

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P15/V2648/FUL</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION
<b>REGISTERED</b>	9.11.2015
<b>PARISH</b>	SHRIVENHAM
<b>WARD MEMBERS</b>	Simon Howell Elaine Ware
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Linden Homes Thames Valley
<b>SITE</b>	Land off Colton Road Shrivenham
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Material minor amendment to planning permission P14/V2757/FUL to alter approved layout to substitute house types and re-plan plots 1-5, 14-18, 32-33, 38, 41, 43-45, 67 and 68; and to re-plan plots 30, 53-58, 65 and 66. (As amplified and clarified by Drawings and Comparison of Accommodation Schedule accompanying applicant's email received 18 February 2016)
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	One – providing missing plans and further information as above
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	423209/188916
<b>OFFICER</b>	Peter Brampton

---

## SUMMARY

This application is referred to planning committee as Shrivenham Parish Council objects, and letters of objection from 7 local residents have been received at the time of writing of this report.

The application seeks a Material Minor Amendment to planning permission P14/V2757/FUL, which permitted the erection of 68 houses on the site. The amendment seeks to alter the house types to be used on 17 of the approved plots.

The main issues are:

- Whether the proposed new house types will have a materially different impact on the character of the development and its relationship with the surrounding area
- Whether the proposed new house types will have a material impact on the overall approved housing mix
- Whether adequate car parking has been provided
- Whether the change in housing mix requires alterations to previously agreed Section 106 contributions

This report seeks to assess the application details against the national and local planning policy framework where relevant and all other material planning considerations.

It is considered that the proposed changes to the previously approved scheme do not materially change the overall impact of this development. The changes caused by the introduction of new house types or the substitution of approved house types within the scheme are not considered material. Similarly, the change to housing mix over the approved scheme represents a relatively small alteration to the mix previously approved. Finally, there are no concerns about the overall level of car parking proposed.

Therefore, the application is recommended for approval.

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This application relates to land to the western edge of Shrivenham, immediately adjacent to the existing built limits and around 700 metres from the High Street. The site is around 2.83 hectares in size, with a slight fall towards Colton Road to the south and to the A420 to the north.
- 1.2 Existing residential development bounds the site to east and south. Mature vegetation and the A420 lie to the northwest, with agricultural land to the west. It is understood that initial site clearance operations have begun in preparation for the applicant commencing construction in the coming months.
- 1.3 Relative to the approved scheme, the existing residential development to the south and east is lower density, being a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced housing.
- 1.4 A location plan for the site is **attached** as Appendix 1.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 This application seeks a material minor amendment to the previously approved scheme for 68 houses to change the house types on 19 of the approved plots. The changes are summarised in the below table:

Plot No	Approved	Approved Ridge	Proposed	Proposed Ridge
1	4-bed	8.24 metres	4-bed	7.95 metres
2	2-bed	7.45 metres	5-bed	9.38 metres
3	5-bed	9.38 metres	5-bed	9.38 metres
4	5-bed	9.38 metres	3-bed	7.12 metres
5	3-bed	7.84 metres	4-bed	7.95 metres
14	3-bed	7.84 metres	4-bed	7.95 metres
15	3-bed	7.68 metres	3-bed	8.80 metres
16	3-bed	7.68 metres	3-bed	8.80 metres
17	4-bed	7.95 metres	4-bed	8.00 metres
18	5-bed	9.38 metres	5-bed	9.38 metres
32	3-bed	7.12 metres	3-bed	7.12 metres
33	2-bed	7.45 metres	2-bed	7.27 metres
38	2-bed	7.45 metres	2-bed	7.27 metres
41	3-bed	7.42 metres	3-bed	7.12 metres
43	3-bed	8.13 metres	3-bed	7.12 metres
44	4-bed	7.95 metres	3-bed	7.12 metres
45	4-bed	7.40 metres	4-bed	9.00 metres
67	4-bed	8.24 metres	4-bed	8.00 metres
68	5-bed	9.38 metres	4-bed	7.95 metres

- 2.2 The overall change in house mix (affordable and market) can be summarised thus:

