

PLANNING & REGULATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held on Monday, 27 November 2017 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 6.13 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Les Sibley – in the Chair

Councillor Jeannette Matelot (Deputy Chairman)
Councillor Mrs Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor
Councillor Mike Fox-Davies
Councillor Bob Johnston
Councillor Glynis Phillips
Councillor G.A. Reynolds
Councillor Judy Roberts
Councillor Alan Thompson
Councillor John Howson (In place of Councillor Dr Kirsten Johnson)
Councillor John Sanders (In place of Councillor Mark Lygo)
Councillor Lawrie Stratford (In place of Councillor Dan Sames)

Other Members in Attendance:

Councillor Lynda Atkins (for Agenda Items 6 & 7)
Councillor Mark Gray (for Agenda Item 7)
Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale (for Agenda Item 6)
Councillor Charles Mathew (for Agenda Item 8)

Officers:

Whole of meeting S. Whitehead and J. Crouch (Law & Governance); C. Kenneford and D. Periam (Planning & Place)

Part of meeting

Agenda Item

6

7

9

Officer Attending

M. Thompson, P. Day, G. Arnold (Planning & Place)

M. Thompson (Planning & Place)

K. Broughton (Planning & Place)

The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with a schedule of addenda tabled at the and decided as set out below. Except as insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

41/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

(Agenda No. 1)

<i>Apology for Absence</i>	<i>Temporary Appointment</i>
Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak Councillor Kirsten Johnson Councillor Mark Lygo Councillor Dan Sames	Councillor John Howson Councillor John Sanders Councillor Lawrie Stratford

42/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - SEE GUIDANCE NOTE OPPOSITE

(Agenda No. 2)

Councillor Judy Roberts declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Cholsey & Wallingford Railway.

Councillor Jeannette Matelot declared an interest as a member of South Oxfordshire District Council.

43/17 MINUTES

(Agenda No. 3)

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2017 were approved and signed.

44/17 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 4)

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
Suzi Coyne – SCP)
Kirsten Berry – Hendeca)
Ian Mason – Bachport)
Katherine Canavan (or a Councillor) –)
SODC and Vale DCs)
Jason Sherwood – OCC)
)
Applicants - Peter Andrew) 6. Fullamoor Plantation, Clifton
Bill Finnlinson) Hampden, Abingdon – Application
Kevin Archard) No. MW.0039/16
Nigel Jackson)
Lucy Binnie)
Keith Hampshire)
)
Councillor Lynda Atkins)
Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale)
)
)
Councillor Adrian Lloyd – Wallingford TC)
Henry Thornton)
)
Applicants – Andrew Short, (Grundons))

<p>Peter Wilsdon (Agent) Councillor Lynda Atkins Councillor Mark Gray</p>	<p>))7. New Barn Farm, Cholsey, Nr)Wallingford – Application No.)MW.0094/16))))</p>
<p>John Salmon – Agent for the Applicant Councillor Charles Mathew</p>	<p>)))8. Dix Pit, Stanton Harcourt,)Witney Application No)MW.0073/17)</p>

45/17 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATES

(Agenda No. 5)

Committee was advised that the Oxfordshire Minerals & Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy had been adopted by Council in September. The applications before Committee today would each be considered individually against this plan.

46/17 PROPOSED EXTRACTION OF SAND, GRAVEL AND CLAY INCLUDING THE CREATION OF NEW ACCESS ROAD, PROCESSING PLANT, OFFICES WITH WELFARE ACCOMMODATION, WEIGHBRIDGE AND SILT WATER LAGOON SYSTEM WITH SITE RESTORATION TO AGRICULTURE AND NATURE CONSERVATION INCLUDING LAKES WITH RECREATIONAL AFTERUSES AND THE PERMANENT DIVERSION OF FOOTPATH 171/15 AND CREATION OF NEW FOOTPATHS ON LAND AT FULLAMOR PLANTATION, CLIFTON HAMPDEN, ABINGDON, OX14 3DD - APPLICATION NO. MW.0039/16

(Agenda No. 6)

The Committee considered (PN6) an application for extraction of 2.5 million tonnes of sand and gravel from an area north of the River Thames between Clifton Hampden and Culham, in South Oxfordshire.

