

## **Application Number 16/00856/OUT**

<b>Proposal</b>	Outline application for residential development and associated works.
<b>Site Location</b>	Former Samuel Laycock School, Mereside, Stalybridge.
<b>Applicant</b>	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
<b>Recommendation</b>	Approve

### **REPORT**

#### **1.0 Application Description**

- 1.1 This planning application seeks outline permission for residential development with only access included for approval at this stage at a former school site at Mereside in Stalybridge.
- 1.2 As the application is in outline all details of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping are reserved for later applications, however, an indicative layout drawing has been submitted with the application which shows a mixture of 30 detached and semi-detached dwellings, fronting a central access road with open space to the east and western sides. The submitted transport statement is based on a notional 29 dwellings.
- 1.3 Vehicular access is shown to use the existing access via Mereside off Lake Road. Car parking is shown on the submitted indicative layout within the curtilage of each of the proposed dwellings.
- 1.4 The following documents have been submitted in support of the application: -
- Arboricultural Survey Report
  - Contaminated Land Desk Study Risk Assessments
  - Design and Access Statement
  - Ecological Site Audit
  - Flood Risk Assessment
  - Planning Statement
  - Proposed Access Arrangement
  - Schematic Masterplan
  - Statement of Community Involvement
  - Transport Statement
  - Topographical Survey
  - Tree Survey and Constraints
- 1.5 Tameside Council as the applicant undertook a community engagement exercise in relation to the application in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement prior to the submission of the application, which comprised sending newsletters to 998 homes in the locality explaining the proposals and inviting attendance to a public exhibition. Opportunities were given to provide feedback on the proposals before, during and after the exhibition.
- 1.6 The statement of community involvement submitted with the application outlines the consultation and responses received, these centre around transport and drainage issues as well as the need for more housing.

#### **2.0 SITE & SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site is 1.38 hectares in area and is located to the north of Mereside and Lake Road, Stalybridge. Existing residential development lies to the south of

the site and the area is characterized by a mix of detached, semi detached and terraced properties. Stamford Park, a Grade II registered park and garden, lies to the west and north of the site. A footpath runs outside of the site along the southern and eastern boundaries.

- 2.2 The site is the grounds of the former Samuel Laycock School, which was replaced on a new site at Broadoak Road. The former school has been demolished and all that remains is the concrete foundation slab and tarmac areas which formed the car park and playground areas. Land levels across the site are characterized by two plateaus with a slight fall from east to west and a sharp bank in between approximately two thirds of the way across the site. There is a further fall in levels outside of the site to the east towards Stamford Park. The site is currently surrounded by tall palisade security fencing and is generally unkempt.
- 2.3 The site is within 400m of the nearest primary school, and 1km of the nearest doctors' surgery.
- 2.4 The nearest bus stop to the site is 350m away at Springs Lane with 2 bus services running hourly and half hourly. The nearest railway station is at Stalybridge approximately 1.2km from the site which operates 2 regular services providing links to Leeds, Manchester and Liverpool. As such the site has good access to public transport and it is considered to be a sustainable location for residential development.

### **3.0 PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1 12/00217/NDM – Notification of Demolition of school buildings – Granted April 2012

### **4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES**

- 4.1 Tameside Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Allocation  
Part Green Belt.  
Part protected green space

#### **4.2 Tameside UDP**

##### **4.2.1 Part 1 Policies**

- 1.3: Creating a Cleaner and Greener Environment.  
1.4: Providing More Choice and Quality Homes.  
1.5: Following the Principles of Sustainable Development  
1.12: Ensuring an Accessible, Safe and Healthy Environment

##### **4.2.2 Part 2 Policies**

- H2: Unallocated Sites.  
H7: Mixed Use and Density.  
OL1: Protection of the Green Belt  
OL4: Protected Green Space.  
OL10: Landscape Quality and Character  
T1: Highway Improvement and Traffic Management.  
T11: Travel Plans.  
C1: Townscape and Urban Form  
C9: Historic Parks and Gardens  
N4: Trees and Woodland.  
N5: Trees Within Development Sites.  
N7: Protected Species  
MW11: Contaminated Land.  
U3: Water Services for Developments

