



Your Ref: APP/Q3115/X/23/3325922  
LPA Ref: P21/S4749/LDP

Our Ref: 332610422?TAU/RS/RM/AT

Date: 21 November 2023

By email: teame3@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

**For the Attention of Ben White**

Dear Ben,

**Appeal by: Taylor Wimpey West London**

**At: Thames Farm, Reading Road, Shiplake, Oxfordshire, RG9 3PH**

**Proposal: Application for a Certification of Lawfulness for Proposed Use or Development to establish that proposed ground stabilisation works, necessary to stabilise the areas of the site affected by dissolution and which are to be undertaken as part of the foundation works, and which comprise compaction grouting, surface ground compacting and associated works, are lawful pursuant to planning permission P16/S0970/O.**

1. I refer to the above appeal. Please take this letter as the final comments on behalf of the Appellant which respond to the LPAs statement and the responses that have been received from the interested parties.
2. The purpose of this statement is to provide the Inspector with further context in relation to the Appellant's Grounds of Appeal as we note that the LPA have raised a number of points requiring clarification. This letter should be read alongside the Appellant's Grounds of Appeal.

**Response of the LPA**

3. The LPA in their statement (paragraphs 4, 7 and 8) have made a number of references to the additional information being provided by the Appellant and have indicated that the additional information does not alter their decision. The LPA also indicate that the main issue of this appeal is whether the Council's decision to refuse to grant a lawful development certificate was well-founded. This is not accepted by the Appellant; the matter for the appeal is whether the proposed development is lawful as a matter of planning law and fact, such that a Certificate of Lawfulness should be granted, and not a review of the Council's decision making.
4. The Council assert that the additional information (listed in paragraph 7) provided by the Appellant relates to planning merits and should not be taken into account as a lawful development certificate should be considered in light of the facts and the law. It is, of course, clear that the Inspector appointed to determine the Appeal needs to consider whether, on the facts of the case and relevant planning law, the specific matter is or would be lawful. Planning merits are not relevant at any stage in this particular application or appeal process. The additional information provided has not been submitted to create a discussion in relation to planning merits of the case, rather, it was submitted to demonstrate the facts in relation to the construction process.
5. Further, the information provided sought to demonstrate that the impacts arising from the proposed construction details, be that in the build programme, construction traffic or in relation to water, are not material, viewed in the context of the development as a whole. This evidence demonstrates

Lakeside House  
Blackbrook Business Park  
Blackbrook Park Avenue  
Taunton TA1 2PX

Registered Office:  
Stantec UK Ltd  
Buckingham Court  
Kingsmead Business Park  
Frederick Place, London Road  
High Wycombe HP11 1JU  
Registered in England No. 1188070

that the proposed works are incidental and ancillary to the development granted by the Outline Planning Permission and not development in their own right. This evidence and submission responds to the assertions of the LPA and the interested parties to the opposite effect. The further information explains why the works are very much part of the foundation works and should be regarded as ancillary to the development permitted and not separate development for which planning permission would be required. The information also, importantly, notes that different parts of the construction process are normally undertaken at different times under different contracts for the purposes of efficiency; this standard practice during construction does not render each aspect of the construction a different construction activity for which a separate planning permission is required; they are all carefully managed in accordance within a single construction programme.

#### Build Programme

6. The build programme was submitted to illustrate the above fact, demonstrating that ground works are perfectly normal and are undertaken on every site as part of the development and staged construction process; the precise nature of ground works, of course, varies from site to site. It is entirely standard practice in the construction industry for Ground Work contractors to be the first on site and for them to prepare the site ahead of any above ground building works. Ground Work contractors undertake all of the required enabling works prior to handing the site over to the construction teams who proceed to build the houses. Those Ground Works are not a separate activity requiring their own planning permission.
7. On every construction site, there is always a programme which sets out a sequence of works. The programme submitted to accompany this appeal was provided to demonstrate that the ground stabilisation works form part of the site enabling works and irrespective of being undertaken over time to prepare for the subsequent construction process and being undertaken under a separate contract are not a separate activity as they are clearly part of the ground and foundation works. The ground stabilisation works have been illustrated separately for the purposes of evidential clarity, but the overlap with other tasks to implement the development shows that they are all of a piece. The evidence must be taken in the round.
8. The sequencing of construction works is entirely normal and indeed extremely common within the construction industry. The fact that the LPA is not aware of this is not wholly surprising as generally once planning permission has been granted and the conditions have been discharged, ground works and indeed the full construction works take place without the LPA having any further involvement.
9. In paragraph 12 of the LPA's Statement, it is stated that:  
  
