

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	P11/V2453
<b>APPLICATION TYPE REGISTERED PARISH</b>	Full 10 October 2011 Garford
<b>WARD MEMBER(S) APPLICANT</b>	Cllr Matthew Barber Memoria
<b>SITE PROPOSAL</b>	Land east of A338, Garford Construction of new crematorium with new access, parking, gardens of remembrance and provision of land for natural burials.
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	None
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	443198 195166

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

This is a full application for the construction of a new crematorium on a site approximately 2.1 hectares in area that lies adjacent to the A338, approximately 200 metres to the north of Venn Mill, at Garford. Site location plans are **attached** at appendix 1. The site is triangular in shape and lies east of the road, in the south-west corner of a larger field. The south boundary of the site is marked by a mature but intermittent hedgerow that is generally four metres in height, which lies adjacent to a stream known as Nor Brook. On the roadside boundary is a continuous mature hedgerow approximately two metres high. There is an existing field access from the road in this south-west corner. The site slopes gently downwards from north to south.

1.2 The surrounding landscape is relatively flat and rural, comprised of fields with mature indigenous boundary hedgerows and sporadic blocks of woodland. To the west of the A338, opposite the site, is Bridleway 222/6 which runs at an angle from the road north-westwards to Garford. Approximately 200 metres to the north of the site is BOAT 222/5 (a Byway Open to All Traffic) which runs westwards from the A338 and crosses Bridleway 222/6. Garford village lies approximately one kilometre to the north-west of the site. Field Barn Farm, a collection of five modern farm buildings, lies approximately 500 metres to the north-east. To the south and east of the site lie the flood plains of Nor Brook and Childrey Brook, both tributaries of the River Ock. The course of Childrey Brook is marked by a substantial tree and hedgerow that runs east from Venn Mill.

1.3 The application comes to committee because Garford Parish Meeting objects to the application.

**2.0 PROPOSAL**

2.1 Extracts from the application drawings are **attached** at appendix 2. The crematorium building would be set back 80 metres from the road and would be approximately 24 metres in length and 14 metres in width. It would be approximately 6.8 metres high with a relatively low eaves height of three metres. There would be a single metal flue, 500mm in diameter, and projecting one metre above the ridge. A memorial garden would lie to the west of the building with an area set aside for natural burials near to the north boundary.

2.2 The existing field access would be closed and a new vehicular access would be built from the A338, approximately centrally located within the roadside boundary, to

serve the proposed crematorium. The A338 would be widened to provide a right-turn lane and the roadside hedge relocated behind the new vision splays of 4.5 m x 160 m in each direction. A car park for 35 cars would be provided immediately to the south of the building, with an overflow area for a further 22 spaces. Two new bus stops, one in each direction, are proposed near to the site entrance, with associated footways. A substantial landscaping scheme is also proposed with blocks of semi-mature and heavy standard trees near to the proposed building and significant blocks of trees along the roadside.

- 2.3 The application has been supported by reports relating to planning, transport, need, landscape and visual impact, trees, ecology archaeology and flooding. These can be inspected on the council's website.

### 3.0 CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 Garford Parish Meeting has made detailed objections to the application, which are attached at appendix 3.

- 3.2 East Hanney Parish Council objects for the reasons attached at appendix 4.

- 3.3 Marcham Parish Council objects for the reasons attached at appendix 5.

- 3.4 Local Residents – 37 letters of objection and a petition signed by 76 individuals has been submitted. The grounds for objection can be summarised as follows:-

- The proposal is contrary to local plan policy and is in a remote, unsustainable rural location that can only be accessed by car
- There is no need for the facility - the use of existing crematoria appears to be in decline and the local plan inspector found there was no need when he examined this issue in the mid-1990's – the applicants are creating a demand not meeting a need
- The quantitative and qualitative analysis supporting the application is flawed and the some of the data used is inaccurate
- The applicants' appraisal of potential alternative sites is inadequate and more sustainable sites are likely to be available
- There will be a harmful visual impact on the surrounding landscape – the development will harm vistas of the Downs, the proposed building is not locally distinctive and there will be further harm from lighting
- The A338 is a dangerously fast and busy road with regular accidents and frequent congestion and is due to take significantly more traffic from the Grove airfield development – the additional traffic from the proposed use will increase danger, especially due to slow-moving corteges and traffic waiting to turn right at the new access close to the Venn Mill bends – there is likely to be increased traffic through Garford village to avoid congestion
- Traffic and other pollution during construction
- Harm to local wildlife
- The site is subject to flooding
- There will be air pollution effects from the use which cannot be entirely filtered
- The proposal should be subject to a Screening Opinion for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

- 3.5 Five letters of support and one letter of observation have also been received.