### **4.3 Other Policies**

- 4.3.1 Greater Manchester Spatial Framework – Publication Draft October 2016
- The Greater Manchester Joint Waste Development Plan Document April 2012
- The Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Development Plan Document April 2013
- Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document
- Trees and Landscaping on Development Sites SPD adopted in March 2007.
- Tameside Playing Pitch Strategy

### **4.4 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

- 4.4.1 Section 1 Delivering sustainable development
- Section 6 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- Section 7 Requiring good design
- Section 8 Promoting healthy communities
- Section 9 Protecting Green Belt land

### **4.5 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)**

This is intended to complement the NPPF and to provide a single resource for planning guidance, whilst rationalising and streamlining the material. Almost all previous planning Circulars and advice notes have been cancelled. Specific reference will be made to the PPG or other national advice in the Analysis section of the report, where appropriate.

### **5.0 PUBLICITY CARRIED OUT**

- 5.1 As part of the planning application process 28 notification letters were sent out to neighbouring properties on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2016 a notice was also posted at the site and displayed in a local newspaper on 29<sup>th</sup> September 2016.

### **6.0 RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES**

- 6.1 Arboricultural Officer: The site contains a number of Category B trees as per accompanying tree report. Any development plans should aim to retain as many of these as possible. A landscape design should include suitable replacement planting for any losses.
- 6.2 United Utilities: No objection to the proposed development subject to conditions requiring details of foul and surface water drainage are attached to any approval.
- 6.3 Greater Manchester Ecological Unit: This previously developed site does not have substantive ecological value, therefore no overall objections to the scheme on ecological grounds. The Landscape context of the site is important; recommend that a detailed Landscape Plan be prepared for the site.
- 6.4 Environmental Health Contaminated Land: recommend that a standard contaminated land condition is attached to any planning approval granted for residential development at the site. The information provided to date will go some way towards satisfying the requirements of this planning condition.
- 6.5 Highways: Anticipate that the development will generate slightly less traffic overall than the previous school use, though peak traffic is likely to be at a different time of day. It is judged that the development traffic will not impact significantly on the local highway network. Conditions suggested.
- 6.6 Councillor Janet Jackson: Supports the development.

6.7 A letter has also been received from Jonathan Reynolds MP in support of his constituent.

## **7.0 SUMMARY OF THIRD PARTY RESPONSES RECEIVED**

7.1 In response to the original notifications 2 objections have been received from 2 households both from Mereside. The grounds given for objecting are:

### **Transport**

- No road has been planned for the front of nos.13 to 19 Mereside.
- Danger from heavy construction traffic.
- Footpath to 13 to 19 Mereside is in very poor state of repair.
- Possibility of parking / access restrictions for residents.
- Previous development has led to problems with parking and access and damaged roads.
- Access for emergency vehicles including existing properties.
- Deterioration of local roads
- Number of accidents on local roads

### **Amenity**

- Loss of light to properties on Mereside.
- Disruption from building / construction traffic.
- 30 houses too many for area.
- Proximity to frontage of home

### **Drainage**

- Query whether utilities (drainage etc) will be adequate for the project.
- Estate on a Spring.
- Land is always marshy and floods when it rains.
- Previous development has put a severe strain on an already over stretched drainage system.
- Often the drains burst and sewage is flooded into gardens proposed thirty more properties will put an even greater strain on the overstretched drainage system.

### **Crime / Disorder**

- Access / paths provided by previous development have led to break-ins.

### **General**

- Previous developments used piled foundations which has led to damage to surrounding properties.

## **8.0 Assessment**

8.1 The principal issues in determining this application are:

- Principle of Development and effect on protected Green Space
- Layout, Design and Landscaping
- Amenity
- Highway Safety and Accessibility
- Ground Conditions
- Ecology
- Trees
- Drainage, Flood Risk
- Green Belt
- Heritage
- Minerals
- Planning Obligations

