sunlight during the day.
35. The practice of ARUP has an acknowledged expertise and the Reports appear thorough. In the absence of contradictory evidence, they carry great weight leading to the conclusion that there would be no unwarranted adverse effects from artificial lighting or the degree of glazing.
36. The building would be visible as it does not seek to hide away, and the paragraph 79e) exception, as with its antecedents back to Planning Policy Guidance Note 7 '*Sustainable development in Rural Areas*', does not require such an approach. Built form is a feature of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and the addition of natural oolitic limestone has placed the building firmly within that setting. The quality of the architecture and landscaping combined would be a positive addition to the site and would enhance the stock of built form of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, while conserving the natural features of the designated area. To conclude on this section, the proposal is sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area, and as a result of the foregoing analysis, the overall conclusion is that the proposal satisfies the requirements of paragraph 79e).
37. Turning to the Development Plan, the proposal accords with the Appendix D Design Guide in making strong local references, respecting elements of the Cotswolds vernacular as set out at D.29, the site is an appropriate one to explore a less conventional design approach, which is encouraged at D.30, and the massing is broken by the colonnade and stepping-down with a simplicity of design as sought in D.31 and D.32. the use of glazing as referred to in D.33 has been shown to be acceptable on the wider landscape, while the performance of the building accords with D.33 and D.34. As a result, the proposal satisfies the requirements of Policy EN2 in the design of the built and the natural environment.
38. The development would not have significant detrimental effects on the natural or historic landscape such that Policy EN4 is accorded with, and the requirements of Policy EN5 on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty would be met. The fact of being contrary to Policy DS4 through being outside principal and non-principal settlements is overcome by the material consideration of satisfying the exception in paragraph 79e) of the Framework.
39. To conclude, the proposal of new house and landscaping together reach the standard sought in order to allow an isolated home in the countryside and accords with relevant Development Plan policies, and hence, planning permission should be granted.

Conditions and Undertaking

40. The Council suggested conditions and these were discussed and amended at the Hearing. Subsequent to that, the wording of the proposed pre-commencement conditions was sent to the appellant for written approval, and this was forthcoming. This is required under Section 100ZA(5) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and The Town and Country Planning (Pre-commencement Conditions) Regulations 2018.
41. In detail, conditions are necessary to ensure the proposed quality of the design is delivered with respect to materials, windows, doors, ecology and biodiversity measures, landscaping and its monitoring, access and parking. Archaeological work is to be carried out prior to any development to ensure that items are not disturbed, and the drainage design is to be submitted and approved prior to commencement. The suggested external lighting condition is altered to make clear that no lighting is to be provided other than that which has been first submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. In the circumstances of the site and design, it is reasonable to remove permitted development rights for extensions, new window and door openings as well as outbuildings. A condition listing the 'as proposed' drawings is required for the avoidance of doubt.
42. The terms of the Unilateral Undertaking with regard to the promulgation of information on the design and access to the site have been set out in the Reasoning to this Decision, the other obligation concerns the Landscape Management Plan which would ensure that the considerable biodiversity net gains would be maintained for a minimum of 30 years.
43. In conclusion, the conditions would satisfy the tests in paragraph 55 of the Framework, of being necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects, as also set out in the web-based Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 21a-003-20190723). The undertaking is essential to the grant of permission; being 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 as referred to in paragraph 56 of the Framework. The Undertaking also satisfies the legal test in Regulations 122 and 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, and full weight it attached to the provisions in this Decision.

Conclusions

44. The particular circumstances of the site lead to the conclusion that the proposed new dwelling would, along with the attendant landscaping secured by conditions, be of the quality sought as an exception under paragraph 79e) to the general policy of avoiding isolated homes in the countryside. Whilst the site is within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, no harm would be caused to the designated area's character and appearance, and its scenic beauty would be conserved and enhanced. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be allowed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

A Moody	Senior Case Officer
	Cotswold District Council
T Rosser-Smith	Landscape Officer
	Cotswold District Council
J Ayton	Conservation Consultant
	for Cotswold District Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

S Whale	of Counsel
J Ellis	Rural Solutions
C Lyon	Lyon+Co Architects
J Stroud	Lyon+Co Architects
K Dougall	Seed Landscape Design
J Marshall	Seed Landscape Design
J Bidgood	Architect
	Chair of South West Design Review Panel for
	the scheme but appearing in personal
	capacity
Cllr J Beale	District Councillor
P and L Hadaway	Appellants

INTERESTED PERSONS:

M Leay	Martin Leay Associates
	Appearing for objectors listed in DOC 6

DOCUMENTS

Document	1	Statement of Common Ground signed by appellant and Council
Document	2	Plan of Traveller site submitted by Council
Document	3	Hard Copy of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment July 2019 Revision B submitted by appellant
Document	4	Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Landscape Strategy and Guidelines: 15 Farmed Slopes submitted by M Leay
Document	5	Unilateral Undertaking dated 25 February 2020 submitted by appellant
Document	6	List of people represented by Martin Leay Associates
Document	7	Appellant's agreement to wording of pre-commencement conditions
Document	8	Revised drawing S108E showing extent of proposed curtilage submitted by appellant.