Type	Original	Proposed	Variance	% of total
1-bed	3	3	0	4.4
2-bed	24	23	-1	33.8
3-bed	21	20	-1	29.4
4-bed	8	11	3	16.2
5-bed	12	11	-1	16.2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>68</b>		<b>100</b>

2.3 The overall change in the market housing mix can be summarised thus:

Type	Original	Proposed	Variance	% of total
1-bed	0	0	0	0
2-bed	8	7	-1	17.1
3-bed	16	15	-1	36.6
4-bed	5	8	+3	19.5
5-bed	12	11	-1	26.8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>		<b>100</b>

2.4 The application also includes a number of minor re-siting of plots, without changing the approved house type or number of bedrooms.

2.5 Reduced versions of the submitted plans and a full schedule of accommodation are **attached** as Appendix 2. All plans and accompanying information are available on our website ([www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk](http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk))

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

Shrivenham Parish Council	<p>Objection received – <i>“The Council is strongly opposed to the proposed housing types as it is clear that the aim is for maximum financial gain at the cost of the actual housing need in Shrivenham.</i></p> <p><i>The new ‘Linden Types’ included do not give any indication as to the number of bedrooms, however, looking at the square footage in comparison to the named types, it is evident that the majority of these private homes will have 4+ bedrooms.</i></p> <p><i>The SHMA recommendations for housing types are; 1 bedroom 5.9%, 2 bedroom 21.7%, 3 bedroom 42.6%, 4+ bedrooms 39.8%</i></p> <p><i>The applicant’s intention is to provide; 2 bedroom 17%. 3 bedroom 36.6%. 4+ bedrooms 46.3%</i></p> <p><i>The Housing Needs Survey that was carried out in 2010, in conjunction with ORCC, highlighted that Shrivenham has a desperate shortage of 1 and 2 bedroom homes, with the vast majority having 4 or more bedrooms. The applicant’s proposals do not address the identified need, instead opting to provide more large, expensive and unnecessary homes. The Council questions the point of including the SHMA recommendations in the emerging Local Plan if developers are allowed to ignore them?”</i></p> <p>Objection maintained following receipt of additional plans and information</p>
Neighbours	<p>Letters of objection have been received from 7 neighbours. The main concerns raised can be summarised thus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in larger units will leave the development out of character with the village, particularly in terms of density</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in larger units does not meet the local need for smaller dwellings</li> <li>• Inadequate level of parking provided for the revised mix of housing, with a lack of visitor spaces</li> <li>• New house types are not in keeping with character of the village</li> </ul> <p>The neighbour representations also raise a number of concerns that relate to the original permission and conditions rather than the changes being proposed as part of this application. They have not formed part of officers' assessment of this scheme as they are not relevant to the proposal but can be summarised thus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction hours on site</li> <li>• Work has commenced on site contrary to application forms</li> <li>• Area of public open space has no parking associated with it</li> <li>• Dissatisfaction with previous housing developments from the applicant in the village</li> <li>• Unclear if Thames Water and the council's drainage engineer have agreed surface and foul water drainage strategies</li> <li>• Need for alternative ventilation for some houses</li> </ul>
Oxfordshire County Council Highways	No objection
Urban Design Officer	<p>No overall objection. Comments on original submission - <i>"The only issue I wish to raise is the reduction of enclosure to the street which will result from pulling back the garages into the plot. This affects plots 1, 2 and 5. The impact of this will be a weaker sense of enclosure and a road dominated character in these areas. I would suggest reviewing the parking provision for these plots in case there is an over provision. In addition, I would suggest the use of covered car ports as an alternative to create the impression of a building line further forward than currently proposed"</i></p> <p>On receipt of the further plans and clarification, the urban design officer has identified the need for the proposed Plot 2 to benefit from side facing windows to ensure increased active frontage at the entrance to the site.</p>

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P15/V2239/DIS](#) – Approved (24/12/2015)

Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26 and 27 on application ref. P14/V2757/FUL

[P14/V2757/FUL](#) - Approved (25/08/2015)

Residential development of 68 new homes, public open space and new site accesses (as amended by covering letter, revised Design and Access Statement, revised plans, and revised technical reports received 7 April 2015 and drawings received 8 July 2015 showing agreed housetype amendments)

[P14/V0952/FUL](#) - Approved (15/08/2014)

Variation of condition 1 of outline planning permission P13/V0399/O.