- 3.6 County Engineer has no objections to the proposed new access arrangements, as they accord with national standards, and, whilst accepting that the site is likely to be accessed by car, does acknowledge that the proposed use is unusual and, consequently, does not object on the grounds of sustainability – these comments are subject to conditions and a financial contribution to local highway works.
- 3.7 Environment Agency has no objections subject to conditions
- 3.8 Natural England has no objections
- 3.9 County Archaeologist has no objections
- 3.10 Countryside Officer has no objections subject to a condition on a reptile mitigation strategy
- 3.11 Environmental Health Officer has no objections
- 4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**
- 4.1 A previous application for the crematorium was withdrawn in September 2011 (application ref P11/V1281).

## 5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

- 5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and revokes all previous government guidance contained in PPG's and PPS's. However, the NPPF does not change the status of the development plan as the starting point for the determination of a planning application - proposed development that accords with an up-to-date local plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

- 5.2 The relevant policies from the adopted local plan include policy CF2, which deals with new community development, and states that permission will be granted where the proposal conforms with the general policies of the local plan (particularly to maximise, as far as possible, access for all) and where any new building is within an existing settlement, or is within, or adjacent to, a group of existing buildings in communal use. Policies DC1, DC5 and DC9 require all new development to be acceptable in terms of design, impact on nearby residents and access. Policy NE9 seeks to protect the landscape character of the Lowland Vale, the area within which the site lies.

## 6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 The main issues for committee to consider are:- 1) the need for the proposed crematorium; 2) the location and visual impact of the proposal; 3) access and parking arrangements; 4) the impact on local ecology, on archaeology and on flooding; 5) the impact on the nearest residents; and 6) the availability of alternative sites. Local residents have questioned whether a Screening Opinion for an EIA should be requested. Officers consider that, following the EIA Regulations 2011, the scale and nature of the proposal does not qualify for an EIA, and that a Screening Opinion is not necessary.

- 6.2 The first issue is the question of need for the proposed crematorium. The applicants' arguments on need have been criticised for being statistically flawed. To help with this crucial issue officers have commissioned a report from an independent consultant, Roger Tym & Partners, which has assessed the case made for need by the applicants. The report is **attached** at appendix 6 and concludes that there is both a quantitative and qualitative need for a new crematorium in the area. Given this

conclusion, the next question is whether the proposed location is suitable.

- 6.3 The applicants argue that the controls placed upon crematoria mean that it is not possible to find a location within a settlement. The Cremation Act 1902 requires new crematoria to be at least 200 yards (183 metres) from the nearest residential dwelling. The Department of Environment publication “The Siting and Planning of Crematoria” (1978) states that the site of a crematoria should usually extend from two to four hectares and be in a suitable setting to enable mourners to have the benefit of quiet and peaceful surroundings. Consequently the applicants argue that many modern crematoria are located in rural areas, outside of settlements, and are treated as exceptions to normal policies on the sustainable location of new development. Officers have considered other recent planning permissions for new crematoria at Surfleet Lincolnshire, March Cambridgeshire, Braintree Essex, Alford Lincolnshire, and Shepton Mallet Somerset. These planning permissions do support the applicant’s argument about the treatment of new crematoria as exceptional cases.

- 6.4 The NPPF does not change the established mechanism for decision-making, where local plan policy can be outweighed by other material considerations, Policy CF2 of the local plan requires that new communal buildings be located in existing settlements. The supporting text to the policy (paragraph 9.12) states that, exceptionally, new buildings may be permitted adjacent to settlements. However, officers accept that the constraints imposed on the siting of a crematorium mean that it can be treated as an exception to normal policy. In addition to the constraints, the applicants argue that the combination of the hope value on land adjacent to settlements, and the relatively large area of land that they require (at least two hectares), mean they cannot compete with land values that owners anticipate for new housing developments. The independent consultant considers this is almost certainly true but does not consider this is a convincing reason to override the local plan (para 2.19 in appendix 5). However, it is considered that this issue should be given some weight in the assessment of the location of the proposed crematorium. Overall, officers consider the argument that a crematorium is reasonably likely to be sited in open countryside, outside settlements, to be persuasive.
- 6.5 In terms of visual impact the site is located in the Lowland Vale area, which is characterised by long open views punctuated by sporadic blocks of woodland. The applicants have produced a detailed landscape strategy which proposes significant tree planting, in stands up to 15 metres deep, adjacent to the A338, and in blocks within the site to the north and west of the proposed building and car park. Fast growing species such as poplar and willow are mixed with slower growing species such as oak and ash. In addition blocks of semi-mature and heavy standard trees are proposed immediately adjacent to the proposed building and car park to provide quicker screening. The planting strategy has been carefully designed in terms of providing stages of cover. The intention is that the faster-growing species, and semi-mature trees, will provide a relatively quick cover, which will be supplemented over a longer period by the remaining trees. The overall intention is to replicate blocks of woodland and boundary hedging which are characteristic of the area. The existing roadside hedgerow would be relocated into the site to allow for the proposed road widening and visibility splays.

