

Kevin Goodwin  
CgMs Consulting  
Morley House  
Holborn Viaduct  
London  
EC1A 2AT

Our Ref: APP/Q3630/A/07/2042202

28 February 2008

Dear Mr Goodwin

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 – SECTION 78.  
APPEAL BY GOLDCREST HOMES (PORTESBURY) LTD  
APPLICATION No: RU.06/1175 (as amended by agreement and  
resubmitted as RU.07/0547)  
FORMER SAFEWAY STORE, STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE, SURREY  
KT15 2PH**

1. I am directed by the Secretary of State to say that consideration has been given to the report of the Inspector, Jean Jones MA DipTP MRTPI, into your client's appeal under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) to refuse outline planning permission for redevelopment of the site for residential use (comprising 191 dwelling units) and 272 sq. m of retail floorspace, with 134 car parking spaces, on land at former Safeway store, Station Road, Addlestone Road, Surrey, KT15 2PH. The public local inquiry was held on 11,12 and 13 September 2007.

2. On 17 April 2007 the appeal was recovered for the Secretary of State's determination, in pursuance of Section 79 of, and paragraph 3 of Schedule 6 to, the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

**Inspector's recommendation and summary of the decision**

3. The Inspector, whose report is enclosed with this letter, recommended that the appeal be dismissed and planning permission refused. For the reasons given below, the Secretary of State disagrees with her recommendation and has decided to grant planning permission. A copy of the Inspector's report (IR) is enclosed. All references to paragraph numbers, unless otherwise stated, are to that report.

**Procedural Matters**

4. The Secretary of State notes that the agreed description of the proposed development has been amended (IR4 and IR11). She does not consider that any prejudice has been caused to any party by accepting these amendments

and has determined the application on this basis. She has therefore based her decision on the description at paragraph 1 of this letter.

5. In reaching her decision the Secretary of State has taken into account the Environmental Statement (ES) and revised ES (details of which are set out in IR12-13) which were submitted under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999. Like the Inspector, the Secretary of State considers that the ES complies with the above regulations and is adequate for the purposes of this case (IR110). Furthermore, in assessing the merits of the proposed conditions (see paragraphs 28-29 below), she agrees with the Inspector that the mitigation measures necessary can be provided for by means of the suggested planning conditions (IR110).

6. On 19 December 2007 the Secretary of State referred back to inquiry parties on the basis that she was not yet in a position to determine the appeals. The Secretary of State required further information on the provision of affordable housing following the formal adoption, on 13 December 2007, after the close of the inquiry, of the RBC Interim Policy Note on Affordable Housing (IPNAH). Responses were received from CgMs Consulting dated 28 January 2008 and from RBC dated 3 and 25 January. The Secretary of State wrote to inquiry parties on 29 January circulating these responses and inviting comments on them. She also indicated that any further information would be considered, before coming to a final view on this application. She received responses from CgMs Consulting dated 5 February and RBC dated 5 February. Copies of this correspondence are not attached to this letter but may be obtained on written request to this office. The Secretary of State has taken full account of all of this post-inquiry correspondence in reaching her decision. The issues are considered in paragraphs 25-27 below.

### **Policy Considerations**

7. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, the development plan comprises the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East (RPG9) (2001), the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 (SP) and the Runnymede Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 (LP). The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that relevant development plan policies include those set out in IR18-20.

8. Other material considerations which the Secretary of State has taken into account include those documents identified by the Inspector at IR21-26. As the IPNAH was formally adopted by RBC on 13 December, the Secretary of State has afforded greater weight to this document than the Inspector and, for this reason, considered it necessary to refer back to parties as set out above.

9. She has also taken into account as material considerations Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1 *"Delivering Sustainable Development"*, Planning Policy Guidance Note (PPG) 2 *"Green Belts"*, PPS3 *"Housing"*, PPS6 *"Planning for Town Centres"*, PPS12 *"Local Development Frameworks"*, PPG13 *"Transport"*,

PPS22 “Renewable Energy”, PPS23 “Planning and Pollution Control”, PPG24 “Planning and Noise”, PPG25 “Development and Flood Risk”.

10. The Secretary of State has also taken into account “*Planning and Climate Change*”, the supplement to PPS1, published on 17 December 2007. She does not consider that this raises any new issues relevant to this application that either affect her decision, or require her to refer back to the parties for further representations before reaching her decision.

### **Main Issues**

11. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the main considerations in this appeal are those set out in IR82.

#### The development plan

12. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector’s conclusions on the development plan as set out in IR83, including that an assessment of the proposals against the development plan is a matter of judgement against the main considerations identified in IR82.