Ms Thompson presented the report advising that the statutory Highway Authority objection had been resolved and drawing attention to the amended recommendation for approval set out in the addenda. She, together with Peter Day and Geoff Arnold then responded to questions from:

Councillor Glynis Phillips – The 7 year land bank target was a minimum and the fact of having greater than the minimum was not a reason for refusal.

In respect of the alternative river crossing the Committee was advised that there were 2 proposed routes, one of which affected the site. No choice had been made between the routes. Officers considered that even if the route over the site was chosen it

would not affect the road going there, as it was a temporary development which would not preclude the provision of the river crossing, although it could affect costs.

Councillor Alan Thompson – The traffic survey had been carried out in May to avoid school holidays when the roads would be quieter.

In respect of the archaeological sites these had been taken into account as set out in the report. There had been geo physical work and trial trenches. The only significant site was the barrow cemetery and this was not under any threat.

Councillor Bob Johnston – The landbank of permitted reserves does not include dormant Review of Old Mineral Permission (ROMP) sites.”

Councillor John Sanders – It was explained that on the condition that no peak period trips were allowed on the two junctions where concern had been expressed then officers were satisfied that the impact would not be severe: which would have to be the case under the National Planning Policy Framework to justify refusal.

Councillor John Howson – the Committee was advised of the survey undertaken in May and that queues outside the peak hours were far less. The figures related to the site access and the two adjacent junctions. If approved the conditions would be monitored and consideration given to the taking of enforcement action as necessary. The routing agreement would also be monitored and any breaches identified addressed.

Councillor Mrs Anda Fitzgerald-O’Connor – A comprehensive flood risk assessment had been carried out and there was no impact on the Thames Path. Page 52 of the report showed an area of land given over to allow for flooding.

Councillor Lawrie Stratford – One hundred trips were planned over 10 hours at a time when the network was better able to cope.

Councillor Judy Roberts – it was confirmed that one of the proposed routes for the river crossing would go across the new lakes area.

Suzi Coyne, SCP, spoke against the application feeling that to approve it at this stage would prejudice the local plan led approach. It would automatically become a site, undermining and pre-determining the Part 2 Site Allocation Plan. There was no need for a decision now as demand continued to dip. An approval would also undermine the South Oxfordshire Landscape Strategy.

Kirsten Berry, Hendeca, spoke against the application on the basis of the environmental impact on Fullamoor residents. Fullamoor was on an escarpment so that despite an enormous bund (itself incongruous in the environment) the site would still be visible. She noted that a physical assessment of the site had not been carried out by the applicant’s landscape advisors. Fullamoor Farmhouse had recently been listed and this made the historic agricultural setting more important. It needed to be preserved within its setting.

She then responded to questions from:

Councillor Howson – Fullamoor Farmhouse was a domestic premises but its setting was still very agricultural. Whilst acknowledging the vernacular architecture of the 17th and 18th Century with views of the railway, the building had been listed recently and recognised in its current setting.

Ian Mason, Burcot & Clifton Hampden for the Protection of the River Thames (BACHPORT) spoke against the application on the grounds of: the impact on the proposed river crossing which was the only strategic solution to dreadful traffic issues in the area and that it was a poor choice of site, being highly valued, alongside the Thames. He spoke of the environment and noise impacts of the site and believed that it was not justified by immediate need. There was sufficient supply available to give time to do Part 2 of the Minerals & Waste Plan looking at site allocations.

Katherine Canavan, Senior Planner at South Oxfordshire District Council referred to the objections raised by South Oxfordshire and the Vale of the White Horse DCs. She stated that there continued to be principle planning issues that could not be resolved. She highlighted the Thames crossing as a key part of the area's infrastructure and the impact on one of the proposed routes that ran through the site. The scale of the excavation would undermine the proposed route and additional work would affect viability and could hinder the plans for housing and employment growth. In addition it was contrary to the Local Plan policy to protect the river corridor and there had been insufficient time to assess the implications of the recent listing of Fullamoor Farmhouse.

