



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2026

by **G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 August 2026

Appeal Ref: 6007612

47 Parkside Road, Reading RG30 2BT

- 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 Mark Barratt of Gables Homes Limited against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/25/1124.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 2no two-bedroom semi-detached dwellings comprising two storeys, together with on-site car parking, secure cycle parking, refuse storage and landscaping. Vehicular and pedestrian access via Wingrove Road, following the demolition of all structures on the Site.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of 2no two-bedroom semi-detached dwellings comprising two storeys, together with on-site car parking, secure cycle parking, refuse storage and landscaping. Vehicular and pedestrian access via Wingrove Road, following the demolition of all structures on the Site at 47 Parkside Road, Reading RG30 2BT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/25/1124, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary and Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has submitted amended details demonstrating how four off-street parking spaces could be provided, equating to two spaces per dwelling. The revised arrangement also incorporates pedestrian visibility splays measuring 1.5 metres by 1.5 metres at the points where vehicles would emerge from the parking area.
3. I am satisfied that the amended parking and visibility arrangements do not fundamentally alter the proposal. They represent a modest revision and would not prejudice any interested party who has had the opportunity to comment on the plans as part of the appeal process.

Main Issues

4. The main issues relevant to the appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the proposed development with regard to the provision of outdoor amenity space

- The effect of the proposal on trees
- The effect of the proposal on highway safety
- The effect of the proposal on biodiversity; and
- Whether the submitted legal agreement would secure affordable housing contributions.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site occupies part of the rear garden of 47 Parkside Road (No. 47), a large corner plot located at the junction with Wingrove Road. Whilst Parkside Road exhibits a more spacious pattern of detached and semi-detached development, Wingrove Road displays a distinct character formed by the well-established "white houses" development comprising terraces, short blocks of dwellings, offset building groups and variations in orientation but are similar in character and appearance. Due to the parallel, offset and perpendicular building groups there is not necessarily a singular building line with evidence of infill and backland-style developments nearby. The dwellings do typically have open landscaped frontages with limited boundary treatment between houses and there are trees present across the wider area. These features contribute positively towards the character and appearance of the area.
6. The submitted analysis shows a pattern of staggered and offset development, including short terraces positioned in differing alignments and orientations in the nearby area. Consequently, the siting of the two dwellings forward of the neighbouring dwellings would not necessarily appear out of character, nor would it undermine a defining feature of the area.
7. Whilst the Council relies upon the spacious character of Parkside Road, the appeal site is read principally in the context of Wingrove Road and the adjacent white houses development. The proposed dwellings would adopt a scale, form and architectural appearance closely related to the surrounding residential development. The scheme would replace the garden that is enclosed behind a utilitarian boundary wall with a pair of dwellings that would read as part of the established residential environment, while retaining the openness in front of the dwellings, similar to that found at neighbouring properties. In this regard, the proposal would not appear as an alien or discordant form of development. Rather, it would reinforce the residential character already present along Wingrove Road.
8. Whilst it is undeniable that development of part of the garden would alter the existing appearance of the site, having regard to the dimensions of the site, the separation from neighbouring development, the retention of garden areas and the provision of landscaping, I find that it would not significantly enclose the spaciousness of the area to the detriment of its character. Having regard to the fencing that would bound the garden boundaries, particular attention has been given to the sections that would face the road. The proposed fencing would be set some distance back from the road. When viewed in the context of the adjacent two-storey houses, the 2-metre-high fencing would not harmfully enclose or detract from the openness of the site's frontage. It would also be appropriate within the wider street scene, where garden walls of a similar height contribute to the