- 6.6 Officers consider that the visual impact of the proposal should be properly assessed in terms of its degree of prominence in available views from the public highway and in terms of the quality of the proposed landscaping and, importantly, how quickly it should provide an acceptable level of screening of the development. The site is visible in views from the north along the A338 from a distance of approximately 500 metres, once one is clear of the group of trees next to the entrance to Field Farm Barn. Views from the bridleway are available south of its crossing of the BOAT, although it is

screened to some degree by intervening hedgerows. Views from the BOAT to the east of the crossing with the bridleway are largely prevented by a tall tree screen. Views from the south along the A338 are screened by trees until one is past Venn Mill.

- 6.7 The landscape strategy is key to the assessment of the impact of the proposal. The proposed building, car parking and access road all have the potential to bring about an urbanising effect and to harm to the character of the area. However, officers consider the proposed planting strategy to be of sufficient quality that, within a relatively short time, it is likely the development will become integrated into the wider landscape to an acceptable degree. Of assistance to this is the fact that the proposed building has a relatively low eaves and a large clay-tiled roof, which is characteristic of traditional rural buildings. The expected overall effect in the medium term (five to ten years) is that the car park should be reasonably well screened by the woodland and hedgerow planting, and although the large pitched roof of the building is likely to be visible through the surrounding trees, the design and appearance of the building in the landscaped setting should not be incongruous in the context of the rural landscape. The access road will remain visible, but such access roads are not uncommon in a rural area. Officers therefore conclude that the visual impact of the development will be moderate.

- 6.8 The screening will improve further in the following years and the site will appear to be an area of woodland that is typical of others in the landscape. It is also considered that lighting can be suitably controlled in terms of the height and power of lamps to ensure an acceptable impact on the surrounding area. A further point to note is that the proposed landscaping is crucial to the success of the proposal in terms of providing the appropriate setting for mourners, which provides assurance that the quality of the strategy will be fully realised.

- 6.9 The third issue is access and parking arrangements. The proposal is to create a new vehicular access and widen the A338 to provide a right-turn lane. The A338 carries 9,500 vehicles per day, to which the proposal would add an estimated 180 movements on days with maximum usage. This represents an increase of only 1.9%. The proposed access arrangements meet national standards and the county engineer has no objections on the grounds of highway safety. It is accepted that the Venn Mill bends are substandard in terms of safety, but there is adequate vision from the proposed access to the bends for the access itself to be safe. Although three bus routes pass the site, with services every half-an-hour, and two new bus stops are proposed, it is acknowledged that the site will be practically accessible only by car. The applicants argue that the site will lie closer to surrounding communities than existing crematoria and will therefore reduce projected future car travel for mourners to the benefit of the environment, but this is strongly disputed by objectors. The county engineer does acknowledge the unusual locational restrictions that apply to crematoria and, for this reason, does not object on the grounds of sustainability. The proposed amount of parking is considered to be acceptable. A financial contribution to local highway works is to be secured via a planning obligation.

- 6.10 The fourth issue is the impact on ecology, archaeology and flooding. An ecological survey has been submitted which has found the presence of some species of protected reptiles on the site. A reptile mitigation strategy has been produced. This has been assessed by the Countryside Officer who has no objections. A desk top archaeological assessment has revealed no archaeological issues that would preclude development, and a condition is recommended to enable further investigation and recording work to be carried out. A flood risk assessment and drainage strategy has been submitted with the application. Although the site did flood in 2007 the Environment Agency has determined that this flood was a rare, extreme

event, and outside the one-in-one hundred year event level that is the standard for assessing planning applications. A sustainable drainage strategy has been devised for the site and the Environment Agency has no objections subject to conditions.

- 6.11 The next issue is the impact on the nearest residents. The nearest dwelling is at Venn Mill, approximately 200 metres from the site. Although concerns have been raised about air pollution the council's Environmental Health Officer notes that the latest abatement technology is to be used in the development and has no objections. Objections have been made regarding noise and other forms of pollution during construction. However, adequate controls exist under other legislation, for example nuisance can be controlled under environmental health legislation. Overall, the impact on the nearest residents is considered to be acceptable.

- 6.12 The final issue is the availability of alternative sites. The applicants have submitted an appraisal of other potential sites within a search area identified to serve the proposed catchment. This is contained in section G of the applicants' Planning Statement. Six other sites were examined, all outside existing settlements, but all were rejected. This appraisal has been criticised on the ground that the number of sites identified is too small and it is claimed that more sustainable locations have been missed.

- 6.13 The recognised approach to be taken on this issue is provided by *Trusthouse Forte Hotels v Secretary of State (1987)*. Here it was decided that where there are clear planning objections to a development on a particular site it may be necessary to consider whether there is a more appropriate site elsewhere, particularly where the development would have significant adverse effects and where the major argument advanced in support of the application is that a need for the development outweighs the planning disadvantages. However, where there are no significant adverse effects, then there is no necessity to consider alternative sites. A major supporting argument in the application is that of need and therefore this matter does require consideration. The *Trusthouse Forte* approach turns on the question of whether there are significant adverse effects arising from the proposal.

- 6.14 Officers consider the visual impact to be moderate, the access to be safe, the use to be a justified exception to normal policies on sustainable development, and the impacts on nearby residents, and on ecology, archaeology and flooding, to be acceptable. In short there are considered to be no significant adverse effects arising from the proposal and, following the *Trusthouse Forte* case, and other cases such as *Hulme v Secretary of State (2010)*, there is no reason to consider alternative sites.

## 7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 A need for the proposed crematorium is considered to exist. The location of the proposal is not in accordance with local plan policy, but other material considerations are considered to outweigh Policy CF2 and the proposed location, although not adjacent to a settlement, is considered to be acceptable. The proposed landscaping strategy is of high quality and, within a relatively short time, the proposal is likely to be integrated into the surrounding landscape to an acceptable degree. The proposed access is considered to be safe, the level of parking to be acceptable, and there should be no harm to local ecology, archaeology or neighbours. As the proposal is not considered to have any significantly adverse effects, there is no requirement to examine potential alternative sites.

## 8.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 It is recommended that authority to grant planning permission is delegated to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, subject to:-

- i) The completion of a planning obligation to secure a financial contribution to public transport**
- ii) Conditions to include external materials, landscaping, boundary treatments, slab and site levels, access and road widening, bus stops, footways, parking, lighting, ecology, archaeology, and drainage**

Author / Officer: Martin Deans Team Leader (Applications)  
Contact number: 01235 540350  
Email address: martin.deans@southandvale.gov.uk

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 March 2012 were agreed subject to a textual amendment to item P1188 giving detail of Councillor Woodford's concerns about the proposal.

**PI.194 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Agenda Item	Councillor/s	Nature of Interest	Reason
9	Robert Sharp  Jerry Patterson	Personal  Personal	Knows chairman of the parish meeting and the land owner  Is a member of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) who are objecting the application, but he has not involved with this campaign
10	Bob Johnston, Jerry Patterson, Helen Phillips, John Woodford, Sue Marchant, Roger Cox, Bill Jones, Margaret Turner	Personal	Know the applicant's agent, Ken Dijkman

**PI.195 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

A list of speakers was tabled at the meeting.

**PI.196 STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON OTHER MATTERS**

None.

**PI.197**

**MATERIALS**

None.

**PI.198 LAND EAST OF A338, GARFORD. CONSTRUCTION OF NEW CREMATORIUM WITH NEW ACCESS, PARKING, GARDENS OF REMEMBRANCE AND PROVISION OF LAND FOR NATURAL BURIALS. P11/V2453**

The officer introduced his report.

Robert Treadgold, from Garford village parish meeting spoke in objection to the application. He felt that there should be an adjournment to look in more detail at the application; he said that he had the overwhelming support of Garford residents. He summarised the arguments put forward by the parish meeting in objection to the application.