*'the extent and nature of the groundworks are a separate activity of substance well beyond and entirely separate to the construction of foundations. The Council is not aware of any sites where such a significant level of groundwork has been carried out before foundations are constructed and the appellant has also not provided any examples.'*
10. The LPA indicate that they are not aware of any sites that have required this level of groundwork and have expressed a concern that the appellant has not provided any examples. This statement is surprising as there is an example in their own district namely Highlands Park. Whilst we fully understand that new information should not normally be introduced at this stage we attach further details of the development as this is necessary to demonstrate that the LPA's comments are unfounded. The further information identifies a very similar situation having occurred in the same LPA area as this scheme, and without any suggestion that a separate planning permission was required for those works. Appendix A confirms that from the information that is within the public domain and within the knowledge of the LPA, this site had very similar ground conditions to those at Thames Farm, Shiplake and a comparable level of grouting was required to stabilise the ground due to the dissolution features that are present.

This not only provides an example, but it demonstrates that the LPA has acted inconsistently, by reaching two different conclusions on two different but very similar sites. For Highlands Park, in discharging the surface water drainage condition, the LPA has concluded that ground stabilisation works were part of the foundation works and are ancillary to the development granted at outline permission.

11. The LPA in their statement at para 17 state:

*'The technical note states that "the grouting works will need to be undertaken to prepare the ground for building" and that "Given the nature of the grouting exercise, this has to be completed in each part of the site prior to other construction activity commencing on the 'house construction activities'." These references to the ground stabilisation and the housing development being two separate activities is at odds with the position outlined in the ASoC, where the ground stabilisation works are referred to as part of the construction of foundations.'*

12. As stated above in paragraph 7, the programme sets out all stages of works and the grouting exercise forms part of the ground works and is not a separate construction activity. The material has been presented in this separated-out form for illustrative purposes; in real life, there would be overlap. The LPAs statement at para 22 continues to state that the ground stabilisation works and the construction of the new homes are in the LPA's opinion two activities. However, for construction projects, all ground works (i.e works carried out to prepare the ground and below ground that lead to the foundations being laid including ground investigations, site clearance, piling, trenching, installation of footings and foundations and the provisions for drainage, cabling and the installation of utilities) are considered to be enabling works and are undertaken as part of the planning consent for the development that is being constructed above ground.

#### Construction Management Plan (CMP)

13. At paragraph 16 of the LPAs statement, it is noted that condition 5 (requiring a CMP) has previously been discharged and they note that the approved Plan does not include grouting lorry movements. The CMP does not deal with any specific lorry movements nor limit the numbers of movements. It does limit the hours of construction activity and vehicle routing and notes that a delivery management system will be operated. All of these matters and the further matters in the CMP would be adhered to when undertaking all construction activity including the ground remediation works.

#### The approved plans

14. In paras 25 and 26 of the LPA's statement they correctly set out what plans were approved as part of the Outline Planning Permission and as part of the reserved matters approval. The grouting works are consistent with the approved plans referenced in the Outline Planning Permission, namely drawing nos. C11748.16.01 (Location Plan), C11748.16.701 (Landscape Strategy), C11748.16.705 (Tree woodland planting), C11748.16.801 (Strategic Landscape Plan) and 3537/201 Rev. N. (access works). The final plan in this list was subsequently revised by a non-material amendment, which substituted Drawing no. A253-278-101-P5 for 3537/201 Rev. N. The access works have been completed in accordance with the approved drawing and the s278/38 Agreement.
15. The Outline Project Method Statement which accompanies the Appeal explains that ground stabilisation works will not be undertaken within the root protection area of existing trees and that within areas designated for new woodland tree planting, ground improvements will follow the requirements set out in the CSA Environmental Woodland Project Plan 2019 (included in Appendix G) to ensure that this ground is suitable for future planting and tree growth.