- character of the area. This includes the existing wall that already forms part of the boundary of the appeal site.
9. The arboricultural evidence submitted by the appellant demonstrates that the layout has been designed around the retention of the principal trees on the site. It identifies only a limited number of trees for removal with these to be replaced alongside additional planting which would result in a net increase in tree planting across the site. This would contribute to and retain the positive contributions the trees around the site contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
 10. The scheme would provide two modestly sized dwellings on a site capable of accommodating built development whilst retaining functional private amenity areas, parking provision and landscape features. The size of the proposed gardens would be similar in size to a number of nearby residential properties.
 11. Furthermore, the proposal would not result in unacceptable pressure upon neighbouring occupiers through overbearing impacts, loss of light or unacceptable overlooking taking into account the distances between the proposed dwellings and nearby houses as well as the scale and orientation of the development.
 12. I also note the presence within the wider area of examples of residential intensification and garden redevelopment, including Victoria Mews and 57A Parkside Road. Whilst each proposal must be considered on its own merits, these developments demonstrate that the locality has successfully accommodated additional housing within existing plots without harming the character of the area.
 13. The proposal would make effective use of land in a sustainable urban location. Whilst there would inevitably be a reduction in the size of the host property's garden, No. 47 would retain a substantial rear garden commensurate with its size and character. The resulting plot sizes would remain functional and appropriate.
 14. Drawing these matters together, I find that the proposal represents a logical and sympathetic form of residential infill development. It would respond appropriately to the mixed grain of development in the locality, would not appear cramped or contrived, and would provide a coherent extension to the established residential pattern surrounding the site. The scheme would preserve the essential character of the area whilst making efficient use of available land for housing.
 15. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not constitute overdevelopment and would not result in unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the area. The development therefore would comply with Policies CC7 and H11 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (LP) which seek, amongst other matters, to ensure development within the curtilage of private residential gardens makes a positive contribution to the character of the area in terms of the layout which integrates with the surrounding area with regard to built up coverage of each plot, building line, rhythm of plot frontages, parking area and existing pattern of openness and boundary treatments on the site frontage.

Private Amenity Space

16. Policy H10 of the LP seeks to ensure the provision of functional outdoor space and that such areas respect the size and character of similar spaces in the vicinity. The evidence demonstrates that Plot 1 would be served by approximately 85 square metres (sqm) of private garden space and Plot 2 by approximately 123sqm. The

retained dwelling at No. 47 would continue to benefit from a garden of approximately 190sqm.

17. I note the appellant's analysis of the surrounding "white houses" development, where many garden areas are significantly smaller, generally ranging between 60sqm and 72sqm, with further reductions occurring where garages and extensions have subsequently been erected. The Council has not disputed these figures and there I find no reason to do so either. In that context, the size of the proposed gardens would not appear out of keeping with the character of outdoor spaces found within the immediate area. Indeed, they would compare favourably with a number of nearby residential properties. Even if the Council's historic floor area-to-garden area standard is applied as a benchmark, Plot 2 exceeds it and Plot 1 closely accords with that guidance. In all instances the garden retained for No. 47 would significantly exceed the standards and would be substantially larger than most gardens nearby.
18. The Council refers to concerns regarding the quality and functionality of the proposed gardens. However, little substantive evidence has been advanced to demonstrate that the spaces would be incapable of accommodating normal domestic activities. The proposed gardens would be 'L' shaped and the total width of them would be comparable to nearby properties and even the narrower parts of the gardens would be wide enough to supplement the rear parts of the gardens. Overall, the gardens would provide space for sitting-out, children's play, planting and general recreational use. Furthermore, as discussed above, 2-metre-tall boundary fencing would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and thus would provide screening around the gardens and contribute to providing private outdoor space for the occupiers of the dwellings. They would therefore perform their intended function as private residential amenity areas. Whilst No. 47 is a notably larger dwelling than those proposed the retained garden would be a substantially sized rectangular shaped garden with a significant amount of space for typical residential activities associated with a dwelling of this size.
19. I also note that the Council did not identify any significant overbearing or overshadowing effects arising from the built form itself. Whilst there are concerns regarding the presence of trees and areas of shade, a degree of seasonal shading is a common feature of suburban residential environments and does not, in itself, render gardens unusable or unattractive. The existence of mature vegetation may equally contribute positively to residential amenity through visual interest, biodiversity and relief from summer temperatures. Considering the size of the gardens and the size and type of trees within them, they would not render the gardens unsuitable for regular residential use or cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the proposed dwellings.
20. Taking all matters together, I find that the proposal would provide functional and suitably sized private amenity space for the occupiers whilst retaining an acceptable level of amenity for No. 47 Parkside Road. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would comply with Policies H10 and CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan. These expect developments, amongst other matters, to ensure the provision of functional outdoor space and that such areas respect the size and character of similar spaces in the vicinity