Catherine Petts, from the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) spoke in objection to the application. She felt that this area was an historic landscape which should be protected from development and suburbanisation, and that an alternative site should be found nearer to a town.

Howard Hodgson, chairman of Memoria, the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. He summarised his company's written submissions and argued that the company would not be making the financial investment if it did not believe that there was enough of a need to justify the return on the investment.

Matthew Barber, ward councillor, was unable to be present, but a written statement from him was read out by the chairman of the planning committee. His concerns were about the potential increase in traffic to the area; whether the "need" for the crematorium had been adequately demonstrated; the fact that this application is contrary to the local plan and whether there were more suitable sites.

A lengthy debate ensued; it was also explained to the Garford residents the role and remit of the committee as a quasi-judicial committee and the matters which could and could not be taken into consideration for planning purposes.

The committee considered traffic issues with regard to the fact that there will be significant population growth, particularly around Grove, over the next few years. It was acknowledged that the county highways engineer had factored in the population growth and that the expected traffic increase is still within acceptable limits. One of the attractions of this site is the good visibility at the access onto the public highway.

Concerns were raised about the potential for flooding as the site had flooded in 2007 and was a possible flood risk. The Environment Agency had not objected to the site as it is not considered to be a 1 in 100 year flood risk.

The committee accepted the potential availability of other sites available does not need to be considered if this site is acceptable on its own merits. It also accepted that the application meets the criteria for being considered as an exception to local plan policies.

Concerns were raised about the adequacy of car parking and this will need to be monitored.

### **RESOLVED (For 13; Against 2; Abstentions 0)**

**To authorise the head of planning, in consultation with the chairman and vice-chairman, to grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:**

- i) The completion of a planning obligation to secure a financial contribution to public transport
- ii) Conditions to include external materials, landscaping, boundary treatments, slab and site levels, access and road widening, bus stops, footways, parking, lighting, ecology, archaeology, and drainage.

# PLANNING

ELECTRONIC  
VERSION

**Planning Decision**

**P11/V2453**

*APPENDIX 2*

Memoria Ltd  
c/o Genesis Town Planning Ltd  
26 Chapel Street  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO19 1BL

## **PLANNING PERMISSION**

---

Application No : **P11/V2453**

Application proposal, including any amendments :

**Erection of new crematorium together with associated highway works, car park, gardens of remembrance and provision of land for natural burials. (Re-submission of withdrawn application 11/01281/FUL)**

Site Location : **Garford Crematorium Site Garford Abingdon Oxfordshire**

---

Vale of White Horse District Council hereby gives notice that **planning permission is GRANTED** for the carrying out of the development referred to above strictly in accordance with the description, plans and specifications contained in the application (as varied by any amendments as referred to above) subject to the following condition(s) :

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.  
Reason: By virtue of Sections 91 to 95 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. That the development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the following approved plans, 1264-04, 1264-01, 1264-02 and 1264-03A, except as controlled or modified by conditions of this permission.

Reason: To secure the proper planning of the area in accordance with



Development Plan policies.

3. Prior to the commencement of development details of all external lighting of the site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details. No additional external lighting shall be provided without the prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the rural area (Policy DC1 of the adopted Local Plan).

4. No development shall take place until a scheme of archaeological investigation (including a programme of archaeological excavation, recording any finds and publishing the results) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme of investigation shall be implemented prior to the commencement of any new development hereby permitted.

Reason: To enable a proper archaeological investigation of the site and the identification and recording of any items of archaeological importance (Policy HE11 of the adopted Local Plan).

5. Prior to the use or occupation of the new development, the vehicular access and visibility splays hereby approved and shown on approved drawing number 4004/F/01 B shall be provided. Thereafter, the visibility splays shall be permanently maintained free from obstruction to vision.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety (Policy DC5 of the adopted Local Plan).

6. Prior to the use or occupation of the new development, the car parking spaces shown on approved drawing number 1264-03A shall be constructed, surfaced and marked out. The parking spaces shall be constructed to prevent surface water discharging onto the highway. Thereafter, the parking spaces shall be kept permanently free of any obstruction to such use.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to avoid localised flooding (Policies DC5 and DC14 of the adopted Local Plan).

7. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include hard surfacing materials, schedules of new trees and shrubs to be planted (noting species, plant sizes and numbers/densities), the identification of the existing trees and shrubs on the site to be retained (noting species, location and spread), any earth moving operations and finished levels/contours, and an implementation programme.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of appropriate landscaping which will improve the environmental quality of the development (Policy DC6 of the adopted Local Plan).

8. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the details and programme approved under Condition 7 above. Thereafter, the landscaped areas shall be maintained for a period of 5 years. Any trees or shrubs which die or become seriously damaged or diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced by trees and shrubs of similar size and species to those originally planted.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of appropriate landscaping which will improve the environmental quality of the development (Policy DC6 of the adopted Local Plan).

9. Prior to the commencement of development, samples of all materials to be used externally in the construction shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be built using only the approved materials.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity (Policy DC1 of the adopted Local Plan).

10. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed scheme for the surface water and foul water drainage of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of any new building.

Reason: To ensure the effective drainage of the site and to avoid flooding (Policy DC14 of the adopted Local Plan).

11. Prior to the commencement of development, an updated flood risk assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved flood risk assessment.

Reason: To ensure the effective drainage of the site and to avoid flooding (Policy DC14 of the adopted Local Plan).

12. Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for groundwater monitoring on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The groundwater monitoring shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the effective drainage of the site in the interest of public health (Policy DC9 of the adopted Local Plan).

13. Prior to the occupation or use of the development, surface water drainage

works shall be carried out in accordance with a detailed scheme which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Before the drainage scheme is submitted, an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in Annex F of PSS25 (or any subsequent version), and the results of the assessment shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Where a sustainable drainage system is to be provided, the submitted scheme shall include the following:

1. - information about the design storm period and intensity, the method - employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site, - and measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater - and/or surface watercourses;
2. - a timetable for its implementation;
3. - a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development - - i.e. arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory - undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of system - throughout its lifetime.

Reason: To ensure the effective and sustainable drainage of the site in the interests of public health and the avoidance of flooding (Policies DC9 and DC14 of the adopted Local Plan).

14. Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved drawings, the site's external boundaries shall be enclosed in accordance with a detailed scheme which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, or any order revoking and re-enacting that order, no gates, walls, fences or other means of enclosure, other than those approved under this condition, shall be erected on the site without the prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity (Policies DC1 of the adopted Local Plan).

15. Prior to the commencement of development, details of the existing and proposed site levels, and of the slab level of the building hereby permitted, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.

Reason: To protect the amenity of rural area (Policy DC1 of the adopted Local Plan).

16. The development shall be implemented in strict accordance with the scheme of mitigation detailed in the reptile mitigation strategy (July 2011) which was submitted with the application. Any variation shall be first approved in writing by

the local planning authority before it is made.

Reason: To safeguard protected species (Policy NE5 of the adopted Local Plan).

NB: The above permission/consent may contain pre-conditions, which require specific matters to be approved by the Local Planning Authority before a specified stage in the development occurs. This means that a lawful commencement of the approved development/works cannot be made until the particular requirements of the pre-condition(s) have been met.

NB: This approval is specific to the details of the development as shown on the approved plans and other associated documentation. Unless otherwise agreed by the Council any departure from the approved plans will constitute unauthorised development and may be liable to enforcement action. As such the Council must be advised in writing of any proposed variations from the approved plans and other associated documentation at the earliest stage possible. A decision will then be made as to whether the changes can be dealt with as a minor revision to the approved details or whether a revised application is required.

This permission refers only to that required under the Town and Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment, byelaw, order or regulation.



Head of Planning  
28th June 2012

## STATUTORY INFORMATIVE

### Appeals to the Secretary of State

If you are aggrieved by the decision of your local planning authority to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State for the Environment under sections 78 and 79 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

If you want to appeal, then you must do so within **six months** of the date of this notice, using a form which you can get from :

The Planning Inspectorate  
Customer Support Unit  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN  
Telephone : 0117 372 6372  
[www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk](http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk).

The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal, but he will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal.

The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to him that the local planning authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions it imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of the development order and to any directions given under the order.

In practice, the Secretary of State does not refuse to consider appeals solely because the local planning authority based its decision on a direction given by him.

### Purchase Notice

If either the local planning authority or the Secretary of State for the Environment refuses permission to develop land or grants its subject to conditions, the owner may claim that he can neither put the land to a reasonably beneficial use in its existing state nor can he render the land capable of a reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted.

In these circumstances, the owner may serve a purchase notice on the Council (District Council, London Borough Council or Common Council of the City of London) in whose area the land is situated. This notice will require the Council to purchase