[P13/V0399/O](#) - Approved (19/03/2014)

Outline application for a residential development of up to 68 new homes, public open space and new site accesses.

[P12/V2549/SCR](#) – EIA not required (22/02/2013)

EIA Screening opinion for proposed residential scheme of up to 80 dwellings.

## 5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

### 5.1 Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan 2011

The development plan for this area comprises the adopted Vale of White Horse local plan 2011. The following local plan policies relevant to this application were 'saved' by direction on 1 July 2009.

Policy No.	Policy Title
DC1	Design
DC3	Design against crime
DC5	Access
DC6	Landscaping
DC7	Waste Collection and Recycling
DC8	The Provision of Infrastructure and Services
DC9	The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses
DC12	Water quality and resources
DC13	Flood Risk and Water Run-off
DC14	Flood Risk and Water Run-off
H15	Housing Densities
H16	Size of Dwelling and Lifetime Homes
H17	Affordable Housing
H23	Open Space in New Housing Development
NE9	Lowland Vale

### 5.2 Emerging Local Plan 2031 – Part 1

The draft local plan part 1 is not currently adopted policy. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF allows for weight to be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, and only subject to the stage of preparation of the plan, the extent of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of the relevant emerging policies with the NPPF. At present it is officers' opinion that the emerging Local Plan housing policies carry limited weight for decision making. The relevant policies are as follows:-

Policy No.	Policy Title
Core Policy 1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
Core Policy 4	Meeting our housing needs
Core Policy 7	Providing supporting infrastructure and services
Core Policy 20	Spatial Strategy for Western Vale sub-area
Core Policy 22	Housing mix
Core Policy 23	Housing density
Core Policy 24	Affordable housing
Core Policy 37	Design and local distinctiveness
Core Policy 38	Design strategies for strategic and major development sites
Core Policy 42	Flood risk
Core Policy 44	Landscape

### 5.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Design Guide – March 2015

The following sections of the Design Guide are particularly relevant to this application:-

*Responding to Site and Setting*

- *Character Study (DG6) and Site appraisal (DG9)*

*Establishing the Framework*

- *Existing natural resources, sustainability and heritage (DG10-13, 15, 19)*
- *Landscape and SUDS (DG14, 16-18, 20)*
- *Movement Framework and street hierarchy (DG21-24)*
- *Density (DG26)*
- *Urban Structure (blocks, frontages, nodes etc.) DG27-30*

*Layout*

- *Streets and Spaces (DG31-43)*
- *Parking (DG44-50)*

*Built Form*

- *Scale, form, massing and position (DG51-54)*
- *Boundary treatments (DG55)*
- *Building Design (DG56-62)*
- *Amenity, privacy and overlooking (DG63-64)*
- *Refuse and services (DG67-68)*

- Open space, sport and recreation future provision – July 2008
- Affordable Housing – July 2006
- Flood Maps and Flood Risk – July 2006

#### 5.4 **Human Rights Act**

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report.

#### 5.5 **Equalities**

In determining this planning application the Council has regard to its equalities obligations including its obligations under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

#### 6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The relevant planning considerations in the determination of this application are:

1. Design, layout and visual impact
2. Housing Mix
3. Residential Amenity for future occupiers
4. Amenity for existing neighbours
5. Traffic, Parking and Highway Safety
6. Developer Contributions

#### **Design, layout and visual impact**

6.2 The NPPF provides that planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment (paragraph 60). It gives considerable weight to good design and acknowledges it is a key component of sustainable development.

6.3 A number of local plan policies seek to ensure high quality developments and to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties (Policies DC1, DC6, DC9, DC12 and DC20). In March 2015 the council adopted its design guide, which aims to raise the standard of design across the district.