16. The Inspector's attention is also drawn to page 8 of the same Outline Method Statement which notes that the ground stabilisation methodology can be modified around structures such as utility features by drilling angled injection boreholes. The methodology and the boundaries of the area to be grouted will be developed ahead of the works commencing.
17. At paragraph 27 the LPA note that the drainage shown on the approved reserved matters plans cannot be implemented in conjunction with the proposed grouting. Whilst drainage details are shown on the approved plans, drainage is not a reserved matter and these drawings should have been regarded as illustrative as the Outline Planning Permission includes a specific drainage condition. The drainage statement which accompanied the Reserved Matters Application records at section 5 of the Drainage Statement "This chapter provides details on an **indicative** foul and surface water drainage strategy and measures to drain the Development". Drainage was included to demonstrate that the layout is capable of accommodating a feasible drainage strategy with the actual details being agreed through condition 11.
18. In paragraph 28 of the LPA's statement they correctly advise that condition 11 relating to the drainage strategy has not yet been discharged. There are a number of potential solutions to drain the site having regard to the remediation works and the approved reserved matters plans including the **indicative** drainage plans and statement. These details have not been shared with the LPA to date due to the LPA's stance regarding the works the subject of this Appeal. Following the outcome of the Appeal, a further application to discharge condition 11 will be submitted with details of suitable methods to deal with surface water drainage on this site. Approval under this condition will be and has to be obtained prior to further construction activity commencing.
19. Since condition 11 has not been discharged, unlike condition 5 (the CMP), it does not affect the Inspector's decision on whether the works which are the subject of the Appeal can take place pursuant to the Planning Permission which encompasses the details approved to date. We would expect the Inspector's decision to acknowledge that the proposed works the subject of the Appeal are lawful subject to discharging the remaining pre-commencement condition.
20. It is the Appellant's case that the ground stabilisation works are consistent with details approved by the LPA to date.

#### Court Judgement

21. The LPA (paragraph 29) and the Thames Farm Action Group have made reference to the court judgement *Eatherley v London Borough of Camden*, 2016 EWHC 3108. Having reviewed this court judgement, the Appellant considers that it has been mis-applied by the Council in this instance. This case raised a question about the extent to which subterranean development can be carried out relying on the statutory regime of permitted development rights, in particular to the meaning of the permitted development in Class A of Part 1, Schedule 2, "enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse". The Court held that the ordinary rules of statutory interpretation applied to permissions under the GDPO.
22. In the *Eatherley* case the local planning authority asserted that the straightforward English words of Class A embraced domestic basements because a basement undoubtedly enlarged, improved, or altered a dwelling house. The Court held that this logic had an attractive simplicity, but the difficulty in accepting it arose from the absence of any boundaries to the permission. There had to be a point where the excavation, underpinning and support for a basement became different in character from the enlargement, improvement and alteration of the dwelling permitted by the GDPO. In the context of a "two up two down" terrace house in suburban London, the development of a new basement when there was currently nothing underneath the house, could, as a matter of fact and degree, amount to two substantial developments, because the engineering aspect of excavating a space while supporting the house and the neighbours' properties might be a separate planning aspect.

23. The Court held that it was for the planning committee, not for the court on an application for judicial review, to decide whether there were two activities or one. In the instant case, the planning committee had asked itself the wrong question. It had focused on whether the engineering works were part and parcel of making a basement, when it should have asked whether they constituted a separate activity of substance. The Court further notes that had the committee asked the right question, it would have needed to assess the additional planning impact of the engineering works at the time of granting the certificate.
24. As noted, the matters in the *Eatherley* Case involve the interpretation of the GDPO, the interpretation of which is different to interpreting an express grant of planning permission and are not relevant to this Appeal. The Appellant is not seeking to rely on the GDPO and permitted development rights but the express grant of planning permission.

### **Response of Interested Parties**

25. The responses received from the interested parties including the Thames Farm Action Group (TFAG) representation (endorsed by Shiplake Parish Council) which mirrors a number of the LPA's comments and we respond to this representation and other third parties as follows:

#### Introduction of Additional Information not before the LPA

26. The third parties have also objected to the additional evidential material included with the appeal. As noted the additional information was submitted to demonstrate the facts in relation to the construction process and to demonstrate that the impacts arising from the proposed construction details, be that in the build programme, construction traffic or in relation to water, are not material, viewed in the context of the development as a whole. This evidence demonstrates that the proposed works are incidental and ancillary to the development granted by the outline planning permission and not development in their own right.