Jason Sherwood, Locality and Infrastructure Manager – South, OCC, spoke against the application as approval would prejudice one of two preferred routes for a river crossing. There would be significant cost implications if the site went ahead with impacts on a number of projects including Science Vale, the Growth Deal, Didcot Garden Town and Enterprise Zone, housing growth and the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) bid.

He then responded to questions from:

Councillor Bob Johnston – the HIF bid was a bid to central government for funding to realise housing and economic growth.

Councillor John Howson – It was expected that work on the ground would begin on the river crossing in 2022.

Councillor Glynis Phillips – There were currently two routes and the next phase of work would be to explore detailed feasibility for both routes. There would be a better understanding of what each involved but not a final choice by the first or second quarter of next year.

Councillor John Howson – The Cambridge Expressway was a complementary piece of work that did not affect the river crossing. The river crossing would be needed anyway.

The Committee then heard from the applicant. Keith Hampshire, Chartered Landscape Architect highlighted that officers had not found any non-compliance. He highlighted the key characteristic of the site as meadow land with some intensive arable land. Hedgerows would be reinstated as far as possible. The proposals would improve bio-diversity in the long term. Mr Hampshire explained the landscape mitigation measures and the progressive restoration of the site with the eventual loss of only 13 hectares of best and most versatile agricultural land.

Kevin Archard, spoke on the traffic issues and detailed the vehicle movements that would result if the application was approved. He stressed that they did not constitute 'severe' and that the access arrangements had been agreed by highways. Emissions were Euro 6 compliant with the site being well placed to serve local markets. With regard to the river crossing it was not yet known if, where or when the river crossing will be but they were willing to work with others once this was known. He highlighted that there was even a benefit to the scheme in having the site there as it could provide engineering fill. The costs had been notified to them quite late in the day and they were not able to comment on them.

Lucy Binnie, responded to points made by speakers so far and commented that despite the very recent listed building the NPPF was clear that the Committee could consider approval if it was in line with other benefits. Minerals were the building blocks for future development in the local area and the site would not compromise the SODC Local Plan or the river crossing. Minerals were needed for these developments. The land bank was not a cap and the application was in line with the Core Strategy. It was right to bring forward proposals and she had been working on this application on behalf of Hills for 10 years. With regard to construction, house building had not been at the targeted level but a quantum leap was now expected and there was more than sufficient demand for this and other sites.

Peter Andrew, indicated that it was a family business and a major player in Oxfordshire. He was personally familiar with all the company's sites and the company knew the local markets. Fullamoor was a sound proposal and the company was a good operator with a good record of restoration. He referred to a previous site that had been granted on appeal and which was running with no issues.

They then responded to questions from:

Councillor Bob Johnston – the trees to be planted in the restoration were mostly British species. Some poplars and willows were included for their speed of growth.

Councillor Mike Fox-Davies – There was no design detail available about the river crossing. The road would go across a flood plain irrespective of the quarry. The quarry operation could save money as materials would be available.

Councillor Alan Thompson – A lake was included in the restoration as they did not want to import additional material due to the additional impacts on local residents and the environment that this would bring with it. The length of the site operation would be lengthened without the lake.

Councillor John Howson – There were plans to ensure that supply would be maintained in the event of a flood so that vehicle movements could be maintained and there would be no need for additional movements once the flooding was over. Phase 7 would be kept as a temporary phase to work in the event of extreme flooding.

Councillor Lynda Atkins, local member for Wallingford, spoke against the application referring to the impact on Culham Science Centre of the noise and dust. She commented that the Atomic Energy Authority still had concerns about dust issues which had not been addressed. The standards for local residential and industrial buildings should not be applied to a site of international importance with very specific standards and requirements around vibration and dust. Councillor Atkins also referred to the impact on the new river crossing.

Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale, local member for Berinsfield & Garsington highlighted local concerns including: the existing traffic gridlock in Culham and Clifton Hampden each morning, the inadequate offer to prohibit vehicle movements and the pollution that would be caused; the river crossing that was a vital scheme and the possible serious difficulties posed by approving the quarry. She asked that if the Committee were minded to approve that they would demand rigorous enforcement of the vehicle movement restrictions.