6.4 It is important to note that this proposal does not make significant changes to the approved layout and so the conclusions of the previous officer on this aspect of the scheme remain valid. In the committee report for the 2014 scheme the officer states,

*“The layout of the site has been designed around the retention of boundary hedging along the A420 in accordance with principle DG10 of the design guide, which states that physical characteristics of the site should be used to influence the form and layout of new development. The development also completely avoids back fences abutting the countryside, as expected by principle DG29...For the most part, the proposal accords with design guide principle DG28 in that it creates a good sense of enclosure, with buildings close to the street, particularly along the central spine road. Fronts generally face fronts, which creates an attractive streetscape and avoids overlooking issues. There are a few exceptions to this, such as in the case of Plot 31 for example, however officers feel the design has gone far enough in its evolution to be acceptable...”*

- 6.5 The urban design officer comments about the recessed position of the garages for certain plots harming the overall sense of enclosure to the street is noted. However, officers do not consider that the changes proposed here significantly change that arrangement and so there is insufficient justification to insist on the recommended amendment of using covered car ports over the driveways of those plots.
- 6.6 Given the above, it is the changes to the built form that represent the biggest impact on the character of the area from this application. Design Guide principle DG51 states that development should generally reflect the scale of the existing settlement. It also states that subtle variations in height, frontage widths and plan forms can add interest to the street scene.
- 6.7 In assessing this application, it is important to note that only a few new house designs are being introduced. As shown by the Accommodation Schedule in Appendix 2, most of the amended plots will benefit from a different house type that was already part of the previously approved scheme. The only entirely new house types are the “4H145”, the “Sharnbrook”, the “4D1734”, the “Clayton Corner” and the “3T838”. These new house types, and some of the previously approved house types, are also provided in Appendix 2.
- 6.8 For clarity, the “4H145” is used at Plots 1, 5, 14 and 68. The “Sharnbrook” is used at Plots 17, 44 and 67. The “4D1734” is used at Plot 45. The “Clayton Corner” is used at Plot 41. Finally, the “3T838” is used at Plots 15 and 16. Generally, these new house types replace the approved house types on a like-for-like basis in terms of bedrooms, although the “4H145” provides 4 bedrooms on Plots 5 and 14, where previously 3 bed houses had been approved.
- 6.9 The remainder of the changes effectively revolve around the substitution of approved house types between plots. In determining the previous application, officers concluded, *“The street scene does present a range of heights and differing plan forms are also proposed through the provision of stand-alone houses, duplex houses, terraced properties and flats. The proposed form and massing is straightforward and unfussy, with rectangular floorplans, pitched roofs, and in the case of the block of flats a simple ‘L’ shaped plan is proposed to ‘turn the corner’ of the junction. This accords with policies DG52 and DG53 of the design guide. The development [is arranged] so that buildings front the streets and other public spaces in the development, providing a good level of natural surveillance in accordance with design principle DG54.”*
- 6.10 Officers consider that this conclusion still holds for the amended scheme. The new house types listed above also have simple plan forms under traditionally pitched roofs and they will sit comfortably in the street scene alongside the already approved dwellings. All conditions relating to materials and boundary treatments are recommended to be carried across to this new permission to ensure a consistent approach across the entire site. Due to the change in house type on Plot 2, a new

condition is recommended to secure additional side-facing windows in both flank elevations of this unit, which stands at an oblique angle at the entrance to the site in Stallpits Road and so active frontages in all directions are crucial for this dwelling as it will be a vital “landmark” assisting legibility.

- 6.11 Officers do not consider there are any occasions within the amended layout where the change in house types lead to a significant increase in the bulk or massing of the street scene, nor are any important gaps between buildings closed unacceptably. Where approved house types are relocated on their current plots, the differences will be largely imperceptible. Thus, officers are satisfied that the overall change in the impact of this development on the character of the area will not be materially different from that previously approved and so the previous conclusions hold.