#### Need for ground remediation not known at the outline stage and no appraisal of foundation design and therefore the works were not applied for

27. TFAG assert that as the need for ground remediation was not known at the outline stage and no appraisal of potential foundation design was undertaken the ground remediation works cannot be permitted by the Outline Planning Permission. Permission cannot be given for works not even in contemplation at the time of the initial application or approval.
28. To have certainty on ground conditions requires intrusive investigations and it is common place to leave those investigations post the grant of planning permission. To suggest that the effect of taking such a step leaves developers exposed on the need for further planning permission is unworkable and is also at odds with the case of *R v Basildon DC. ex.p Martin Grant Homes Ltd [1987] JPL 863* referenced in the Appellant's legal opinion of Morag Ellis KC (see paragraph 2.5). That case concerned a full grant of permission for residential development which had been granted on the basis of certain levels marked on plans. At Building Regulation stage, however, the Council's Building Control department had required higher levels in order to approve a gravity drainage scheme. Basildon District Council as Local Planning Authority argued that the new levels were not authorised by the planning permission. The Court disagreed, on two bases: firstly, that the Council as LPA was deemed to know of its decision under Building Regulations and, secondly, that the LPA, in granting permission, must have intended that all necessary and reasonable works for implementing the permission were incorporated within the general grant of permission. As noted in the same paragraph of Morag Ellis KC's opinion this case has been applied in a modern appeal decision on a Certificate of Lawfulness: APP/C3430/X/17/3176413, High House, Poplar Lane, Cannock WS11 1RS included in the Appeal bundle of documents. In that case, upon implementation of a permission for partial demolition and reconstruction of a building, it was

discovered that the foundations were substandard. Therefore, rebuilding began with trench excavation for installation of new foundations on the footprint of the previous building. Martin Grant was cited to and applied by the inspector on its second limb (i.e in granting permission, must have intended that all necessary and reasonable works for implementing the permission were incorporated within the general grant of permission).

The works will result in physical disturbance to the ground abstraction boreholes and aquifer or otherwise affect the public water supply and/or these are matters that need further consideration (TFAG, Susan Barbour, Sara Browett, Alan Crystal, Anthony De Normann, Alan Levison, Joanna Stone)

29. A number of the interested parties raise concerns regarding physical disturbance to the aquifer and the requirements of the Environment Agency where a hydrogeological risk assessment identifies unacceptable risks. A hydrogeological impact assessment has been provided with the Appeal documents which demonstrates that the grouting will not have an effect on the nearby ground abstraction boreholes where groundwater is abstracted from the chalk aquifer for public water supply.
30. The Environment Agency's ability to protect ground water resources and the policy referenced in TFAG's representation extends beyond controlling how development proceeds. The Environment Agency has the ability to stop activities that are polluting activities outside of planning controls. The Environment Agency expects site owners, developers and operators to comply with any relevant government or Environment Agency guidance when undertaking any works that could affect ground water resources and it has the ability to prevent or control activities that could be polluting activities through its regulatory function and framework, regardless of whether it has made or been able to make representations at any planning stage (e.g in the case of the GDPO representation may not come into play).
31. TFAG correctly references paragraph 188 of the NPPF (September 2023) which notes as follows:

*"The focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes). Planning decisions should assume that these regimes will operate effectively. Equally, where a planning decision has been made on a particular development, the planning issues should not be revisited through the permitting regimes operated by pollution control authorities".*

The relevant paragraph at the time of the grant of the Outline Planning Permission (paragraph 122 of the NPPF (2012) was similar:

*".... local planning authorities should focus on whether the development itself is an acceptable use of the land, and the impact of the use, rather than the control of processes or emissions themselves where these are subject to approval under pollution control regimes. Local planning authorities should assume that these regimes will operate effectively. Equally, where a planning decision has been made on a particular development, the planning issues should not be revisited through the permitting regimes operated by pollution control authorities."*

The question at the Outline Planning Permission stage was whether development of the site was appropriate for housing. There are other controls which govern processes and emissions and which can come into play should that be necessary here. As previously noted the Appellant's evidence is that there will be no impact on ground water and to the extent that this depends on the associated drainage strategy this remains to be approved and will need to be discharged ahead of the works which are the subject of this Appeal commencing.