Councillor Glynis Phillips proposed deferral but withdrew it on hearing an alternative proposal from Councillor Stratford, to refuse the application on the grounds set out in the original report together with additional grounds. The Committee was advised of Counsel's advice that there was no argument on prematurity based on Part 2 not yet being available. Following an adjournment Mr Kenneford advised the committee that a refusal of planning permission could lead to an appeal against the refusal and the possibility of costs being awarded against the County Council should the appeal be upheld and it be found that the council had acted unreasonably. It was then proposed by Councillor Stratford, seconded by Councillor Matelot and:

RESOLVED: (by 11 votes for with 1 abstention) that Application MW.0039/16 (P16/S1192/CM) be refused planning permission for the following reasons:

- (i) The additional vehicle movements arising from the development would lead to severe highways impacts contrary to paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework; would not maintain the safety of road users and the efficiency of the road network contrary to Oxfordshire Minerals Waste Core Strategy policy C10 and would contribute to congestion, disruption and delays on the road network, contrary to Local Transport Plan policy 02.
- (ii) The additional vehicle movements arising from the development would worsen queuing at the local junctions leading to stationary vehicles with associated air emissions, causing unacceptable adverse impacts on environmental amenity, contrary to Oxfordshire Minerals Waste Core Strategy policies C5 and C10.
- (iii) The development would prejudice the future development of a new link road and Thames crossing along one of the routes safeguarded by policy TRANS3 of

the emerging South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2033 and core policy 18 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 contrary to these policies.

- (iv) The development is inappropriate in the Green Belt contrary to Oxfordshire Minerals Waste Core Strategy policy C12, South Oxfordshire Local Plan policy GB4 and National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 87, 88 and 90 and no very special circumstances exist to justify making an exception to these policies.

47/17 PROPOSED EXTRACTION OF SAND AND GRAVEL WITH ASSOCIATED PROCESSING PLANT, CONVEYORS, OFFICE AND WEIGHBRIDGE, PARKING AREAS. CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ACCESS ONTO THE A4130. RESTORATION TO AGRICULTURE, INCORPORATING TWO PONDS, USING IMPORTED INERT MATERIALS ON LAND AT NEW BARN FARM, CHOLSEY, NR WALLINGFORD, OXFORDSHIRE, OX10 9HA - APPLICATION NO. MW.0094/16

(Agenda No. 7)

The Committee considered (PN7) an application for the extraction of 2.5 million tonnes (MT) of sand and gravel at New Barn Farm, Cholsey, Wallingford, Oxfordshire.

Mary Thompson, Senior Planning Officer, presented the report and addenda confirming that there would be no need to divert the footpath, no dewatering and with restoration back to agricultural land. She outlined the routeing agreement and referred to paragraph 93, confirming that the viewpoint referred to was within the AONB but that this did not change the views of the Environmental Strategy Officer. She then responded to questions from:

Councillor John Sanders – The numbered phases indicated the order of development and restoration. Section 1 was chosen to be developed and restored first as it was closest to the housing.

Councillor Mrs Anda Fitzgerald O'Connor – All vehicles leaving the site would turn left, then use the roundabout if they wanted to go right.

Henry Thornton, speaking as a local businessman spoke against the application that he felt would harm Oxfordshire. The application was in the wrong location close to AONBs and popular amenities and close to a care home, medical centre, a hospital and two schools. He commented that the report was all about damage limitation and highlighted the huge amount of opposition to the proposal. It had been removed from Part 1 of the Core Strategy and this was an attempt to reintroduce what was already rejected. He commented that there was a sufficient supply of sand and gravel and this application was premature. Work should be completed on Part 2 of the Core Strategy on site allocations.

Wallingford Town Councillor Adrian Lloyd, speaking on behalf of Wallingford Town Council stated that they had consistently opposed the application. He commented that the report did not make clear that the public right of way was the Agatha Christie Trail which 1000's walked each year. He argued that the applicants had been wrong to use wind information from RAF Benson and that Cholsey Hill was a closer

meteorological site. Data from 2012 was publicly available and using this data the noise would carry into the new housing site.