**Housing Mix**

- 6.12 Policy H16 of the Adopted Local Plan requires 50% of houses to have two beds or less. However, as stipulated at paragraph 47 of the NPPF this policy is out of date as it is not based on recent assessments of housing need. The Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 (SHMA) is the most recent assessment and estimates the following open market dwelling requirement by number of bedrooms (2011 to 2031) for the District:

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed	Total
SHMA %	5.9%	21.7%	42.6%	29.8%	100%
Approved %	0%	19.5%	39%	41.5%	100%
Proposed %	0%	17.1%	36.6%	46.3%	100%

- 6.13 Members will note that the approved scheme underprovided against 1, 2 and 3 bed units, and that this amendment will further underprovide on smaller units. However, it is important to note that the amendment only proposes to lose a single 2-bed unit and a single 3-bed unit, replacing them with 4-bed houses. One 5-bed unit is also downsized to a 4-bed unit.
- 6.14 The increase in larger units through this amendment has been the thrust of the objection from the parish council and a number of neighbours. However, across a scheme of 68 houses, officers consider these changes to be relatively minor. The overall under-provision of smaller one and two bed market units against the SHMA estimate is slightly over 4 units. Officers are satisfied that only minor harm is caused by this under provision and that it would be difficult to uphold a reason for refusal based on housing mix at appeal.
- 6.15 As an aside, the affordable housing provision remains identical to that previously approved.

**Residential amenity for future occupiers**

- 6.16 In terms of amenity space for future occupiers of the site, the Design Guide recommends the following: Apartments – communal gardens and private areas for ground floor flats, 1 bed dwellings – 35 square metres, 2-bed dwellings - 50 square metres, 3-beds or more dwellings – 100 square metres.
- 6.17 In this regard, the conclusions of the previous officer hold firm, *“All of the proposed houses have private gardens ranging in size from approximately 40 square metres to over 150 square metres, and all of the flats have communal gardens. Some of the gardens do not meet the above recommendations, however whilst larger gardens for some of the houses and flats would be desirable, it is noted that every dwelling has*



*useable amenity space which is easily accessible from the rear of the house or flat, and therefore a reasonable standard of amenity will be provided.”*

- 6.18 Across the site, back-to-back distances of 21 metres are generally achieved in accordance with the Design Guide requirements and so there remain no concerns about the future amenity of occupiers of this site. Conditions relating to neighbourliness were recommended previously and are pulled across to this new consent.

**Amenity for existing neighbours**

- 6.19 Adopted local plan policy DC9 seeks to prevent development that would result in a loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight for neighbouring properties or that would cause dominance or visual intrusion for neighbouring properties and the wider environment. Protecting amenity is a core principle of the NPPF. Design principles DG63-64 of the Design Guide pertain to amenity, privacy and overlooking.
- 6.20 Again, the conclusions of the previous officer are equally applicable to this amendment: *“It is accepted that the development will result in some overlooking of the rear gardens of the adjoining dwellings, however overlooking to gardens is a consequence of many new developments and the impacts are not so great as to warrant refusal of the application... The proposed dwellings are located far enough from all existing dwellings that undue loss of light will not be an issue. There will be some overshadowing to gardens, particularly in the afternoons, and the worst case is Plot 32, where the proposed two storey house is only 2.5 metres from the boundary with the neighbour to the east. Due to the close proximity of the proposed dwelling to the boundary it will also be a reasonably dominant feature when viewed from the adjoining neighbour however it is noted the separation distance is well over 12 metres, the recommended minimum distance for rear to flank relationships. Overall, whilst it is accepted that the proposed development will result in some overshadowing to neighbours and that the proposed house on Plot 32 will be a dominant feature when viewed from the neighbour, the scale and form of the new buildings largely complies with the council’s policies pertaining to residential amenity, and refusal on the basis of the limited impacts is not justified and the wider benefits of the proposal outweigh this limited harm.”*

**Traffic, parking and highway safety**

- 6.21 Adopted local plan policy DC5 requires safe access for developments and that the road network can accommodate the traffic arising from the development safely. In consultation, the Highways Authority have provided the following response to the changes proposed with this scheme:
- 6.22 *“The original application (P14/V2757/FUL) was for 68 units and, notably, a financial contribution was requested towards enhancing the bus service through Shrevenham based on a rate of £1,000 per dwelling, i.e. £68,000. The number of dwellings remains unchanged in this application and the amendment relates predominantly to the private house types and mix and alterations to Plot plans. It is noted that the amount of car parking has been increased, although it is unclear whether there are to be nine or eleven additional spaces. However, this it is not of particular concern.*
- 6.23 *The submitted drawing entitled Revisions from Consented Scheme indicates that two of the internal minor access roads are slightly re-aligned. These re-alignments are very minor and are not significant in highway terms. All of the other changes are on-plot modifications. The highway authority therefore has no further comment.”*
- 6.24 Officers are in agreement that the proposed changes to this scheme have a very minor impact on highway safety.