#### Character, appearance and functioning

13. For the reasons given in IR84-85, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the access details are acceptable and that the proposal would function satisfactorily in movement terms.

14. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector’s reasoning and conclusions on the scale, massing and height of the proposal, as set out in IR86-93. She agrees that *By Design* gives a good framework for assessing the scheme (IR86), but for the reasons given below, does not agree with the Inspector’s conclusion that the proposal would be over dominant and harmful to the character and appearance of its surroundings (IR111).

15. In considering this issue, the Secretary of State accepts that many of the buildings nearest to the site are two storey (IR86). However, she also notes the Inspector’s observations that “there is a variety of building heights in Addlestone town centre and it lacks a cohesive structure”, and that “there are some higher buildings not far away” (IR86). In view of this, the Secretary of State concludes that the urban pattern and grain of the area is somewhat mixed in usage, massing and height.

16. Having concluded this, the Secretary of State has then, like the Inspector, gone on to consider whether the proposal would be in keeping with these surroundings. She agrees with the Inspector that the height and mass of the four storey “Backdrop” (block G) would be appropriate and could enhance its surroundings (IR86), and that the heights of the “Villa” blocks A-D relative to the adjoining houses are acceptable (IR88). She also agrees that “the station is an important focus for the town centre and some increase in the height of buildings in its vicinity would assist legibility” (IR86). She further notes that the Inspector

considers that the “Beacon” (block F) could be acceptable in principle on this footprint, albeit as an urban or civic scale building (IR87). These factors serve to demonstrate to the Secretary of State that the proposal would conform with certain aspects of its surroundings.

17. Notwithstanding this, the Secretary of State does accept that there would be a number of features of the proposal which would be less in keeping with its surroundings. She accepts that the “Buffer” block E would be a long, continuous feature (IR89). However, she considers that efforts to vary its roofline and articulate its façade mitigate against this to some extent. She also accepts that block F would be seen from many points. However, given her conclusion that the proposal is in a mixed urban area, she does not consider that it would stand out to the extent that it would be over dominant. The Secretary of State also agrees with the Inspector that the proximity of blocks E and F would be read together as a large building (though she would not go so far as to say “massive”) and that the large footprints and mass of blocks A-D do not reflect the finer grain of existing development (IR88). However, given her conclusion that this is a mixed height area, she considers that it is not strictly necessary to conform exactly with the immediate area and, having concluded that the heights of blocks A-D are acceptable, she is satisfied that there would be an acceptable degree of conformity with surroundings. In view of these factors the Secretary of State does not consider that the aspects of the proposal addressed in this paragraph are so detrimental as to warrant refusal, as has been concluded by the Inspector.

18. In view of the acceptability of the proposal in those respects set out in paragraphs 13-17 above and the Secretary of State’s opinion that the negative factors are less detrimental than concluded by the Inspector, the Secretary of State does not consider that there are any overriding objections to the proposal in terms of its relationship with its surroundings - indeed, she considers that it relates quite well to them.

19. In relation to the internal layout of the proposal, the Secretary of State does not consider that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the proposal would be unacceptable. She reaches this conclusion after careful consideration of the Design and Access Statement, proposed planning conditions, and other design matters considered at the inquiry, and the Inspector’s assessment of these - in particular her conclusions in IR88 and IR89. For example, although the Secretary of State accepts that there may be a relative lack of space for planting of sufficient scale to be a foil to such large buildings (IR88), she does not consider this to be an overriding objection to the scheme, particularly in view of what appears to be acceptable amenity space around blocks A-D. In fact, it appears to the Secretary of State that, on the basis of the Design and Access Statement and having addressed *By Design* (IR92), the proposal would be of a relatively high standard of design. The Secretary of State also observes that there is nothing in the development plan to suggest that the proposed density is too high. Indeed the Secretary of State notes that the proposal site has been overtly identified as being suitable for high density housing development as far back as 1999, having been identified in the Addlestone Town Centre Strategy

SPG. She considers that this adds some weight to the high density proposed, albeit she accepts that it does not specify the high level proposed.

20. The Secretary of State further considers that this is a particularly sustainable location, being within walking distance of the many amenities of the town centre. While she accepts that train and bus services are not of a very high frequency (IR91), she considers that they are good (as does the Inspector in IR94), and enhance what is already a sustainable location. She therefore disagrees with the Inspector's conclusion in IR91 that these transport facilities do not support this very high density.