## **9.0 Principle of development and effect on protected Green Space**

- 9.1 Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, states that applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Consideration will also be necessary to determine the appropriate weight to be afforded to the development plan following the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraphs 208 - 219 of the NPPF set out how its policies should be implemented and the weight which should be attributed to the UDP policies. Paragraph 215 confirms that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. At the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development and would support the delivery of a wide choice of quality homes with housing applications being considered in the context of a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 9.2 In terms of emerging policy the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) has recently gone out to consultation on a publication draft. This document is at a very early stage in the adoption process and as such cannot be afforded weight as a material consideration. In any event the GMSF does not propose any alteration to the green belt or other boundaries that would affect the principle of the proposal. The application is identified in the evidence base for the GMSF as well as the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) as a possible development site but it has not been brought forward into the current publication draft as a strategic housing site.
- 9.3 In policy terms the land is comprised of Protected Green Space and Green Belt. The part of the site designated as Green Belt, however, is not shown to be developed and this matter is considered separately under section 16 below. Whilst designated as protected green space the land is comprised of both previously developed land upon which the school buildings stood and the remains of the school playing field to the east. UDP policy H2 confirms that the Council will generally permit the redevelopment of previously developed land for residential use. In this case, the site is no longer in active use as an education site and currently lies vacant, and can therefore be deemed as previously developed (in part) and available. The key issue is therefore the effect of the development upon the protected green space and the Green Belt.

### **Effect upon Protected Green Space**

- 9.4 Being allocated as protected green space, the site lies immediately to the east of Stamford Park and although small in area the playing fields are not a site on which the Council would normally grant permission for built development.
- 9.5 Policy (OL4) seeks to retain areas of protected green space but does, however, allow for sites to be released for built development in light of certain considerations. One such consideration is if a playing field or green space which will be lost as a result of a proposed development would be replaced by a playing field or green space of an equivalent or better quality and quantity, in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements, prior to commencement of development. This wording is broadly equivalent to the provision within paragraph 74 of the NPPF.
- 9.6 In the case of this site the area of playing field is small and is partially occupied by a steep slope. As the site also became redundant as part of the New Charter academies programme Samuel Laycock School has been replaced complete with new playing fields on an alternative site and as such alternative provision has already been made.

- 9.7 The Council's playing pitch strategy also confirms that the site is no longer required and as the site does not appear to have ever accommodated a formal pitch and in any event has been disused for over 5 years no consultation with Sport England is required or indeed appropriate.
- 9.8 As such the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of Policy OL4 and with the NPPF (Section 8).

## **10.0 Green Belt**

- 10.1 Part of the eastern side of the site is designated Green Belt, policy OL1 states that the Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development and approval will not be given for the construction of new buildings except in specific purposes. The wording of this policy is slightly at variance with updated guidance in paragraph 89 of the NPPF, however, the fundamental requirement to keep Green Belts open and only to allow built development for specific purposes or where very special circumstances can be demonstrated remains.
- 10.2 The indicative layout submitted with the scheme shows the part of the site designated as Green Belt being kept clear of any additional development and is shown instead as open space. Paragraph 89 of the NPPF specifically includes the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation as an exception to the general requirement not to allow development in the Green Belt and as such the use set out in the indicative scheme is not inappropriate in the Green Belt or harmful to its openness.
- 10.3 The indicative scheme shows that the site can be developed without harm to the openness of the Green Belt, however, as this is a point of principle and despite layout being a reserved matter a condition will need to be applied to ensure that any reserved matters consent does not encroach upon the Green Belt.

## **11.0 Layout, Design and Landscaping**

- 11.1 Whilst the layout of the site is a reserved matter the application is accompanied by an indicative drawing showing how the site could be laid out. The layout shows a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings fronting a single access road. Areas of open space are shown to the eastern and western sides of the site.
- 11.2 Existing trees are shown to be largely retained by the indicative layout, including those to either side of the entrance and those to the northern boundary. Whilst little planting is shown to the boundaries of the site and landscaping is a reserved matter ample space is available to increase planting to the margins of the site to improve the appearance of the development and 'filter' views from outside the site. The applicant has also produced an updated layout drawing showing that additional planting to the boundaries of the site can be achieved to 'feather' the edge of the development and integrate it further into its surroundings. It is also noted that thick tree belts already exist outside of the site which would screen views from the north and the east and that further benefits are likely to arise from the redevelopment of the site including the regeneration of the site and removal of palisade fencing.
- 11.3 The overall density of development is approximately 22 units per hectare, but this includes the green belt area to the east which cannot be developed and the buffer areas maintained to the western side with Stamford Park.
- 11.4 Although, ultimately, a reserved matter, officers are satisfied the indicative layout successfully demonstrates that up to 30 houses could be accommodated on this site and that policies H7 and OL10 can be satisfied.