He then responded to questions from:

Councillor Matelot – He had a technical background having worked in wind farms and his opinion was based on experience.

Councillor Judy Roberts – He confirmed that in his opinion the wrong wind direction information had been used so the information regarding noise was incorrect.

Councillor Howson – He confirmed that for part of the local area, including the community hospital, nursing home and nursery school the information was correct. With regard to dust Wallingford Town Councillor Lloyd commented that the houses were not on the same level and that smaller particles would travel further. He felt that it was likely that dust would travel into the affordable housing areas affecting families and young children. He noted that the site would work on Saturday mornings meaning the noise nuisance would continue at a time when many people would be hoping for a lie in after the working week.

The Committee then heard from the applicant, Andrew Short, Grundons, explained the context of their interest in the site and advised that changes to the proposal had been made following consultation and exhibition. They had worked with the Council and the report and officer conclusions supported their application. He addressed the question of prematurity which had been carefully considered by officers (paragraph 67). The application was in line with the recently adopted core strategy that provided for local building materials for local development.

Peter Wilsdon, agent to the applicant, believed that all consultees had agreed that with the proposed mitigation there was no adverse impact. He outlined the proposed mitigations including, dewatering, a traffic routeing agreement and progressive restoration that reduced the overall impact. The application was the most sustainable opportunity to provide a local supply of sand and gravel.

They then responded to questions from:

Councillor Judy Roberts and Councillor John Howson – Peter Wilsden explained the phasing of works on the site and the use of a conveyor system.

Councillor Alan Thompson – The route to be used was an advisory lorry route with satisfactory junctions. The highways authority had no objections.

Councillor Lynda Atkins, local councillor for Wallingford, spoke against the application expressing particular concerns for residents living adjacent to area 17 and 18. Area 18 contained the plant and there was a gap in the noise protection to allow access to the site. Area 17 was one of the last areas to be worked and was immediately adjacent to the new housing which was closer than existing buildings and which needed an equivalent barrier. She was concerned at the impact on residents of Saturday working and expressed concern at the impact on the heritage railway of having a bund along half of its length. Councillor Atkins responding to a question from

Councillor Stratford commented that she felt it perfectly possible that the new housing would be built and sold quickly.

Councillor Mark Gray, local councillor for Benson & Cholsey highlighted the amenity impact of the application. In addition to 2 nursing homes there were 2 listed buildings nearby. Heritage assets were irreplaceable and impacts on them should be given considerable weight. Councillor Gray also argued that the local roads were not suitable for the traffic from the site. He also expressed concern that the inert waste for the restoration had not been identified and he feared that it would not happen. He suggested that the application was premature in predetermining where extraction should happen in advance of Part 2 of the Core Strategy.

Councillor Gray responding to a question from Councillor Howson explained that the quarry would destroy the setting of the Grade II listed building.

During discussion Mary Thompson responded to further questions confirming that the new housing had been taken into account when looking at environmental impacts; that the phasing allowed the central haul road to progressively shorten and speed restoration. Members expressed some concern over traffic along local roads and site access onto the main road.

Councillor Sibley proposed, it was seconded by Councillor Phillips and it was:

RESOLVED: (by 3 votes for, 3 against with 5 abstentions, on the Chairman's casting vote) that subject to:

- (i) a Section 106 legal agreement to include matters set out in Annex 2;
- (ii) a routing agreement to ensure that HGV movements associated with the new development accord with the County Council's Lorry Routing Strategy; and that
- (iii) that the Director for Planning and Place be authorised to refuse the application if the legal agreement referred to in (i) above is not completed within 10 weeks of the date of this meeting on the grounds that it would not comply with OMWCS policy M10 and the guidance set out in paragraph 118 of the NPPF in that there would not be satisfactory provisions for the long-term management of the restored site.

application no. MW.0094/16 be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Director for Planning and Place to include the matters set out in Annex 1 to the report PN7.