32. It is acknowledged that TFAG has provided a critique of the hydrogeological impact assessment and other third parties (Sara Browett) suggest that the Appellant has failed to provide an adequate hydrogeological impact assessment. This is not accepted by the Appellant. The technical assessment work undertaken to date provides an initial assessment and initial methodology, where necessary further work will be undertaken ahead of the works commencing and in the discharge of Condition 11, as noted above.

#### Engineering operations and other operations

33. TFAG quote a number of cases on what amounts to an engineering operation or other operations and, therefore, development requiring planning permission. TFAG note that the threshold for constituting an engineering operation or other operation is low, eg. the digging out of a tennis court amounts to development. The fact that the works the subject of the Appeal may be an engineering operation or other operation and therefore involving development does not make the intended works separate development for which planning permission is required. In this regard we would draw the inspector's attention to the case referenced above and paragraph 2.4 of the legal opinion of Gowling WG where Nourse, LJ judgment in *West Bowers Farm Products Ltd v Essex CC* is quoted. Again for convenience Lord Justice Nourse noted:

*"The planning legislation was not impressed by the indivisibility of single processes. It cared only for their effects. A single process might for planning purposes amount to two activities. Whether it did so or not was a question of fact and degree. If it involved two activities, each of substance, so that one was not merely ancillary to the other, then both required permission."*

34. The works the subject of the Appeal need, however, to be viewed in the context of the development as a whole. When judged against the development as a whole, the scale and duration of the works are not works of substance and are ancillary to the development of houses.

#### Existing Sinkholes and the Lack of Information or Due diligence

35. TFAG raise criticism of the amount of due diligence undertaken by the previous owner and the Appellant as to ground conditions. For the reasons already noted this is common place and not relevant to the subject matter of the appeal. Any applicant or developer coming to development expects that all necessary and reasonable works for implementing the permission are authorised, including any works to remediate and/or to provide appropriate foundations for the permitted development.

#### Other Matters raised by Third Parties

36. There are third party representations that appear to revert back to the principle of the housing development which is not relevant to this appeal. Such representations include those of Professor Barbour which notes that the development will prejudice the health and wellbeing of the local community. Should that representation be a representation regarding the public water supply then this is addressed at paragraphs 29 to 32 above. The representation of Susan Barbour notes:

*"It is time to accept that earlier mistakes in granting permission for a development without due diligence be acknowledged and the opportunity to stop further damage being inflicted should be taken".*

Such points are illustrative of the opposition to the principle of development and why the Appellant has had to make the Appeal.

37. Other third parties reference back to drainage (e.g. Sara Browett) as noted above the condition related to drainage is yet to be discharged.

**Conclusion**

38. The evidence clearly demonstrates that the proposed ground remediation is ancillary to the residential development. The works are not a separate activity of substance or scale and the objective purpose is ground remediation to ensure solid foundations for the permitted residential development. The ground remediation is not, therefore, a separate engineering operation requiring the grant of planning permission. The Appeal should, therefore, be allowed and the Certificate of Lawful Development granted.

Yours sincerely,



**Robin Shepherd**  
Director of Planning  
on behalf of Stantec UK Ltd

Encs: APPENDIX A – CASE STUDY

## Appendix A – Case Study

### Site Location

Site Location: Highlands Park, Henley-on-Thames, Oxfordshire, RG9 4BD

LPA: South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC)

Development: Construction of up to 170 dwellings along with up to 2,000 m<sup>2</sup> B1 employment space, a community hub, public open space etc.

### Background:

SODC granted planning permission for a site that is within close proximity (circa 1km) to Thames Farm, Shiplake as shown below:



### Relevance to appeal:

This site is very similar to the site that is the subject to this appeal. The LPA granted outline planning permission and reserved matters approval. The outline planning permission included a condition requiring surface water drainage details to be submitted. The discharge of condition is the first time that the compaction grouting is highlighted and identified as being required.

From the information that is within the public domain, this site had very similar ground conditions as Thames Farm, Shiplake and a significant level of grouting was required to stabilise the ground due to the dissolution features that are present.

In order to discharge the surface water drainage condition, a report titled 'Desk Study and Ground Investigation' was submitted and approved by the LPA, this report is dated June 2012 and was updated in November 2016. This report was discharged as part of the material submitted in September 2019.

This approved report under the 'Geotechnical Conclusions' on page vi states:

|                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Ground Treatment</b></p> | <p>In order to mitigate the risks of loose ground and voids from the identified solution features and to meet the low risk requirements of the Client, it is recommended that excavation to the top of the Chalk and is undertaken. Any solution features identified will then be grouted (compaction grouting), by a specialist contractor and suitable excavated soils replaced and compacted to a Structural Fill Specification (including the placement of a geogrid or geotextile) in accordance with the Specification for Highways Works.</p> |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

This approved report continues to discuss compaction grouting on page 48 and sets out the '*pressure grouting of the solution features*' are required as part of the 'Enablement Phase'. An extract is provided below:

#### 6.9.2 Enablement Phase

The following works are considered necessary during the Enablement Phase of works;

- break out of all hardstanding and below ground obstructions and processing for reuse;
- removal of above ground tanks, below ground tanks, drums, existing drainage system and associated pipework;
- examination of soils below and around all potential point sources (known hotspots, above ground tanks, underground tanks, drums, pipes, drains and areas of staining);
- removal of any free phase hydrocarbons and disposal;
- *ex situ* remediation of petroleum hydrocarbon contaminated soils
- excavation of all Topsoil and Made Ground soils, with appropriate materials management, remediation and processing of excavated soils using a combination of: excavation and stockpiling and screening of soils;
- appropriate mitigation measures (by suitably trained operatives) during excavation, processing, screening and placement of Made Ground soils to remove identifiable ACM and mitigate the risks of asbestos fibres becoming airborne;
- For areas where full excavation is permitted (Area 2, Area 3 (northwest) and Area 5), the following geotechnical works will be undertaken:
  - bulk excavation of River Terrace Deposits with an archaeological watching brief or archaeological control as necessary;
  - ground improvement from a reduced level in the area of deep Made Ground (former Chalk Quarry) in the southwest of the site;
  - location and treatment of solution features within the Seaford Chalk by visual observation of the upper chalk surface;
  - pressure grouting of the solution features;
  - over-excavation / improvement of the solution feature areas;

This extract demonstrates that in discharging this planning condition on another site that the LPA in September 2019 concluded that '*pressure grouting of the solution features*' to be site enabling works.

This not only provides an example, it demonstrates that the LPA has acted inconsistently, it has reached two different conclusions in two different but very similar sites. For Highlands Park, in discharging the surface water drainage condition, the LPA has concluded that ground stabilisation works are part of the foundation works and are ancillary to the development granted through the outline permission.

## Planning History

Outline Planning: Reference: P16/S0077/O

Outline planning application (all matters reserved except for access) for the phased development of the demolition of existing buildings and construction of up to 170 dwellings along with up to 2,000 m2 B1 employment space, a Community Hub, public open space, sustainable urban drainage, earthworks, structural planting, substations and associated infrastructure. (as amended by drawings and accompanying additional information received 4 October 2016).

Granted: 22 December 2016

Reserved Matters: Reference: P17/S0024/RM

Reserved matters approval for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following P16/S0077/O (design amended as outlined within agent's letter dated 5 April 2017) 'Outline planning application (all matters reserved except for access) for the phased development of the demolition of existing buildings and construction of up to 170 dwellings along with up to 2,000 m2 B1 employment space, a Community Hub, public open space, sustainable urban drainage, earthworks, structural planting, substations and associated infrastructure

Granted: 4 May 2017

Discharge of Condition: Reference: P18/S0234/DIS

Discharge of condition 14 - surface water drainage works, 25 - foul drainage works and 28 - cycle parking facilities on application ref. P16/S0077/O (amended drainage details received 4 September 2018). Outline planning application (all matters reserved except for access) for the phased development of the demolition of existing buildings and construction of up to 170 dwellings along with up to 2,000 m2 B1 employment space, a Community Hub, public open space, sustainable urban drainage, earthworks, structural planting, substations and associated infrastructure.

Discharged: 6 September 2019

Amended scheme: Reference: P19/S2646/FUL

Full planning permission for a variation of housing mix at Highlands Farm (as consented under P17/S0024/RM), comprising the substitution of 85 dwellings in the central and south-western parts of the site with 113 dwellings; a net increase of 28 dwellings with 40% affordable housing maintained across the site, along with footpath connection (as amended to alter the route of the proposed footway off Highlands Lane and to provide minor adjustments to the development layout)

Granted: 25 June 2020