## **12.0 Amenity**

- 12.1 In terms of amenity the layout and scale of the development are reserved matters, however, the general impact of the development can be considered and some conclusions can be drawn from the indicative layout drawing provided.
- 12.2 The Council's Residential Design SPD sets out minimum distances between habitable rooms and blank walls of 21m and 14m respectively, these distance are moderated where steep slopes exist or where development is at an angle. The submitted indicative layout within the site complies with the requirements of the Residential Design SPD.
- 12.3 Whilst neighbours have commented on the likely impact of the development on neighbouring properties a good separation distance is also maintained from the majority of houses neighbouring the development and those shown on the indicative layout.
- 12.4 It is clear that the distance between one of the detached dwellings to the south eastern corner of the indicative layout and the neighbouring property at 13 Mereside would require closer examination at reserved matters stage with regard to the detailed relationship between existing principal windows and the position of the proposed dwelling, however, as approval is not sought for layout at this stage it would not be appropriate to resist the application on this basis.
- 12.5 Comments have also been received from neighbours regarding the potential for disruption from construction traffic and regarding the issues which have been caused by piling to other nearby developments. Some level of disruption is an inevitable consequence of development and this cannot be used as a reason to resist planning proposals. Conditions are suggested to mitigate some of the impacts in terms of the hours in which works can be carried out and to agree a methodology for piling of foundations if this technique is proposed to be used.
- 12.6 Officers are satisfied that the site is capable of accommodating residential development in a manner which would not be unduly detrimental to the amenities of occupants of neighbouring dwellings subject to conditions. This matter will, however, require further detailed consideration at reserved matters stage.

## **13.0 Highway Safety and Accessibility**

- 13.1 The application is supported by a transport statement which sets out the sustainable transport options for the site and analyses the likely impact in terms of traffic generation.
- 13.2 As outlined above the application site is in a sustainable transport location with good access to local services as well as bus and rail services.
- 13.3 Vehicular access to the site will continue to be taken off Mereside via the existing access arrangements. The footpath which runs to the south and east of the site would be unaffected. Additional points of access are also likely to be created for pedestrians, although the exact details of such arrangements will be addressed as part of the final layout at reserved matters stage.
- 13.4 The use of the existing access allows for 2 groups of trees either side of the access to be retained as part of the proposals.
- 13.5 As a school site the previous use would have generated significant vehicle movements, a fact reflected in the submitted transport statement (TS) which identifies a net reduction of 12 vehicle movements in the morning peak and a reduction of 3 in the evening peak based on 29 dwellings.

- 13.6 The traffic generated by the development would thus not materially exceed that generated by the previous school use of the site. Due to the relatively low volume of traffic expected a travel plan is not required.
- 13.7 A number of objections are raised on grounds of highways safety and convenience, however, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal would result in any issues over and above those which arose from the former use of the site as a school.
- 13.8 In overall terms therefore officers are satisfied that the proposed development is acceptable in terms of access, highway safety and parking provision and the development complies with UDP Policies T1, T7, T10 and T11 as well as Section 4 of the NPPF.

#### **14.0 Ground Conditions**

- 13.1 The application is supported by a contaminated land risk assessment, the Council's Environmental Health Contaminated Land officer has reviewed this document and has confirmed that whilst there are some issues to still be addressed but have no objections subject to a standard contaminated land condition. The information provided to date will go some way towards satisfying the requirements of this planning condition and there is no evidence to suggest that any contamination that may be present on site cannot adequately be dealt with.
- 14.2 The site is not in an area at risk from former coal workings and the development is acceptable in accordance with policy MW11: Contaminated Land.