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1637/S100C; 1637/S101C; 1637/S102C; 1637/S103C; 1637/S104D; 1637/S105D; 1637/S106C; 1637/S107C; 1637/S108E; 1637/S109C; 1637/S110C; 1637/S200D; 1637/S201D; 1637/S202C; 1637/S203D; 1637/S204D; 1637/S205D; 1637/S206C; 1637/S207C; 1637/S208D; 1637/S209D; 1637/S210D; 1637/S211D; 1637/S212C and 1637/S213D.
- 3) No development shall take place until samples of the proposed walling and roofing materials shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and only the approved materials shall be used.
- 4) Prior to the construction of any external wall of the development hereby approved, a sample panel of walling of at least one metre square in size showing the proposed stone colour, coursing, bonding, treatment of corners, method of pointing and mix and colour of mortar shall be erected on the site and subsequently approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the walls shall be constructed only in the same way as the approved panel. The panel shall be retained on site until the completion of the development.
- 5) No development shall take place until details of the windows and external doors have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be accompanied by drawings to a minimum scale of 1:5 with full size moulding cross section profiles, elevations and sections. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.
- 6) No development shall take place until a full surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the size, position and construction of the drainage scheme. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved details and shall be fully operational prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and be retained as such thereafter.
- 7) No development shall take place within the application site until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 8) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations in the following reports all prepared by Ecology By Design (with amendments to be agreed as necessary):
 - Section 6 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated November 2016
 - Section 6 of the Bat Survey dated September 2017
 - Section 6 of the Reptile Survey dated September 2017; and the
 - Ecological Design, Creation and Management report dated April 2018

- 9) No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works and vegetation clearance) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan – Biodiversity (CEMP-B) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP-B shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:
 - i Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities;
 - ii. Identification of 'biodiversity protection zones';
 - iii. Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements);
 - iv. The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features (e.g. daylight working hours only starting one hour after sunrise and ceasing one hour before sunset);
 - v. The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works;
 - vi. Responsible persons and lines of communication;
 - vii. The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person(s);
 - viii. Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs, including advanced installation and maintenance during the construction period; and
 - ix. Ongoing monitoring, including compliance checks by a competent person(s) during construction and immediately post-completion of construction works.
- 10) No development shall take place until a comprehensive landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include full details of all biodiversity enhancements, including the green/brown roof (and the use of subsoil rather than topsoil), living walls (if possible), wildlife pond profile drawings and a 5-year aftercare maintenance schedule. The scheme must show details of all planting areas, tree and plant species, numbers and planting sizes. The proposed means of enclosure and screening should also be included, together with details of any mounding, walls and fences and hard surface materials to be used throughout the proposed development.
- 11) The landscaping scheme shall be carried out by the end of the planting season immediately following the completion of the development or the site being brought into use, whichever is the sooner, or in accordance with a programme to be submitted
- 12) Before the erection of any external walls, details of the provision of bat roosting features (including at least two Habitat boxes as shown in Appendix 6 of the Bat Survey report dated September 2017 prepared by Ecology By Design) and nesting opportunities for birds (specifically, House Martin, House Sparrow, Starling and Swift) into the dwelling, stable/garage building, folly/summerhouse and Ecology Wall shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include a drawing showing the locations and types of features and a timetable for their provision. The development shall be carried in accordance with the approved details and the approved features shall be retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

- 13) No external lighting shall be installed or used on the site other than that which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details to be submitted shall show how and where external lighting will be installed (including the type of lighting), so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent bat species using their territory, potential roosts (i.e. new bat boxes) and that light spillage into wildlife corridors such as the field boundary hedgerows and trees will be minimised as much as possible. All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the details, and these shall be retained thereafter.
- 14) A Landscape and Ecology Management and Monitoring Plan (LEMMP) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before occupation of the development. The content of the LEMMP shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following information:
- i. Description and evaluation of features to be managed; including location(s) shown on a site map;
 - ii. Landscape and ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;
 - iii. Aims and objectives of management;
 - iv. Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
 - v. Prescriptions for management actions;
 - vi. Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a 5-10 year period)
 - vii. Details of the body/organisation responsible for implementation of the plan;
 - viii. Monitoring Strategy for a period of 15 years (at least first 5 years on an annual basis), including the successful establishment of all habitats and the colonisation of the site by target species (specifically, invertebrates, bats, birds, reptiles and amphibians if possible);
 - ix. Details of any contingencies and/or remedial actions (where the results from monitoring show that the conservation aims and objectives of the LEMMP are not being met) and how these would be identified, agreed and implemented;
 - x. Timeframe for reviewing the plan; and
 - xi. Details of how the aims and objectives of the LEMP will be communicated to the occupiers of the development.
- The LEMMP shall be implemented in full in accordance with the approved details.
- 15) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, or any other statutory instrument amending or replacing it, no extensions, new window/door openings, or outbuildings shall be erected, constructed or sited in the application site, other than those permitted by this Decision.
- 16) Before the occupation of the development, the access facilities necessary to serve the site shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the

submitted details with any gates hung so as to open inwards and the area within 5m of the carriageway edge surfaced in bituminous macadam or other non-migratory material and thereafter be similarly maintained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- 17) The development shall not be occupied or brought into use until the vehicle parking and manoeuvring facilities have been completed in all respects in accordance with the approved details and they shall be similarly maintained thereafter for that purpose.