### **Developer Contributions**

- 6.25 A Section 106 agreement was signed with the previous application that provided 40% affordable housing and over £1million in financial contributions to local infrastructure. When a material minor amendment application such as this is made, that alters the housing mix, it is necessary to consider whether a Deed of Variation to that Section 106 agreement is necessary to capture that change in population mix which could have a greater (or lesser) impact on local infrastructure and thus require alterations to the contributions to mitigate that impact.
- 6.26 With this application, there is a slight increase in the number of larger units. Whilst the vast majority of contributions have been calculated on a “per unit” basis and thus remain unchanged, primary education contributions are calculated on a “per bedroom” basis. Therefore, Oxfordshire County Council’s Education team has identified that this contribution needs to increase from the previously agreed £233,146 to £242,179 (both index-linked to Quarter 1 of 2012 so an indexing up-lift will take the total actually payable today to £289,798).
- 6.27 Officers are satisfied that this contribution remains necessary, relevant and proportionate as required by the NPPF. Through the use of a Deed of Variation there are no concerns about “double-counting” the primary school contribution from this site in terms of pooling.

### **7.0 CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 The proposed changes to the approved scheme with this material minor amendment are not considered to have a material impact on the overall impact of this previously approved scheme. The changes largely involve the introduction of new house types that are comparable in quality to those previously approved and the substitution of already approved house types between plots. The character of the area will not be materially affected by these changes.
- 7.2 It is acknowledged that the housing mix now proposed deviates further from the requirements of the Oxfordshire SHMA. However, the loss of two smaller units from a scheme of 68 houses is not considered to cause significant harm when compared to that previously approved. Impacts on existing and future residential amenity, and highway safety, remain as approved.
- 7.3 An increased burden on Shrivenham primary school from the change in housing mix will need to be mitigated through a Deed of Variation to the previously agreed Section 106 to secure a larger financial contribution to assist the expansion of Shrivenham primary school. Subject to this, and the recommended conditions, this application should be approved.

### **8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**It is recommended that authority to grant planning permission is delegated to the head of planning subject to:**

- 1. A deed of variation to the previous S106 agreement being entered into with the county council in order to secure increased contributions towards expansion of the local primary school; and**
- 2. Conditions as follows:**
  - 1. Commencement within 18 months of original consent (25 August 2015).**

2. Approved plans.
3. Materials as approved.
4. Boundary walls and fences as approved.
5. Removal of permitted development rights for all extensions.
6. Landscaping as approved.
7. Development to be accordance with approved arboricultural method statement.
8. Protection of trees as agreed.
9. Surface water drainage strategy to be agreed.
10. Foul water drainage strategy to be agreed.
11. Implementation of agreed flow and pressure water supply tests.
12. Implementation of agreed water supply upgrades.
13. Written scheme of archaeology as agreed.
14. Programme and record of archaeological work as agreed.
15. Construction traffic management plan as agreed.
16. Travel information packs to be agreed.
17. Access, parking and turning as agreed.
18. New estate roads as agreed.
19. Footpaths as agreed.
20. No surface water drainage to highway.
21. Wildlife protection and mitigation as agreed.
22. Obscure glazing for plots 30 and 31.
23. LEAP details to be agreed.
24. Fire hydrants as agreed.
25. Noise attenuation as agreed.
26. Slab levels as agreed.
27. Spine road speed controls as agreed.
28. Permitted development restriction on satellite dishes on apartment block.
29. Side facing windows in Plot 2 to be agreed.

Author: Peter Brampton  
Email: [peter.brampton@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:peter.brampton@southandvale.gov.uk)  
Tel: 07717 271509