Trees and Landscaping

21. The appeal site contains a number of domestic garden trees. Importantly, none are protected by Tree Preservation Orders, none are identified as ancient or veteran specimens, and the site does not form part of a woodland or other strategically important tree resource. The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment describes the majority of the trees as low-quality ornamental and fruit trees providing a limited degree of visual amenity within the wider townscape.
22. As identified earlier, there would be a net increase in tree planting across the site. I acknowledge the Council's concern that future occupiers may seek to prune or remove retained trees. Whilst the retained trees would inevitably cast shade across parts of the gardens at certain times of year, the evidence does not demonstrate that the resulting amenity spaces would become unusable or incapable of supporting normal domestic activities. The gardens would retain open and functional areas beyond the canopies of the retained trees and would remain capable of accommodating sitting-out areas, planting and general recreation.
23. The evidence before me does not demonstrate that the relationship between the proposed dwellings, gardens and retained trees would be so poor as to create inevitable and unacceptable management pressures. On the contrary, the Arboricultural Impact Assessment concludes that only limited and routine maintenance would be required to maintain a sustainable relationship between the development and the retained vegetation.
24. Whilst future occupiers may seek routine maintenance of retained trees, I have not been presented with convincing evidence that the relationship between the proposed dwellings and retained vegetation would create inevitable pressure for excessive pruning or removal.
25. Furthermore, the proposal would not result in a substantial reduction in the verdant character of the site. The replacement planting strategy would introduce additional trees, including some positioned where they would be more readily visible from the public realm than the existing trees currently screened behind the boundary wall. As a result, the landscaping strategy has the potential to make a positive contribution to the street scene over time.
26. I recognise that Policy EN14 is not confined to protected trees. Nevertheless, having regard to the arboricultural evidence before me, the proposed removals are limited in number and quality and are offset by replacement planting that would maintain and potentially enhance canopy cover over time.
27. In these circumstances, I find that the proposal would not lead to unnecessary pruning or loss of trees and would secure additional tree planting on site and thus the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to trees or conflict with the objectives of Policy EN14. This expects new developments, amongst other matters, to make provision for tree retention and planting within the application site, particularly on the street frontage.

Highway Safety

28. The Council has questioned whether the visibility splays could be physically achieved having regard to existing boundary treatments and potential third-party interests. However, whilst there are boundary walls either side of the proposed

driveways it has not been substantively evidenced that the visibility splays shown on the amended plans are incapable of delivery. Nor has it been demonstrated that any legal, ownership or physical constraints would prevent compliance with a suitably worded condition requiring the provision of visibility splays prior to occupation.

29. In the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary, I am satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect of the required works being undertaken. The details can appropriately be secured through condition and assessed by the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation as was suggested by the Council's Highways Authority. Consequently, I am not persuaded that the uncertainty identified by the Council provides a sufficient basis for withholding planning permission in this case.
30. The appeal site is served from Wingrove Road, a small residential cul-de-sac serving a limited number of dwellings and there is no evidence before me suggesting that vehicle speeds are unusually high or that traffic volumes are significant. The nature of the road environment is such that vehicle movements are likely to occur at low speeds and be limited in number.
31. I also attach weight to the fact that there is no pedestrian footway on the northern side of Wingrove Road next to the site. The principal pedestrian desire line is along the footway on the opposite side of the carriageway. Consequently, the opportunity for conflict between emerging vehicles and pedestrians would be very limited.
32. The Framework establishes a high bar for refusing development on highway grounds, namely that impacts on highway safety should be unacceptable or that residual cumulative impacts on the road network should be severe. Based on the scale of development proposed, the characteristics of the surrounding road network and the mitigation measures shown on the amended plan, I am not persuaded that either threshold would be reached in this case.
33. I therefore find that adequate parking provision can be achieved and that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to highway safety. Consequently, the scheme accords with Policies TR1 and TR3 of the LP, insofar as these expect developments to not be detrimental to the safety of users of the transport network, including pedestrians and cyclists.

Biodiversity

34. The appellant submitted a Biodiversity Impact Calculation, Statutory Biodiversity Metric and Arboricultural Impact Assessment in support of the application. These documents provide a detailed assessment of the ecological characteristics of the site. The Council disputes the findings of those assessments, principally on the basis that vegetation had allegedly been cleared prior to the submission of the application and that the baseline habitat value should therefore be higher than that recorded within the submitted metric. However, beyond this assertion, the Council has not provided substantive evidence quantifying the alleged extent of clearance or demonstrating how the appellant's baseline calculations are fundamentally flawed.
35. I note the appellant's explanation that the site forms part of a long-established domestic garden subject to routine maintenance activities, including mowing, pruning and general tidying. Such activities are entirely consistent with the normal residential use of land and do not, in themselves, demonstrate that the site was

intentionally degraded in anticipation of development. Furthermore, the submitted aerial photography and arboricultural evidence indicate that the overall structure of the garden, including its tree cover and landscape framework, has remained substantially unchanged over time. I therefore have insufficient evidence before me to conclude that the baseline used within the appellant's assessment is inaccurate.

36. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out that the statutory BNG requirement has been principally designed as a post-permission matter. Compliance involves the discharge of the Biodiversity Gain Condition (BGC) following the grant of planning permission to ensure the objective of at least 10% net gain will be met by a development proposal. The determination of the Biodiversity Net Gain Plan (BGP) under this condition is the mechanism to confirm whether the development would meet the biodiversity gain objective, and the development may not commence until the BGP is approved. Given this, the PPG is clear that it is generally inappropriate for decision makers to refuse a proposal on the grounds that the biodiversity net gain objective will not be met.
37. Even if the Council's lower post-development biodiversity value were accepted, the evidence before me does not demonstrate that the proposal would be incapable of complying with the statutory biodiversity gain framework. Any relevant permission would be subject to the discharge of the statutory BGC which would require the achievement of a minimum 10% BNG.
38. Policy EN12 seeks the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and, where necessary, the provision of compensation. Whilst the policy expresses a preference for on-site measures where practicable, it does not preclude reliance upon off-site measures where required. In this case I am satisfied that there is a clear and deliverable mechanism available through the statutory biodiversity gain process to secure the requisite biodiversity improvements. Consequently, I find no substantive evidence that the proposal would conflict with the overall objectives of Policy EN12 or result in unacceptable biodiversity harm.
39. Drawing these matters together, I find that the appellant has demonstrated a clear and deliverable pathway towards achieving compliance with the statutory biodiversity net gain requirements. Any residual matters relating to the precise mechanism for securing off-site provision can be addressed through the submission and approval of a BGP and associated management arrangements. Consequently, I find no convincing evidence that the proposal would result in unacceptable biodiversity harm or that compliance with the biodiversity net gain framework could not be secured.
40. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with Policy EN12 of the Reading Borough Local Plan, Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, or the biodiversity objectives of national planning policy.

Affordable Housing and Legal Agreement

41. The appellant has submitted a completed Unilateral Undertaking (UU) under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 which secures an affordable housing contribution in accordance with Policies H3 and CC9 of the Reading Borough Local Plan and the Council's Affordable Housing SPD. Whilst an error was identified in the initial calculation submitted at the commencement of the appeal, the appellant subsequently provided a revised and corrected Unilateral Undertaking securing the required contribution.

42. Concerns were raised regarding the use of an electronic signature. The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that electronic signatures may be used where the relevant legal requirements are met. On the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the undertaking has been executed as a deed and there is no substantive evidence that its validity is compromised by the use of an electronic signature.
43. Given that the definition of Index Linked is provided within Clause 1 of the UU and reference is made back to this within the Affordable Housing Schedule, I am satisfied that the contribution is subject to indexation.
44. I have considered the Council's concern that clauses 3.5, 3.6 and 3.7 render the Affordable Housing Contribution insufficiently secure. However, the contribution is required to be paid before the occupation of any dwelling, and the obligation therefore falls due before the exemptions relating to purchasers, occupiers and owners of completed dwellings become relevant. Furthermore, the deed preserves liability for antecedent breaches following disposal of an interest in the site. Consequently, I am satisfied that a failure to pay the contribution prior to occupation would constitute a breach capable of enforcement against the party responsible, and I am therefore satisfied that the undertaking secures delivery of the Affordable Housing Contribution. Furthermore, the amount to be paid is defined in the Schedule.
45. The obligation is sought having regard to Policy H3 of the LP which requires that schemes of 1-4 dwellings to provide a financial contribution to enable affordable housing elsewhere within the Borough. Given that this relates to a policy within an adopted development plan, I am satisfied that the obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, is directly related to the development and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to it. The obligation therefore complies Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).
46. The submitted unilateral undertaking includes an express covenant requiring the Owner, upon the grant of planning permission, to pay the Council's reasonable and proper administration costs of monitoring compliance with the planning obligations contained within the deed. Whilst the undertaking does not specify a fixed monetary amount, the obligation to pay monitoring costs is clearly established by Clause 6.1, with the amount payable being limited to such costs as are reasonably and properly incurred by the Council in monitoring performance of the obligations. The absence of a specified sum does not negate the obligation to pay; rather, it requires that any amount sought by the Council be capable of justification as reasonable and proper monitoring costs directly attributable to the obligations in the undertaking. Accordingly, the undertaking makes provision for the payment of monitoring costs and the obligation is capable of satisfying the statutory tests where it has been concluded that the planning obligations comply with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).
47. There is no substantive evidence before me that the obligation fails to meet the relevant statutory and policy requirements, nor that any further mitigation is necessary. Consequently, I am satisfied that the planning obligation secures the required affordable housing contribution as well as the administration and monitoring fees. Accordingly, I find that the proposal secures the mitigation required by Policies H3 and CC9 of the LP and complies with those policies in this respect

Conditions

48. I have had regard to the relevant policy and guidance concerning the use of planning conditions and have only imposed those conditions that are necessary, relevant to planning and the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. In a number of instances, I have amended the Council's suggested conditions where I consider that the same planning objective can be achieved through a less onerous or more precise mechanism.
49. Further to the statutory commencement condition, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the permitted plans is necessary in the interests of certainty.
50. In the interests of the living conditions of nearby occupiers, a condition requiring approval of a Construction Method Statement is necessary. It is necessary for this to be pre-commencement to ensure the method is approved before works commence that could affect the living conditions of neighbours. Likewise, restrictions on the hours of construction/demolition and deliveries to the site and the burning of materials are also needed to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.
51. Conditions relating to external materials, landscaping arrangements and boundary treatments are reasonable and necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the proposed development and surrounding area. It is necessary for the landscaping condition to be pre-commencement to ensure works are not undertaken that may prevent the landscaping being implemented.
52. In light of the changes to the site plan, the tree protection plan included within the Tree Survey does not necessarily accord with the submitted plans. As such, a condition requiring the submission of an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan is necessary in the interests of protecting the trees on site during construction as well as the character and appearance of the area. It is necessary for this to be pre-commencement to ensure trees are protected before works commence that may affect them.
53. In the interests of sustainability and to comply with LP policies CC2 and H5 and the Framework, conditions securing building emissions rate and water efficiency as well as accessibility standards is necessary. Whilst these matters may exceed those set out in the Building Regulations they are required by adopted development plan policies.
54. Conditions requiring the provision of the proposed vehicle access, footway extension, vehicle parking spaces and visibility splays prior to the occupation of the development is necessary in the interest of highway safety. While a condition relating to the provision of bicycle storage is both reasonable and necessary to promote sustainable travel. It is not necessary that this information is approved prior to commencement, so I have altered the relevant conditions accordingly.
55. The provision of refuse and recycling storage areas prior to occupation of the proposed dwellings is necessary to ensure future occupiers have access to these facilities, as well as to maintain highway safety. However, the submitted site plan shows the location of the bin storage and collection areas and as such, it is not necessary to require another plan to be submitted to show this or how it will be conducted from within the site, particularly given that this relates to a scheme for

two dwellings. Furthermore, it is not reasonable to require by condition that the bins are stored in the bin storage areas on days other than the bin collection day. It is also not necessary for this information to be approved prior to the commencement of development and so I have reworded the condition accordingly.

56. The location of the electric vehicle charging points are also included on the submitted site plan and so do not need to be approved again. Furthermore, electric vehicle charging points are required for most new dwellings that have associated parking spaces by Building Regulations and thus it is unnecessary to include a condition requiring them.
57. Given that biodiversity enhancement measures will be considered and secured through the discharge of the statutory Biodiversity Gain Condition, I am not persuaded that a separate planning condition prescribing specific ecological features is necessary. To impose a further condition requiring particular biodiversity enhancements would duplicate matters capable of being addressed through the Biodiversity Gain Plan process. Accordingly, I am satisfied that biodiversity improvements, including features such as bird and bat boxes where appropriate, can be adequately secured through the statutory framework without the need for an additional planning condition.
58. The Framework sets out that permitted development rights should not be restricted unless there is clear justification to do so. The development has been designed with open frontages which reflect the prevailing character of the street scene. The erection of walls, fences or gates under permitted development rights would result in a fragmented and enclosed appearance that would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, clear justification with regard to protecting the character and appearance of the area has been demonstrated and as such it is necessary and reasonable to restrict Class A, Part 2 permitted development rights.

Conclusion

59. The development would be in accordance with the development plan, and the material considerations do not indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Sibley

INSPECTOR

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 drawing nos 18034-THPR-XX-XX-DR-A-1000-P02; 25.8196/P201; 18034-THPR-XX-EL-DR-A-1031-P01; 18034-THPR-XX-EL-DR-A-1032; and 18034-THPR-XX-XX-DR-A-1033-.
- 3) No development shall commence on site, including any works of demolition, until a site-specific Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Statement

shall provide for:

- a) Space on site where vehicles of site operatives and visitors can be parked with details of how site operatives and visitors will be required to make use of the parking area provided, and how unauthorised parking will be restricted;
- b) Location on site for storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- c) The erection and maintenance (including removal of any graffiti or fly posters) of security hoarding around the site;
- d) Identification of any footpath closures or road closures needed during construction;
- e) Required wheel washing facilities on site;
- f) A scheme for recycling waste resulting from the construction works.
- g) Measures for controlling the use of site lighting whether required for safe working or for security purposes;
- h) Required measures to control the emission of dust, dirt and other airborne pollutants during demolition and construction;
- i) Provisions to be made for the control of noise coming from the site during demolition and construction.

The measures within the approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition and construction period unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- 4) No development shall commence on site until a comprehensive scheme of hard and soft landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:
 - a) Proposed finished ground and floor levels or contours, means of enclosure (including mammal gaps where appropriate), car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
 - b) Hard surfacing materials and minor artefacts and other ancillary structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, external services, etc);
 - c) Soft landscaping details shall include planting plan, specification (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), tree pit specifications, schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate, and implementation timetable;
 - d) A maintenance programme detailing all operations to be carried out in order to allow successful establishment of planting; and
 - e) routes and details of proposed and existing functional services above and below ground including foul and surface water drainage, soakaways and SUDs details, power, communications cables and water and gas supply pipelines, including access points.

The approved hard and soft landscaping scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development. Any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

- 5) No development shall commence on site (including demolition or preparatory works) until an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan for all existing trees that are not shown as being removed on the approved drawings, both within and adjacent to the site, has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.
- 6) No development shall commence above foundation level until a schedule of the materials, including samples, to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and thereafter maintained in accordance with the details approved.
- 7) No development shall commence above foundation level until full details of the vehicle access and footway extension serving the development has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The vehicle access and footway extension shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation.
- 8) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatment shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plan before the development is occupied.
- 9) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until written verification has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that the dwellings hereby permitted have achieved a minimum of a 19% improvement in the dwelling emission rate over the target emission rate as defined in The Building Regulations for England Approved Document L1a: Conservation of Fuel and Power in New Dwellings (2013 edition), and built to the higher water efficiency standard under Regulation 36(3). Such evidence shall be in the form of an 'As Built' Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP), produced by an accredited energy assessor.
- 10) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until all vehicle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with drawing no 25.8196/P201. The spaces shall be kept available for parking at all times thereafter.
- 11) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until details of visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The visibility splay shall thereafter be kept free of all obstructions to visibility over a height of 0.6 metres above carriageway level.
- 12) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until the bicycle parking facility for that dwelling has been provided in accordance with the plans hereby approved. The facility shall be kept available for bicycle parking at all times thereafter.
- 13) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until the 'bin storage' shown on drawing no 25.8196/P201 has been carried out in accordance with the permitted drawing and shall remain free of vehicles or other goods. The bin storage area shall be retained for the storage and recycling containers at all times.

- 14) The dwellings hereby permitted shall be constructed to comply with Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations - Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings.
- 15) No construction, demolition or associated deliveries shall take place outside the hours of 0800hrs to 1800hrs Mondays to Fridays, and 0800hrs to 1300hrs on Saturdays, and not at any time on Sundays and Bank or Statutory Holidays.
- 16) No materials or green waste produced as a result of the clearance of the site, demolition works or construction works associated with the development hereby approved shall be burnt on site.
- 17) Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A 'gates, fences, walls etc' of the General Permitted Development (England) Order 2015 (As amended) no development permitted by virtue of Class A of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the Order, other than those approved in accordance with Condition 8 of this planning permission, shall be undertaken.

End of Schedule