

REPORT TO THE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date of Meeting	04 June 2024
Application Number	PL/2024/02330
Site Address	B4069, Lyneham Banks, Lyneham
Proposal	Reinstatement of a stretch of approximately 140m of the B4069, the Lyneham Banks section, located 2km northwest of Lyneham, including associated engineering, land drainage works and demolition.
Applicant	Wiltshire Council
Town/Parish Council	Dauntsey/Lyneham & Bradenstoke
Division	Brinkworth & Lyneham
Grid Ref	OS X:400821 Y:179779
Type of application	Full Planning, Major
Case Officer	Callan Powers

Reason for the application being considered by Committee

This application is made by or on behalf of Wiltshire Council (a 'Regulation 3') application, and an objection has been received. According to the Council's Scheme of Delegation the application is therefore not to be determined under delegated powers but instead by the Strategic Planning Committee.

1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to assess the merits of the application proposal against the policies of the development plan and other material considerations and to consider the Officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

2. Report Summary

The application seeks planning permission for engineering works intended to restore a section of road outside Lyneham following significant damage necessitating its closure. The key planning matters to be considered are:

- The principle of development;
- The landscape impact;
- Highways matters; and
- The ecological impact.

The application has been the subject of three representations made by members of the public; one of these is in objection to the proposal. No objections are outstanding from internal or statutory consultees.

3. Site Description

The application site is an area of land on the hillside below the village of Lyneham and above Dauntsey Lock. The main feature of the site is the course of the B4069, a single carriageway route leading between the respective villages. The hillside suffered a major landslide in February 2022, causing significant damage to the road and putting it out of use since that time. Other incidents have necessitated remediation, perhaps most significantly in 1981, since which time the road is also known to have required repeated piecemeal repairs over time prior to this more significant event. It is this affected stretch of the road that forms the focal part of the application site; land to either side of the road is also included within the site.

The escarpment on which the site sits slopes downwards from the south, while the road passes in a diagonal direction relative to this orientation. There is a change in elevation of around 30 metres across the site, with still much of the hill sited further below the site.

Land within the site to the north of the road is in agricultural use. The parcel of land above the road is the location of a site on which a dwelling was previously situated, and on which planning permission was granted in 2019 for a replacement dwelling.

4. Planning History

No planning history has direct bearing on the consideration of this application. Part of the site contains land on which planning permission was granted in 2019 under Application No. 19/00670/FUL for a replacement dwelling.

5. The Proposal

This application proposes the restoration of access along the B4069 route for vehicular traffic. The road itself is to be repaired, whilst engineering works are also proposed with a view to preventing recurrence of land stability problems affecting this section of road.

The engineering works, beyond the structure of the road itself shown in the supplied section, include works above and below the road intended to respond to the pressures to which the road has been subject in the long term. These proposals result from engineering reports and in particular a ground investigation report.

On the slope above the road the land is to be regraded, with a pattern of herringbone and counterfort drains to be installed, intended to assist the drainage of the land so that the water table will not so readily affect ground stability. The buildings in this site, including that partially completed, are to be demolished and fill removed from the site, as it is understood to be likely that the additional weight on this part of the site contributed to the magnitude of the most recent landslide event. It is intended that no buildings will remain on this land.

North of the road further land drainage measures are proposed to divert water from the site towards drainage ditches including via a culvert towards a new drainage ditch to the west. There is to be a new retaining wall to reinforce the lower edge of the road.

6. Planning Policy

Wiltshire Core Strategy

Core Policy 48 – Supporting Rural Life

Core Policy 50 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Core Policy 51 – Landscape

Core Policy 52 – Green Infrastructure

Core Policy 56 – Contaminated Land
Core Policy 57 – Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping
Core Policy 60 – Sustainable Transport

North Wiltshire Local Plan (saved policies) adopted June 2006
None relevant

Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations DPD adopted February 2020
None relevant

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) adopted December 2023
2, 4, 10, 11, 38, 47

7. Consultations

Ecology

No objection subject to conditions:

“Thank you for consulting me on the above application. I have reviewed the submitted documents against OS maps, aerial photographs of the site and surrounding area, together with GIS layers of statutory and non-statutory designated sites and existing records of protected species.

The application site does not lie within or immediately adjacent to any statutory or non-statutory designated sites for conservation, or any notably sensitive areas for protected species.

Comprehensive survey of the site has been undertaken by ecologists from Atkins Realis, which gives sufficient detail to be able to assess the potential impacts likely to result from this project, on local wildlife populations.

The nature of the works is such that temporary disturbance of habitats is likely, on a relatively small scale, with negligible residual effects. There is scope for habitat enhancement that will increase functionality of the habitats within the site for wildlife in the longer term. The surveys by Atkins Realis confirm that if construction works employ precautionary measures, there will be no direct impacts on local populations of wildlife species.

Recommendations are given within the ecology reports and the DAS for precautionary working methods to ensure that sensitive habitats and species within the site area are given due regard and protected from harm during the works. These recommendations should be incorporated into the overarching Construction Ecological Management Plan to ensure their implementation.

Since the nature of the works is to restore the highway to safe and practical usage, will restore adjacent habitats and since the footprint is almost entirely within the highway corridor, I do not consider that this proposal will result in loss of habitat to development, therefore the requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain is not triggered.

I am therefore happy to support the application, with the following conditions imposed:

Conditions:

1. Compliance with agreed plans and drawings

Recommendations made in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report. Atkin Realis. September 2022

Recommendations made in the Protected Species Report. Atkins Realis, February 2024.

Proposed Site Plans - LYN-ATK-GEN-XX-DR-CH-000006_C01 and LYN-ATK-GEN-XX-DR-CH-000007_C01

2. Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP)

Prior to the commencement of works, including demolition, ground works/excavation, site clearance, vegetation clearance and boundary treatment works, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. The Plan shall provide details of the avoidance, mitigation and protective measures to be implemented before and during the construction phase, including but not necessarily limited to, the following:

- a. Identification of ecological protection areas/buffer zones and tree root protection areas and details of physical means of protection, e.g. exclusion fencing.
- b. Working method statements for protected/priority species, such as nesting birds and reptiles.
- c. Mitigation strategies already agreed with the local planning authority prior to determination, such as for great crested newts, dormice or bats; this should comprise the pre-construction/construction related elements of strategies only.
- d. Work schedules for activities with specific timing requirements in order to avoid/reduce potential harm to ecological receptors; including details of when a licensed ecologist and/or ecological clerk of works (ECoW) shall be present on site.
- e. Key personnel, responsibilities and contact details (including Site Manager and ecologist/ECoW).

Development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved CEMP.

REASON: To ensure adequate protection and mitigation for ecological receptors prior to and during construction, and that works are undertaken in line with current best practice and industry standards and are supervised by a suitably licensed and competent professional ecological consultant where applicable.

3. Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP)

Prior to the start of construction, a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP will include long term objectives and targets, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for each ecological feature within the development, together with a mechanism for monitoring success of the management prescriptions, incorporating review and necessary adaptive management in order to attain targets. The LEMP shall be implemented in full and for a minimum period of 5 years, to ensure establishment and development of suitable natural features within the site.

REASON: To ensure the successful establishment of landscape and ecological features retained and created by the development, for the benefit of visual amenity and biodiversity for the lifetime of the scheme.”

Climate Team

No objection, following receipt of additional information:

“I have met with the developer to discuss the project and reviewed their additional submission from 16 April 2024. The submission provides information to demonstrate compliance with CP41 of the development plan because it adequately demonstrates a low-carbon strategy for the proposal. Furthermore, it provides information to indicate that the

developer has in the design choices considered issues of climate change adaptation and resilience, alongside decarbonisation. They have also indicated that these are factors that are being considered as the project evolves and approaches construction.

Information has now been provided to show that a balance is being struck between minimising embodied carbon emissions and making the scheme more resilient to the impacts of climate change. This is positive. Furthermore, re-instating this infrastructure should reduce elevated carbon emissions from diverted vehicle movements. This is also positive environmentally. This is a route that contributes positively in social and economic terms and information has been provided to demonstrate that it should continue to do so for many decades while surface transport decarbonisation occurs.”

Drainage

No objection:

“I have reviewed the application on behalf of the councils drainage team.

The LDC application has been reviewed separately and recommended for approval.

Based on the submitted documents, it is understood that the proposals will help to reduce future landslide issues to the B4069, and will replace highways drainage on a like for like basis in the impacted area.

Based on the FRA, the site is not at significant risk of flooding from any source, and would be sequentially appropriate in line with the NPPF with its classification as Essential Infrastructure.

The proposed solutions provide the required 20% betterment in discharge rates in line with Wiltshire Council's betterment policies, and therefore do not increase flood risk elsewhere.

Submitted hydraulic modelling demonstrates that the drainage will be designed for no flooding within the 1 in 30yr RP event as per Wiltshire Council requirements.

The drainage team therefore have no objection to the proposed works as per the submitted plans.”

Archaeology

No objection:

“The archaeological desk-based assessment submitted in support of this application has sufficiently characterised the archaeological potential of the application area. I am therefore satisfied that no further form of archaeological mitigation is necessary.”

Tockenham Parish Council

“... Strongly support this application.”

Lyneham and Bradenstoke Parish Council

No objection.

Dauntsey Parish Council

No objection:

“The Council has no objection to the proposals and trusts that the application can be determined in the shortest possible timeframe as the road closure has had a significant detrimental impact on local lives.”

Public Protection

No objection:

“We have been consulted re: PL/2024/02330 -B4069, Lyneham Banks, Lyneham.

Having read through the contaminated land report, we would agree that an asbestos watching brief should be adopted during road development for the safety of construction workers.”

Landscape

Comments as follows:

“I note the further submission of the requested cross section of the road at 1:20 Scale, this is helpful and better illustrates that green road verges will be reinstated, it shows the relationship of the retaining wall with adjoining fields to the north of the road, and illustrates the location of the required highway safety barrier. I note that there will be no replacement tree planting, either north or south side of the repaired section to compensate for tree removals or within the reinstated hedgerow to provide hedgerow trees. This is likely to be due to future conflict of tree roots with the cut off and roadside drainage infrastructure, which I accept etc.

It would have been preferable if the proposed square section timber road side post and rail fence was located to the rear of the replanted hedge, along the field boundary which also corresponds with the Highway Boundary on the submitted plans and section drawing, so that the hedge eventually screens this fence.

Otherwise no further comments, and I accept there will be no need for any landscape pre-commencement conditions.”

Highways

Comments as follows:

“Further to my initial highway comments made on 12th April 2024, I have received additional information in response to queries raised. As noted in my original response, whilst Highways are fully supportive of measures that will bring the failed section of the B4069 at Lyneham Banks back into use, some points of clarification were requested. These in summary were as follows:

- Based on the information supplied, a query on the intended depth of the piled wall sections.
- The means of ensuring adequate maintenance of the land drainage measures was unclear, and information sought on who would take responsibility for this/need for easements.
- Whether any monitoring undertaken here since the surveys in 2022 made any case for extending works to include remedials in the adjacent lengths known to exhibit past issues with slope movement.

Responses have now been received from the project sponsor in the form of an email and supporting plan. These are shown below with my follow-up comments.

Depth of Piled wall section: RESPONSE

- Retaining wall - General Arrangement supplied - Drawing LYN-ATK-SRW-XX-DR-CB-000001
- The piles will be installed to a depth of 12m.
- There will also be micro-piles installed at a 45-degree angle from the capping beam back into the slope, these will be 14m in length.

COMMENT: This is all now clear and shows that the proposed pile depth of 10.57m and capping beam of 1.5m (12.0m overall) will be sufficient to cut-across the identified potential plane of future slip failure.

Maintenance of land drainage: RESPONSE

- We are in advanced talks with both landowners on the delivery of this scheme.
- The intention is to acquire the plot on the southern side of the road, becoming WC land and responsibility for all maintenance.
- On the northern side of the road, we have draft easements and land purchases in place to ensure we have ongoing access for maintenance.
- The majority of land drainage features have been installed with minimal maintenance requirements.
- Where the need is there, suitable easements will be put in place.

COMMENT: I am satisfied that, on this basis, there will be sufficient provision in place to facilitate future WC maintenance of the land drainage asset installed to the north and south of the proposed retaining wall line. It seems to me that the north or down-slope side of the wall may be of greater importance, as any movement here could cause tilting and movement of the wall should the slip plane be close to the bottom of the pile depth. However, this seems unlikely in view of the driven depth.

Further damage to B4069: RESPONSE

- We have been undertaking extensive surveying to the west of the main landslip.
- There is a further package of work that has been developed and will be delivered by the appointed contractor on site.
- We have a number of borehole 'observation points' all the way along this stretch of road which continue to be monitored, and will do so following the completion of the works.
- We will be undertaking works to the west of the main landslip to address current instability issues. These will however be limited to drainage and surface treatments due to the limited budget available.
- The intention is to continue monitoring post reinstatement to make a case for further funding if required.

COMMENT: All noted. It is accepted that budget constraints will affect what can be done in one 'scheme' of construction, and that highway comments are only sought now on what is proposed. I only sought to ascertain as to whether there would be overall 'economy' in addressing some of the movement issues in the adjacent lengths at the same time. However, it is accepted monitoring is ongoing and, dependent on results, the best method of remediation in these adjacent sections (as needed) may not be fully known at this time.

Conclusion

In summary, I would reiterate the point that Highways remain fully supportive of measures that will bring the failed section of the B4069 at Lyneham Banks back into use and that, as far as possible, will ensure long term slope stability in a location where historical ground

movements have been reported over time. Further to my comments made on 12th April, I have now been provided with additional information from the project sponsor which deals adequately with all my points of clarification raised.

I therefore offer no objection to the remediation proposals as presented. Furthermore, I foresee no need for any bespoke highway conditions other than the prior submission and approval of a Construction Management Plan.”

8. Publicity

The application has been the subject of public consultation with letters sent to nearby neighbours and an advert placed in the Wiltshire Gazette and Herald; the application has been available to view and for members of the public to comment on the Wiltshire Council website.

Three representations were received from members of the public.

One representation was in objection to the proposal, as follows:

“As long term residents in this area and having personally experienced the continuous subsidence of the B4069 from the Peterborough Arms all the way up to the Antiques depot for the last 25 years, we must raise our objections to the council wasting millions of pounds of council tax payers money on this project. The council need to grasp the fact that whilst these repairs may stabilise the road, at this point of the road in the area which is rebuilt, they will do nothing to prevent, and may even exacerbate, movement in the rest of the road. This land is historically unstable and instead of throwing more money after bad, the council should be thinking wider and looking for an alternative route on more stable ground.

If these repairs do go ahead, what steps are the council planning to control the weight limits and volume of traffic on this road as these repairs can not be considered a long term solution.”

The remaining two made comments, as follows:

“As a long term resident of The Banks, a road which has had numerous accidents and some spectacular near misses over the years I am writing to the Council to ask if they would consider adding speed restrictions to the planning application for the following reasons:

- 1. Safety of horses and riders which regularly use the road.*
- 2. Safety of pedestrians crossing the road from the footpath above the garage and by the Bradenstoke junction.*
- 3. Enable residents to pull out onto the road without any fear of meeting a speeding car hurtling towards them.*
- 4. Reduction in noise*
- 5. Stop the cars and motorbikes coming to The Banks purely to race up and down it. This happened regularly and could go on for several hours at a time.*

The rebuilt road will be of benefit to the whole of the community. It will be a busy road and it's in all our interests to make it as safe as possible for the people that use it and live along side.”

and

“We are situated 100m on the left past the Bradenstoke turning travelling towards Chippenham. Prior to the road closing traffic regularly exceeded the 40mph speed limit, including hgvs. There is no pavement between the houses down our lane to reach the

current footpath at the Bradenstoke junction or the public footpath used by many Bradenstoke dog walkers. During construction of the new road we ask that you include a footpath linking The Banks to the rest of Lyneham and either reduce the speed limit or put in traffic calming measures.”

9. Planning Considerations

Principle of development

This proposal is to reinstate a long-standing road that has not been abandoned but has been unavailable for use due to a single damaging event. Core Policy 48 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy allows for proposals which improve accessibility between towns and villages, such as transport and infrastructure improvements, where they are not to the detriment of the local environment or local residents.

The loss of the road since the landslip has had a significant impact on the way of life for many villagers in affected settlements, including in Lyneham, Bradenstoke and Dauntsey. Due to the closure of this road, which has necessitated a one-way restriction on Clack Hill nearby, access to many services from the smaller villages has been reliant on more lengthy, unsustainable journeys. The restoration of this road is therefore considered to deliver significant benefits for local residents. Efforts to improve road stability for the long term are welcomed.

Environmental impact on ecological features can be adequately addressed through use of planning conditions. There are no other environmental concerns and the development, by virtue of its support under Core Policy 48, is acceptable in principle.

Landscape impact

The application site is not in an area subject to specific landscape protections. Nevertheless all developments should protect conserve and where possible enhance landscape character according to Core Policy 51 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. Paragraph 180 of the NPPF requires that planning policies and decisions recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

The works involved in reinstating this road involve a greater degree of intervention than was seen as necessary in building the original road. The retaining wall in particular, alongside the fence running along the road, will be visible evidence of the development overall. Nevertheless these elements, which are essential to the long-term success of the scheme, have been approached in a sensitive manner and are not considered to result in unacceptable landscape harm. Indeed, the totality of the development has been considered by the Council's Senior Landscape Officer and, following clarifications provided by the project team, no objection has been raised in terms of landscape impact.

Highways matters

The Council's Strategic Highway Specialist has indicated in his comments in respect of this application that the foundation on which the engineering reports have been generated is sound and, in turn, the use of land drainage measures to enhance ground stability is supported in an effort to restore the road to use.

Questions have been raised as to the extent and size of piling and foundation necessary to provide for the long-term retention of the reinstated road; these are specialised engineering matters. The project team have engaged in dialogue with the Highways Development Control Engineers to provide adequate reassurance in respect of the level of work required.

The project team have indicated that there is an intention to monitor the landslip area following the development to evaluate whether there is a case for further works to maintain stability once achieved. It is understood that data are still being gathered in areas of the road west of the main landslip.

Given these findings and the overall support for re-opening the road, the development is supported in highways terms.

Ecology

The site is not in an area with known significant presence of protected species, and the proposed works do not give cause for concern with respect to habitat loss. The Council's Senior Ecologist proposes that there is limited risk to features of biodiversity other than in the construction phase, and therefore proposes that this risk can be adequately addressed through a condition securing a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). These would need to be secured and approved prior to commencing work on the development. As a result it is concluded that the ecological impact of the development can be made acceptable through use of conditions and this would not form a reason to refuse planning permission.

Archaeology

The application has been supported by archaeological investigation. The report provided is a desk based assessment and explores the likelihood of valuable archaeological features. The report, based on the available information, concludes that no impact to below ground archaeology is expected. The findings of the report have been accepted by the Assistant County Archaeologist and there is no objection from this perspective.

Loss of a dwelling

The proposal will entail the removal of development above the road, on which lawfully a dwelling has historically been sited. The replacement of this dwelling was underway at the time of the landslip and it is the intention to demolish and remove the partially built replacement. The development would ultimately therefore result in the removal of a dwelling unit from Wiltshire's housing stock. This is a material consideration of modest weight weighing negatively against this application. In reality, the ground stability issues associated with the site and the issues with access render it likely to be impracticable to resume the construction of this dwelling in any event, and the weight given to this material consideration is minimised indeed. As a result this issue is not considered to outweigh the significant benefits of restoring the road.

Other matters

The cost of the development has been raised by a member of the public as being of concern. Whilst this may be a matter of public interest, this is not a matter that is material to the consideration of a planning application, which is confined to the performance of the development against planning policy and other material considerations. Whilst material considerations may include 'local finance considerations', section 70 (4) of the Act (as amended) defines such considerations as confined to grants or other financial assistance from the Crown, or sums payable in respect of the Community Infrastructure Levy, which is not understood to be payable in this instance. It is furthermore not for the local planning authority to determine the spending priorities of the Council and highway authority.

Concern has been raised about the speed limit along The Banks, with it being suggested that a 40 mph limit is excessive. This is not a matter for the local planning authority to

consider in this application. It has also been suggested that a footway should be included alongside the road. Whilst it is certainly preferable to widen access via sustainable modes of transport, this application seeks to reinstate an existing route and there is no basis on which to refuse planning permission due to continued lack of a footway.

The submission initially drew objection from the Council's Climate Team due to concerns over the sustainability of returning the road to use given recent and historic stability issues. Additional information has since been provided indicating that the highway construction and drainage are intended to last for the next 60 years, while the more heavy engineering elements of the proposal should last 120 years. Following this explanation and reassurance the Climate Team's objection was withdrawn.

10. Conclusion

The restoration of this road will return accessibility to a range of services and facilities to rural residents of the small villages near to Lyneham. The road is known to have experienced ground stability issues for many decades. Engineering measures including a retaining wall and a series of drainage ditches and routes are accepted as being necessary to achieve a long-term solution to the ground instability in this particular part of the road.

The development makes sufficient provision for the conservation of the landscape and the ecological impacts of development can be made acceptable through use of appropriate conditions. The development overall complies with Core Policy 48 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and other relevant parts of the development plan, and there is no conflict with national policy. On this basis it is recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

Permission, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:
Drawing No. LYN-ATK-GEN-XX-DR-LL-000001 Rev C02: Landscape Plan, dated 29/02/24 and received 29 February 2024;
Drawing No. LYN-ATK-GEN-XX-DR-CD-000001 Rev C01: Drainage Layout Plan 1, dated 15/12/23 and received 29 February 2024;
Drawing No. LYN-ATK-GEN-XX-DR-CD-000002 Rev C02: Drainage Layout Plan 1, dated 16/12/23 and received 29 February 2024;
Drawing No. LYN-ATK-GEN-XX-DR-CD-000003 Rev C01: Field Drainage Layout Plan, dated 15/12/23 and received 29 February 2024;
Drawing No. LYN-ATK-GEN-XX-DR-LL-000004 Rev P01.1: Cross Section, received 23 April 2024;
Drawing No. LYN-ATK-SRW-XX-DR-CB-000001 Rev C01: Retaining Wall General Arrangement, dated 14/12/23 and received 23 May 2024;
Drawing No. LYN-ATK-GEN-XX-DR-CH-000006 Rev C01: Proposed Site Plan Sheet 1, dated 20/02/24 and received 29 February 2024;
Drawing No. LYN-ATK-GEN-XX-DR-CH-000007 Rev C01: Proposed Site Plan Sheet 2, dated 20/02/24 and received 29 February 2024;
Drawing No. LYN-ATK-HGN-XX-DR-CH-000013 Rev C01: Proposed Retaining Wall Profile, dated 20/02/24 and received 29 February 2024;
Document No. LYN-ATK-EGN-XX-SP-CH-000001 Rev C01: Landscape Specification, dated 14/12/23 and received 23 April 2024;
Document No. LYN-ATK-GEN-XX-RP-LW-000001 Rev 1.0: Flood Risk Assessment, dated 28/02/2024 and received 29 February 2024;

Document No. LYN-ATK-GEN-XX-RP-LP-000002 Rev 1.0: Design and Access Statement, dated 29/02/2024 and received 29 February 2024;
Document No. LYN-ATK-EGT-XX-RP-CE-000001 Rev 1.0: Geo-Environmental Assessment Report, dated 27/02/24 and received 29 February 2024;
Document No. 5214576/GEO/RP/02 Rev 1.0: Ground Investigation Report, dated 02/06/23 and received 29 February 2024;
Protected Species Report, dated 26/02/24 and received 29 February 2024;
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Rev 2.0, dated 28/02/2024 and received 29 February 2024;
and
Application Form, dated 29/02/2024 and received 29 February 2024.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

3. No development shall commence, including demolition, ground works/excavation, site clearance, vegetation clearance and boundary treatment works, until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan shall provide details of the avoidance, mitigation and protective measures to be implemented before and during the construction phase, including but not necessarily limited to, the following:

- a. Identification of ecological protection areas/buffer zones and tree root protection areas and details of physical means of protection, e.g. exclusion fencing.
- b. Working method statements for protected/priority species, such as nesting birds and reptiles.
- c. Mitigation strategies already agreed with the local planning authority prior to determination, such as for great crested newts, dormice or bats; this should comprise the pre-construction/construction related elements of strategies only.
- d. Work schedules for activities with specific timing requirements in order to avoid/reduce potential harm to ecological receptors; including details of when a licensed ecologist and/or ecological clerk of works (ECoW) shall be present on site.
- e. Key personnel, responsibilities and contact details (including Site Manager and ecologist/ECoW).

Development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved CEMP.

REASON: To ensure adequate protection and mitigation for ecological receptors prior to and during construction, and that works are undertaken in line with current best practice and industry standards and are supervised by a suitably licensed and competent professional ecological consultant where applicable.

4. No development shall take place until a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP should include long term objectives and targets, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for each ecological feature within the development, together with a mechanism for monitoring success of the management prescriptions, incorporating review and necessary adaptive management in order to attain targets. The LEMP shall be implemented in full and for a minimum period of 5 years, to ensure establishment and development of suitable natural features within the site.

REASON: To ensure the successful establishment of landscape and ecological features retained and created by the development, for the benefit of visual amenity and biodiversity for the lifetime of the scheme.

5. No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Statement should include, at a minimum, details of:

- a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- c) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- d) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, if needed and where appropriate;
- e) wheel washing facilities;
- f) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
- g) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
- h) measures for the protection of the natural environment; and
- i) hours of construction, including deliveries.

The approved Statement shall be complied with in full throughout the construction period. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved construction method statement.

REASON: The application contained insufficient information to enable this matter to be considered prior to granting planning permission and the matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences in order that the development is undertaken in an acceptable manner, to minimise detrimental effects to the neighbouring amenities, the amenities of the area in general, detriment to the natural environment through the risks of pollution and dangers to highway safety, during the construction phase.

6. Development shall not proceed other than in accordance with the recommendations set out at Section 7.2 of the approved Geo-Environmental Assessment Report regarding management of contaminated land, including the provisions for the handling of materials contaminated with asbestos.

REASON: To manage risks associated with land contamination in the construction phase and thereafter.

7. All soft landscaping comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner; All shrubs, trees and hedge planting shall be maintained free from weeds and shall be protected from damage by vermin and stock. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. All hard landscaping shall also be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for the development and the protection of existing important landscape features.

8. INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:

Any alterations to the approved plans, brought about by compliance with Building Regulations or any other reason must first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before commencement of work.

9. INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:

The applicant should note that the grant of planning permission does not include any separate permission which may be needed to erect a structure in the vicinity of a public sewer. Such permission should be sought direct from Thames Water Utilities Ltd / Wessex Water Services Ltd. Buildings are not normally allowed within 3.0 metres of a Public Sewer although this may vary depending on the size, depth, strategic importance, available access and the ground conditions appertaining to the sewer in question.

10. INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:

The applicant is requested to note that this permission does not affect any private property rights and therefore does not authorise the carrying out of any work on land outside their control. If such works are required it will be necessary for the applicant to obtain the landowners consent before such works commence.

If you intend carrying out works in the vicinity of the site boundary, you are also advised that it may be expedient to seek your own advice with regard to the requirements of the Party Wall Act 1996.

11. INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT

The applicant should note that the works hereby approved involve works on land where there is known or suspected asbestos contamination. Asbestos materials should only be removed by a licenced contractor, Asbestos waste is classified as 'special waste' and as such, can only be disposed of at a site licensed by the Environment Agency. Any contractor used must also be licensed to carry 'special waste'.