#### **15.0 Ecology**

- 15.1 The application is accompanied by a baseline ecology audit including phase 1 habitat survey. This has been assessed by GMEU who agree that the site has no substantive ecological value and do not object to the scheme on ecological grounds. Both the baseline ecology report and GMEU highlight the significance of existing trees on site, which is addressed below in section 16 of this report and highlight the importance of any tree removal taking place outside of the bird nesting season (March to August) which can be secured by condition.
- 15.2 The proposals would not have any adverse effect upon protected species and are thus in accordance with policy N7: Protected Species.

#### **16.0 Trees**

- 16.1 The application site has a number of trees of varying maturity predominantly located to the perimeter.
- 16.2 As outlined above the retention of the existing access point allows the retention of two substantial groups of trees either side of the existing access. The submitted indicative layout shows the removal of 4 category C (low value) and 2 category B (intermediate value) trees. The submitted layout also shows the possibility for 14 replacement trees and an additional plan has also been submitted which shows in excess of 50 new trees on site.
- 16.3 The Council's tree officer has been consulted and comments that the development plans should aim to retain as many of the category B trees as possible and a landscape design should include suitable replacement planting for any losses. Given that only 2 category B trees are shown to be lost on the indicative scheme with potential for over 50 replacements it is considered that this requirement is met and the development accords with the requirements of policies N4 and N5.



## **17.0 Drainage, Flood Risk**

- 17.1 The application site is located in Environment Agency flood zone 1, the area with the lowest probability of fluvial (river) flooding. As a major development proposal the application is accompanied by a flood risk assessment.
- 17.2 The submitted flood risk assessment identifies a low risk of surface water groundwater flooding and there is no record of historic sewer flooding.
- 17.3 United Utilities state they have no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions requiring details of foul and surface water drainage. Whilst neighbour comments query whether drainage will be adequate, United Utilities have been engaged at pre – application stage and raise no concerns regarding sewer capacity or objections to the development.
- 17.4 In the absence of any technical objection the proposal is considered to accord with policy U3.

## **18.0 Heritage**

- 18.1 The application lies immediately to the east of Stamford Park, a Grade II Listed Park and Garden, but due to the set back from the park, combined with a change in levels and the relationship of the site to the broader built-up area to the south the proposal is not considered to have an impact upon the setting of the park.
- 18.2 The proposal is therefore considered to accord with policy C9.

## **19.0 Minerals**

- 19.1 Parts of the site are located within Mineral Safeguarding Areas within the Greater Manchester Minerals Plan for Brickclay and Sandstone, although it is noted that the footprint of the former school buildings is not.
- 19.2 The designation of Mineral Safeguarding Areas is intended to prevent the sterilization of mineral resources by development which would preclude their later extraction. Development is not precluded as long as consideration is given to extraction of these minerals prior to development or the value of the development is considered to outweigh the value of the underlying mineral resources.
- 19.3 In this case the application site is constrained by its size and location in that it can only be accessed through a residential area and the site is relatively small. As such, mineral extraction is unlikely to be a suitable activity in the area or economically viable. It is also considered that the need for the development of the site for housing outweighs the need to extract the underlying minerals and the proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy 8 of the Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Development Plan.

## **20.0 Developer Obligations**

- 20.1 As the development is on Council – owned land there is no requirement for any S106 obligations.

## **21.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion**

- 21.1 At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, this requires planning applications that accord with the development plan to be approved without delay and where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date granting permission unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the

framework as a whole or specific policies in the framework indicate that development should be restricted.

- 21.2 The application site does not have a particular designation for residential use and as such a decision as to whether or not it is suitable for development must be made balancing the social, economic and environmental benefits and dis-benefits of the proposal.
- 21.3 The redevelopment of the site would bring about a number of benefits including: -
- Re – use of a redundant site
  - Visual amenity improvements
  - Additional planting / ecological improvements
  - Contribution to housing need in the borough
  - Short term employment
  - Economic contributions by future occupants
- 21.4 In terms of dis-benefits the development would involve some short term noise and disruption during construction. Some low level impact upon outlook and privacy may also be anticipated but this is not unusual with new residential development.
- 21.5 On balance it is therefore considered that the benefits of the scheme clearly outweigh any dis-benefits and planning permission should therefore be granted.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

To grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out below:-

1. Application for approval of reserved matters must be made not later than the expiry of three years beginning with the date of this permission and the development must be begun not later than the expiry of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.
2. Before any development is commenced approval shall first be obtained from the local planning authority with respect to the reserved matters, namely the layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping of the development.
3. The plans and particulars to be submitted with the reserved matters shall include full details of both hard and soft landscape works, inclusive of existing vegetation cover and ancillary built structures. These details shall include:-
  - a) hard - existing and proposed finished levels or contours, means of enclosure, car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas, hard surfacing materials, minor artefacts and structures [eg: furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc], proposed and existing functional services above and below ground [eg; drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc indicating lines, manholes, supports etc];
  - b) soft - planting plans, written specifications [including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment], schedule of plants [noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate], implementation programme).
4. The plans and particulars to be submitted with the reserved matters shall include details of the existing and proposed ground levels for the whole site, and the proposed finished floor levels of the dwellings.

5. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: the location plan drawing reference 8451-16 and, in so far as it relates to access to the site only drawing ref. SL-CL-5202 'Samuel Laycock Proposed Access Arrangement'.

6. Development shall not commence until the following information has been submitted in writing and written permission at each stage has been granted by the Local Planning Authority;

i) A preliminary risk assessment to determine the potential for the site to be contaminated shall be undertaken and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Prior to any physical site investigation, a methodology shall be approved by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include an assessment to determine the nature and extent of any contamination affecting the site and the potential for off-site migration.

ii) Where necessary a scheme of remediation to remove any unacceptable risk to human health, buildings and the environment shall be approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to implementation.

iii) Any additional or unforeseen contamination encountered during development shall be notified to the Local Planning Authority as soon as practicably possible and a remedial scheme to deal with this approved by the Local Planning Authority.

iv) Upon completion of any approved remediation schemes, and prior to occupation, a completion report demonstrating that the scheme has been appropriately implemented and the site is suitable for its intended end use shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The discharge of this planning condition will be given in writing by the Local Planning Authority on completion of the development and once all information specified within this condition and other requested information have been provided to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and occupation/use of the development shall not commence until this time, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

7. No development or works of site preparation shall take place until all trees that are to be retained within or adjacent to the site have been enclosed with temporary protective fencing in accordance with BS:5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. The fencing shall be retained throughout the period of construction and no activity prohibited by BS:5837:2012 shall take place within such protective fencing during the construction period.

8. Prior to the commencement of any development, a surface water drainage scheme, based on the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance with evidence of an assessment of the site conditions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage scheme must be in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or any subsequent replacement national standards and unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no surface water shall be discharged to the public sewerage system either directly or indirectly unless specifically otherwise agreed in writing. Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems unless otherwise agreed in writing and in the event of surface water draining to the public surface water sewer, the pass forward flow rate to the public sewer must be restricted to 24 l/s. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details

10. The gradient of driveways shall not be steeper than 1 in 15.

11. The development shall not commence until details of the wheel cleaning facilities, temporary access, vehicle parking and turning facilities to be provided during the construction period, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These measures shall be implemented and retained in operation through the duration of the building works
12. Prior to commencement of work on site, the proposed car parking provision shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The car parking spaces shall be provided and thereafter kept unobstructed and available for their intended purposes. Parking areas or driveways must be at least 3.1 metres wide and 6 metres long where in front of house doors or 5.5 metres long where in front of a garage. The areas shall be maintained and kept available for the parking of vehicles at all times.
13. The development shall not commence until details of a lighting scheme to provide street lighting (to national standards), to any shared private driveway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of how the lighting will be funded for both electricity supply and future maintenance. The approved works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development.
14. During demolition and construction no work (including vehicle and plant movements, deliveries, loading and unloading) shall take place outside the hours of 07:30 and 18:00 Mondays to Fridays and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays. No work shall take place on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
15. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the road works and traffic management measures necessary to secure satisfactory access to the site have been completed in accordance with details having been agreed in writing previously with the local planning authority.
16. No tree felling or vegetation removal shall take place during the optimum period for bird nesting (March to July inclusive) unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
17. Piled foundations shall not be used in the development unless and until a method for their construction has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
18. The area of the site designated as Green Belt and shown on the schematic masterplan as public open space shall only be used for the purpose of public open space and shall not be developed for housing.