48/17 SECTION 73 APPLICATION TO CONTINUE THE OPERATION OF DIX PIT RECYCLED AGGREGATE FACILITY PERMITTED BY PLANNING PERMISSION NO. 16/04166/CM (MW.0140/16) WITHOUT COMPLYING WITH CONDITION 6 THEREBY ALLOWING AN INCREASE IN THE MAXIMUM TONNAGE OF WASTE MATERIAL IMPORTED TO SITE TO 175,000 TONNES PER ANNUM AT SHEEHAN RECYCLED AGGREGATES PLANT, DIX PIT, STANTON HARCOURT, WITNEY, OX29 5BB - APPLICATION NO. MW.0073/17

(Agenda No. 8)

The Committee considered (PN8) a Section 73 application to continue the operation of Dix Pit Recycled Aggregate Facility permitted by a previous permission without complying with condition 6 thereby allowing an increase in the maximum tonnage of waste material imported to site to 175,000 tonnes per annum.

Having presented the report David Periam, responding to a question from Councillor Reynolds indicated that there would be an additional 5-6 additional vehicle movements/hour during the off-peak period.

John Salmon, agent for the applicant, commended the report that he felt explained how the application met the Council's policies. It would result in a re-use of materials avoiding landfill and would provide a supply of local building materials. He outlined the efforts taken to monitor and control vehicle movements. Mr salmon responded to questions from:

Councillor Glynis Phillips – The plant was designed for a much higher capacity and the additional tonnage would use the plant efficiently with the only impact being on the numbers of vehicles on the roads.

Councillor John Howson – Mr Salmon explained that there were a wide range of third party contractors using the site. These could be single person operations and he explained the difficulty in controlling their vehicle movements. It was not possible to put trackers on third party vehicles but they used fines and bans as methods of control.

Councillor Charles Mathew, Chairman of Stanton Harcourt Parish Council and local councillor for Eynsham expressed concern over the impact on the B4449. The extra lorries were totally unacceptable with 1 extra hgv every 10 minutes, on a road that narrows at points to only 5.5m wide. He referred to breaches to the routeing agreement that had been notified. The planning conditions were aimed at mitigation but needed enforcement action. Councillor Mathew asked the Committee (if they were minded to agree the application) to consider a staged increase to see the effects on hgv movements. Councillor Mathew also asked for a quarterly email on vehicle movements and on breaches that had been notified. Councillor Mathew responded to questions from:

Councillor Jeannette Matelot – The Sutton bypass once constructed would ease the problems in Staton Harcourt but funding was not available.

Councillor Judy Roberts – He agreed that it would be better for lorries to turn left from the site to get to the A40 but the operators did not agree.

During discussion Members suggested that there was merit in considering a staged increase and Councillor Reynolds proposed, it was seconded and it was:

RESOLVED: (by 10 votes for to 1 against) to defer a decision to allow further negotiation with the applicant.

49/17 DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING ONE AND A HALF CLASSROOM PREFABRICATED MODULAR BUILDING AND THE INSTALLATION OF A TWO CLASSROOM PREFABRICATED MODULAR BUILDING, TO INCLUDE DRAINAGE AND CREATION OF FIRE APPLIANCE HARD-STANDING ACCESS WHERE THE EXISTING PREFABRICATED MODULAR BUILDING IS LOCATED AT GREAT MILTON (C OF E) PRIMARY SCHOOL, HIGH STREET, GREAT MILTON, OXFORD, OXFORDSHIRE, OX44 7NT - APPLICATION NO. R3.0064/17

(Agenda No. 9)

Committee considered an application(PN9) for the demolition of an existing one and a half classroom prefabricated modular building and the installation of a two classroom prefabricated modular building for a temporary period of 5 years at Great Milton (C Of E) Primary School, High Street, Great Milton, Oxford.

It was proposed by Councillor Stratford, seconded by Councillor Johnston and it was **RESOLVED:** (by 11 votes for to 0 against) that planning permission for application no. R3.0033/17 be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Director of Planning and Place to include the following:

- (i) Detailed compliance.
- (ii) Temporary period of 5 years.
- (iii) School Travel Plan to be submitted and approved within 6 months of the date of occupation of the building. The approved scheme to be implemented.
- (iv) Prior to the first occupation of the development a scheme for the location of at least two bird boxes shall be submitted and approved. The approved scheme to be implemented.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing