

National Tel:
0845 260 55 54

Local Tel:
01268 751 264



REFINE + RESOLVE ARCHITECTS

Email:
info@rnraarchitects.com

Website:
www.RnRArchitects.com

Project 405 – 22

Supporting Statements

(Position Statement – Recently Withdrawn Emerging Local Plan + Appeal Precedent)

For

2no. Affordable Housing Development

At

MASCOT (SITE)

WINDSOR ROAD, BOWERS GIFFORD, ESSEX, SS13 2LH

Registered Office: 75 Springfield Road,
Chelmsford, Essex CM2 6JB.
Company No: 9118078

RIBA



ALL COPYRIGHTS RESERVED

Page 1 of 6

REFINE + RESOLVE ARCHITECTS

1.0 OVERVIEW

- 1.1 At a meeting held on Thursday 3 March 2022, Basildon Borough Council resolved to withdraw the Basildon Borough Local Plan from examination, as such, the council is in the process of preparing a programme of work to prepare a new Local Plan for the Borough.
- 1.2 This will be reported to the next available Strategic Planning and Infrastructure (SPI) Committee, to be held after the local elections in the summer. This report will feed into the development of a new Local Development Scheme for adoption by the Council shortly after being approved by SPI.
- 1.3 With reference to the above, Basildon Borough Council do not currently have an up-to-date Local Plan and further, presently, the Council do not have a plan progressing to examination.
- 1.4 Following two Freedom of Information request made by the applicant to Basildon Borough Council (*see FOI Request – Basildon Borough Council FOI CAS-492230 + 485454*) it was established that as of the end of March 2022 the Council had **2283** applicants on the Housing Register.
- 1.5 In addition, it was confirmed that only **308** planning consents for Affordable Housing, have been approved in the 5 years between 2017-2021
- 1.6 Regarding demand, the FOI confirms that the Basildon Borough Council have identified a target delivery of **288** affordable units per annum since 2017 which is **1440** (over the 5 year period)
- 1.7 Noting the current target delivery of **1440** against the actual delivery of **308**, Basildon Borough Council have confirmed a short fall of **1132**.
- 1.8 Officers and Members will therefore be mindful that this application, to which this statement relates, seeks to deliver a proposal of **100% Affordable Housing** units of **2 dwellings** which would provide a level of contribution to the Council's own targets and assist with their shortfall.

REFINE + RESOLVE ARCHITECTS

2.0 RECENT APPEAL PRECEDENT

- 2.1 The applicant would like to make reference to a recent appeal decision, Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/W/21/3286455 (See Appendix), for a site within the Basildon borough which was approved for 2 affordable units within the Green Belt. The Inspectorate makes the following comments within the appeal decision that are directly applicable to this application to which this statement relates;
- 2.2 Paragraph 5 - *Neither policy BAS GB1 nor policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan 2007 (the LP) allow for development of this nature in the Green Belt. Accordingly, I have given greater weight to the Framework in determining whether the appeal proposal is inappropriate development.*
- 2.3 Paragraph 6 - *The site is garden land associated with Patricia. The Framework states that residential garden land outside of a built-up area is previously developed land, and the appeal site complies with this definition.*
- 2.4 Paragraph 7 - *The appellant has provided a **unilateral undertaking** confirming that the proposed development would be for affordable housing for first and subsequent occupiers of the houses.*
- 2.5 Paragraph 7 - ***The Council has an established shortfall in its affordable housing provision, which this development would assist in reducing.***
- 2.6 Paragraph 8 - *Green Belt openness has both a spatial and a visual element. While the appeal site is previously developed land, it is largely open without any significant permanent structures on it. The introduction of two bungalows and a driveway would therefore reduce both visual and spatial openness within the site. **However, there would be space between the bungalows and to either side, and the bungalows would have shallow pitched roofs. On balance, therefore, the development would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.***
- 2.7 Paragraph 10 – ***The Meadow Way street scene comprises a mix of dwelling styles and sizes, with varying distances in terms of how far each house is set back from the road. Within this context, the proposed development would comprise a pair of relatively modest bungalows with a generous set back from the road. The bungalows would be simple in form and design and would largely be screened from view by the existing and proposed boundary planting. Together with the use of appropriate external materials, this would prevent them from appearing as incongruous additions within the***

REFINE + RESOLVE ARCHITECTS

street scene. The matters of landscaping and external materials can be controlled by appropriately worded conditions.

- 2.8 Paragraph 11 - *The appeal proposal **would not therefore be harmful** to the character and appearance of the area. It would consequently accord with Policy BAS BE12 of the LP which requires that development not cause material harm to the character of the surrounding area, including the street scene.*
- 2.9 Paragraph 13 - *In this instance, a financial contribution is sought in accordance with the RAMS to mitigate the effects of increased recreation pressure from the development. **The appellant has provided a unilateral undertaking committing to pay the contribution sought for each of the proposed bungalows.***
- 2.10 Officers and Members will therefore be mindful that this application, to which this statement relates, seeks to deliver a proposal of **100% Affordable Housing** units of **2 dwellings** which would provide a level of contribution to the Council's own targets and assist with their shortfall.
- 2.11 The site which is the subject of this applicant, is residential garden land associated with Mascot and is therefore previously developed land as per the definition.
- 2.12 The proposal also seeks to achieve good separation between the proposed and existing dwellings.
- 2.13 The proposed dwelling sizes are also modest in scale and are screened by the existing and proposed structural planting at the front of the site all within the red outline.
- 2.14 In addition, the applicant has signed and provided a unilateral undertaking committing to pay the contributions for each dwelling.
- 2.15 All the above point achieved within this application follow the precedent noted by the Inspector within the referenced appeal.

REFINE + RESOLVE ARCHITECTS

- 2.16 The applicant would like to make reference to a recent appeal decision, Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/W/21/3283720 (See Appendix), for a site within the Basildon borough which was approved for 4 detached bungalows within the Green Belt. The Inspectorate makes the following comments within the appeal decision that are directly applicable to this application to which this statement relates;
- 2.17 Paragraph 5 - *The appeal site is an area of undeveloped grassland. It lies amid houses along Newhouse Avenue and London Road, as well as a farmyard and garden centre on neighbouring land, **with the wider area falling within the village of Wickford.***
- 2.18 Paragraph 6 - *The four proposed houses would occupy plots of similar width to other houses along Newhouse Avenue. They would be bungalows with accommodation in the roofs. Similar house types are present on the opposite side of Newhouse Avenue. **The footprint of each house would be relatively modest, with sizable gaps between each neighbouring house, and between the side boundaries of the site and the facing elevations of the nearest houses. The scale of development is therefore in keeping with that of the surrounding area.***
- 2.19 Paragraph 7 - *Given these considerations, **the appeal proposal would amount to limited infilling in the village of Wickford.** It would therefore not be inappropriate development, in accordance with the requirements of the Framework.*
- 2.20 It has long been stated locally that this part of Basildon Borough is within the village of Bowers Gifford and following the comments of the Inspector in the above appeal, the infill policy is **appropriate** if the site is read as part of the wider area of a village, as is the case in with this application.
- 2.21 As with the previous appeal, the proposal also seeks to achieve good separation between the proposed and existing dwellings and the proposed dwelling sizes are also modest in scale.
- 2.22 Both the above point achieved within this application follow the precedent noted by the Inspector within the referenced appeal.

REFINE + RESOLVE ARCHITECTS

3.0 APPENDIX

3.1 Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/W/21/3286455

3.2 Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/W/21/3283720



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2022

by **M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/W/21/3286455

Patricia, Meadow Way, Wickford, SS12 9HA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Vince Millen (Millen Homes Ltd) against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01269/FULL, dated 13 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "erection of 2no affordable dwellings on land adjacent to Patricia, Meadow Way, Wickford".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of 2no affordable dwellings on land adjacent to Patricia, Meadow Way, Wickford, SS12 9HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01269/FULL, dated 13 August 2021, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's emerging Local Plan has been withdrawn from examination. Accordingly, its policies carry no weight in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The site is in the Green Belt, and the main issues are therefore:
 - Whether the development proposed would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, including the effect on openness, having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and any relevant development plan policies,
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - The effect on European Protected Sites and Special Protection Areas.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

4. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. It further states that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt save for certain identified exceptions. One of these exceptions allows for redevelopment of previously developed land which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

5. Neither policy BAS GB1 nor policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan 2007 (the LP) allow for development of this nature in the Green Belt. Accordingly, I have given greater weight to the Framework in determining whether the appeal proposal is inappropriate development.
6. The site is garden land associated with Patricia. The Framework states that residential garden land outside of a built-up area is previously developed land, and the appeal site complies with this definition.
7. The appellant has provided a unilateral undertaking confirming that the proposed development would be for affordable housing for first and subsequent occupiers of the houses. The Council has an established shortfall in its affordable housing provision, which this development would assist in reducing.
8. Green Belt openness has both a spatial and a visual element. While the appeal site is previously developed land, it is largely open without any significant permanent structures on it. The introduction of two bungalows and a driveway would therefore reduce both visual and spatial openness within the site. However, there would be space between the bungalows and to either side, and the bungalows would have shallow pitched roofs. On balance, therefore, the development would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
9. The appeal proposal would consequently accord with the requirements of paragraph 149(g) of the Framework, and so would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Character and appearance

10. The Meadow Way street scene comprises a mix of dwelling styles and sizes, with varying distances in terms of how far each house is set back from the road. Within this context, the proposed development would comprise a pair of relatively modest bungalows with a generous set back from the road. The bungalows would be simple in form and design and would largely be screened from view by the existing and proposed boundary planting. Together with the use of appropriate external materials, this would prevent them from appearing as incongruous additions within the street scene. The matters of landscaping and external materials can be controlled by appropriately worded conditions.
11. The appeal proposal would not therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would consequently accord with Policy BAS BE12 of the LP which requires that development not cause material harm to the character of the surrounding area, including the street scene.

European Protected Sites and Special Protection Areas

12. The appeal site falls within the zone of influence for the Essex Coastal Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS). This was developed together with Natural England and other Essex councils to deliver the mitigation necessary to avoid the likely significant effects of residential development across Essex, leading to increased recreational pressure on European designated habitat sites and Special Protection Areas along the Essex coast.
13. In this instance, a financial contribution is sought in accordance with the RAMS to mitigate the effects of increased recreation pressure from the development. The appellant has provided a unilateral undertaking committing to pay the contribution sought for each of the proposed bungalows.

14. The contribution is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, is directly related to the scale of development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Consequently, it accords with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, and so counts as mitigation towards the affected sites. The appeal proposal would not therefore result in a significant adverse effect on the integrity of these sites.

Other Matters

15. My attention has been drawn to a previous appeal decision on the site, where the proposal for one house was found to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, there is no evidence that the proposal was for affordable housing as the Inspector in that case assessed whether the proposal amounted to limited infilling in a village. It therefore differs from the proposal before me, so carries little weight in my determination of this appeal.
16. I have also been referred to an appeal decision for a site on Newhouse Avenue. In that case the permission was sought for limited affordable housing for local community needs. The Framework requires such proposals to be under policies set out in the development plan, and the Inspector found that no such policies existed. As this appeal was assessed against a different exception identified in the Framework, it also carries little weight.

Conditions

17. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. Where appropriate, I have amended the wording in accordance with national Planning Practice Guidance.
18. I have imposed the standard condition relating to the commencement of development (1). I have also imposed a condition specifying the approved plans, for the sake of certainty (2).
19. A condition requiring approval of external materials (3) is appropriate to ensure that the final appearance of the development is acceptable. I have also imposed a condition requiring protective fencing for the trees within and adjoining the appeal site (4) to ensure that they are not damaged by the development.
20. I have imposed conditions relating to dust suppression (5) and requiring no burning of materials on site (6) to ensure that the development does not result in harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents during construction.
21. A condition requiring that parking be provided and retained on site (7) in accordance with the submitted drawings is reasonable and necessary, given that Meadow Way has limited on-street parking available.
22. I have not imposed the suggested condition relating to the foul sewer connection as this is a matter covered under the Building Regulations rather than addressed through the planning process.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons set out above, the appeal succeeds.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions for appeal ref: APP/V1505/W/21/3286455

Patricia, Meadow Way, Wickford, SS12 9HA

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the following approved drawings:

WICK001 Location plan
WICK002 Site layout plan
WICK003 Block plan
WICK004 Arboricultural impact plan
WICK005 Street scene elevation
WICK006 Elevations
3. No development above ground level shall take place until details of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.
4. All works affecting the trees within and adjoining the site shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 5837 (2012) - Trees in relation to design, demolition, and construction, and this shall include the erection of protective fencing around the extent of the root protection areas of those trees to be retained for the duration of the construction period as shown on drawing WICK004.
5. Dust suppression methods shall be employed during demolition and construction so as to minimise the likelihood of nuisance being caused to neighbouring properties.
6. No materials produced as a result of the site development or clearance shall be burned on site.
7. Prior to occupation, at least two on-site parking spaces per dwelling, each with a minimum dimension of 2.9m by 5.5m shall be provided within the site as shown on drawing WICK002 and thereafter retained at the site in perpetuity.

End of schedule of conditions



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2022

by **M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/W/21/3283720

Land on the east side Of Newhouse Avenue, Wickford, SS12 0JZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Vince Millen (Millen Homes Ltd) against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00762/FULL, dated 5 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is 4 detached 3 bedroom bungalows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 4 detached 3 bedroom bungalows at land on the east side of Newhouse Avenue, Wickford, SS12 0JZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00762/FULL, dated 5 May 2021 subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has confirmed that it has chosen to withdraw its emerging Local Plan. I have therefore determined this appeal in accordance with the Basildon District Local Plan 2007 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether the development proposed would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and any relevant development plan policies,
 - Whether the development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to noise disturbance from neighbouring sites; and,
 - The effect on European Protected Sites.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

4. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt, and that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate, save for certain exceptions. One of the identified exceptions involves limited infilling in villages. No policies in the Basildon District Local

Plan 2007 (the LP) have been identified as being relevant to whether the appeal proposal would be inappropriate development, and therefore I have determined this issue solely with reference to the Framework.

5. The appeal site is an area of undeveloped grassland. It lies amid houses along Newhouse Avenue and London Road, as well as a farmyard and garden centre on neighbouring land, with the wider area falling within the village of Wickford.
6. The four proposed houses would occupy plots of similar width to other houses along Newhouse Avenue. They would be bungalows with accommodation in the roofs. Similar house types are present on the opposite side of Newhouse Avenue. The footprint of each house would be relatively modest, with sizable gaps between each neighbouring house, and between the side boundaries of the site and the facing elevations of the nearest houses. The scale of development is therefore in keeping with that of the surrounding area.
7. Given these considerations, the appeal proposal would amount to limited infilling in the village of Wickford. It would therefore not be inappropriate development, in accordance with the requirements of the Framework.

Noise

8. The appellant has provided a noise impact assessment with their appeal addressing the reason for refusal relating to noise and disturbance from neighbouring businesses. The assessment was carried out in accordance with the relevant British Standards 8233 and 4142 for noise levels in new buildings and for assessing industrial and commercial sound respectively.
9. The assessment found that typical noise levels within the site were low, with the main source of noise coming from traffic on London Road. The neighbouring commercial uses, which are sited close to existing houses, were not found to cause significant noise disturbance at the appeal site. The assessment concludes that dwellings of standard construction would experience noise levels substantially below the recommended levels set out in British Standard 8233, and I see no reason to disagree with this conclusion.
10. I am satisfied that the findings of the assessment are representative of noise levels at the site, and as a result the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers. It would therefore accord with the requirements of Policy BAS BE12 of the LP. This requires that new residential development will be refused if, amongst other criteria, it causes material harm through noise or disturbance.

European protected sites

11. The appeal site lies within the zone of influence for the Essex Coastal Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS). New residential development within the zone is likely to have a cumulative significant effect on coastal habitat sites through recreational activities.
12. The Essex councils and Natural England have developed the RAMS with the aim that it deliver the mitigation necessary to avoid the likely significant effects of residential development across Essex. In this case, a financial contribution is sought to fund strategic off-site measures to increase resilience to recreational pressures. The appellant has provided a unilateral undertaking committing to make the payment for each of the proposed houses.

13. This contribution is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It is directly related to the scale of development, and it is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. It therefore accords with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and counts as mitigation towards increasing resilience of the coastal habitat sites. The development would not therefore result in a significant adverse effect on the integrity of the sites.

Other Matters

14. My attention has been drawn to previously refused schemes on this site, including an appeal relating to thirteen dwellings that was dismissed. I note that the proposal for thirteen dwellings was assessed against different criteria as it was not proposed as limited infilling. Given the different nature of the appeal proposal to that scheme, it carries very little weight in determining this case. An earlier application for four detached bungalows was also refused permission, but I have little information on that application or why it was refused. In any case, each appeal must be determined on its own merits, which I have done in this case.
15. I have considered the concerns raised by residents regarding the proposed development. Any disturbance arising from construction would be temporary, while hours of work are controlled under other legislation. The potential for increased wear on the surface of Newhouse Avenue is a private legal matter.
16. The development would result in the loss of part of the existing established hedgerow, which would be compensated for by additional planting. The impact on wildlife would be mitigated by biodiversity enhancement measures.
17. The appeal proposal would result in additional traffic on Newhouse Avenue from the new houses. However, the Council did not consider that this additional traffic would cause such additional congestion or disturbance that it would warrant refusing planning permission. I see no reason to disagree with this conclusion, given the number of existing properties that have an access onto this road.
18. Concerns regarding the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy to existing houses were not found by the Council to justify refusing permission. Given the separation distance between the existing and proposed houses and the presence of the hedgerow along the front boundary of the site, I see no reason to disagree with this conclusion.

Conditions

19. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council and, where appropriate, amended the recommended wording in accordance with national Planning Practice Guidance.
20. I have imposed the standard commencement condition (1) and, for the sake of certainty, one specifying the approved plans (2).
21. I have imposed a condition requiring submission of details of external materials (3) as these are not specified on the approved plans. I have also imposed a condition relating to landscaping of the development site (4) and given that the proposals include the partial removal of an established hedgerow it is

- appropriate that these details be submitted and agreed prior to any works commencing on site.
22. Conditions relating to the management of ecological impact and biodiversity enhancement (5, 6, 7) are reasonable and necessary as the appeal site is greenfield land with some habitat potential for protected species.
 23. A condition requiring that the vehicle access be laid out to a safe standard (8) is reasonable and necessary as the development will create new traffic on a relatively narrow road. A further condition requiring that the surface of the access be finished in bound material (9) is necessary to ensure that unbound material does not spill into the highway and create unsafe conditions. In addition, as the road is narrow with multiple properties taking access from it, a condition requiring a construction traffic management plan (10) is necessary to ensure that parking associated with the development does not obstruct access to these neighbouring properties.
 24. A condition requiring provision of a residential travel information pack (11) for the occupiers of the new houses is appropriate to encourage sustainable travel use on the part of occupiers of the approved dwellings.
 25. I have not imposed a condition requiring a further noise impact assessment as one has been provided with the appeal.

Conclusion

26. For the reasons set out above, the appeal succeeds.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions for appeal ref: APP/V1505/W/21/3283720

Land On The East Side Of Newhouse Avenue, Wickford, SS12 0JZ

1. The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the following approved drawings:
 - LRW 001 Revision 1 (Block Plan)
 - LRW 002 Revision 1 (Site Layout Plan)
 - LRW 003 Revision 1 (Site Survey)
 - LRW 004 Revision 1 (Location Plan)
 - LRW005 Revision 1 (Street Scene)
 - FLE 002 Revision 1 (Floor Plans P 1 & 2)
 - FLE 002 Revision 1 (Floor Plans P 3 & 4)
 - FLE 003 Revision 1 (Elevations P 1 & 2)
 - FLE 003 Revision 2 (Elevations P 3 & 4)
3. No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwellings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
4. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until there has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority a scheme of landscaping which shall include details of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development. All planting, seeding and turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following occupation of the buildings, or completion of the development, whichever is sooner. Any trees or shrubs or other elements of landscaping dying within five years of planting, shall be replaced by the developers or their successors in title.
5. All mitigation and enhancements measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Hybrid Ecology Ltd, October 2019), as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination.
6. Prior to the commencement of development, a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall include the following:
 - a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities,
 - b) Identification of biodiversity protection zones
 - c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements),
 - d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features,

- e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works,
- f) Responsible persons and lines of communication,
- g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works or similarly competent person; and,
- h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details.

7. A Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy for protected and Priority species shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of works above ground level, following the recommendations made in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Hybrid Ecology Ltd, October 2019). The content of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy shall include the following:
- a) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed enhancement measures,
 - b) detailed designs to achieve stated objectives,
 - c) locations of proposed enhancement measures by appropriate maps and plans,
 - d) persons responsible for implementing the enhancement measures; and,
 - e) details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant).

The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

8. Prior to occupation of the development the vehicular access shall be constructed at right angles to the existing carriageway as shown in principle on planning application drawing number LRW 002 Revision 1. The width of the access at its junction with the highway shall not be less than 5.5 metres, shall be retained at that width for the first 6 metres within the site and shall be provided with an appropriate crossing to the Newhouse Avenue carriageway.
9. No unbound material shall be used in the surface treatment of the vehicular access within 6 metres of the highway boundary.
10. No construction works shall commence on site until a construction traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The principal areas of concern that should be addressed are site operative, delivery and visitor parking.
11. Prior to first occupation of the proposed development, the Developer shall be responsible for the provision, implementation and distribution of a Residential Travel Information Pack for sustainable transport, approved by Essex County Council, to include six one day travel vouchers for use with the relevant local public transport operator. These packs (including tickets) shall be provided by the Developer to each dwelling free of charge.

End of schedule