21. In view of her conclusions in this section, the Secretary of State considers that the proposal would meet development plan policies SE4, BE2 and HO9 and would be in line with design policies set out in PPS1 and PPS3. Given that the proposal is in outline the Secretary of State considers that it would be advisable for the developer to consult CABE's Design Review Panel in formulating proposals for the detailed design of the scheme, just as all local authorities are encouraged to consult CABE on any scheme that is significant in some way<sup>1</sup>.

#### Housing supply/demand and the provision of high quality, sustainable, mixed and inclusive communities

22. With respect to housing supply, the Secretary of State notes the Inspector's conclusion that there is up to date evidence of a 5 year supply of housing sites that meet the criteria of PPS3 as being available, suitable and achievable and that this would still be the case even without the appeal site (IR94).

23. Like the Inspector, the Secretary of State has carefully considered the land supply position, including that set out in "Draft Policy Guidance - Housing Delivery" (doc LPA2), in which she notes that the proposal site is specifically identified as a site over 1 ha with housing potential. Notwithstanding that the proposal may, as concluded by the Inspector (IR94), not be needed to meet the five year land supply, it appears to the Secretary of State, on this basis, that this site is highly likely to be treated as one of the sites which would be allocated in the overall land supply as set out in paragraph 53 of PPS3. Following this conclusion, she has gone on to consider whether granting planning permission would undermine achievement of the local authority's policy objectives as set out in paragraph 70 of PPS3. Given that the Secretary of State has concluded elsewhere in this decision that the proposal would not conflict with the development plan to the extent that planning permission should be refused, she concludes that it would not undermine other objectives. Although the Secretary of State accepts that the "Draft Policy Guidance – Housing Delivery" can only be given limited weight, she considers that it represents the best and most up to date available information with regard to housing delivery in Runnymede on which to base her decision. In view of these factors, she concludes that releasing this site now would not be in conflict with the development plan and would conform with PPS3.

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter to local planning authorities dated 6 December 2006: [Planning Applications: Arrangements for Consulting Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment as a Non-Statutory Consultee](#)

24. For the reasons given in IR94, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the proposal would lead to the provision of a sustainable mixed and inclusive community. She disagrees with the Inspector's conclusion in this paragraph that the quality would not be high, and has set out her reasons for this above.

#### Affordable Housing

25. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the position with regard to the provision of affordable housing. She agrees with the Inspector's reasoning and conclusions that, at the time of the inquiry, there was insufficient policy justification for refusing planning permission on the basis that only 35% rather than 40% affordable housing had been offered (IR97). However, as noted above, since the close of the inquiry, the IPNAH has been formally adopted and therefore carries greater weight than at the time of the inquiry. Having deemed it necessary on this basis to refer back to parties for further information the Secretary of State has carefully considered the further information provided in reaching her decision on this appeal. She notes that there has been no change to the amount of affordable housing being offered and has carefully considered the reasons put forward by the appellants for this – reasons which were largely rehearsed at the inquiry. Equally, she has carefully considered the reasons why RBC consider the amount of affordable housing to be inadequate – again, the reasons for which were largely rehearsed at the inquiry. On the basis of the further information provided, and that submitted to the inquiry, the Secretary of State does not accept that the appellant's viability argument justifies a lower provision of affordable housing. She agrees with the Inspector's assessment of this matter in IR98-99 and considers that it is the high cost paid for the land that is the issue. Having reached this conclusion the Secretary of State does not consider that the proposed amount of affordable housing meets the requirements of the IPNAH. She therefore considers this to be a factor weighing against the proposal.

26. Notwithstanding this, the Secretary of State has taken into account the significant need for affordable housing in RBC and that this proposal would, in total, deliver 67 much needed affordable housing units - only 9 fewer units than would be provided if 40% of the units were affordable. Whilst this is not a sufficient reason on its own to overcome the conflict with IPNAH in this respect, the Secretary of State has given some weight to this factor in balancing the failure to meet the requirements of the IPNAH against RBC's current inability to deliver affordable housing provision in line with identified need.

#### Planning obligation or conditions

27. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's reasoning and conclusions on planning obligations or conditions as set out in IR100-103. Notwithstanding the additional weight she has afforded to the IPNAH which sets out a planning obligation as the only means of providing affordable housing, she considers that the delivery of the proposed affordable housing by way of planning condition would be acceptable. This is because, like the Inspector (IR102), she is satisfied that the condition would both be in line with guidance in

Circular 11/95, and meet the advice in the Planning Officers' Society Best Practice Note. It would therefore deliver the affordable housing as intended and agreed, and the Secretary of State can see no reason to reject this route on such a basis.

28. The Secretary of State also agrees with the Inspector's reasoning and conclusions on planning conditions set out in IR78-81.

Contributions to infrastructure, living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, traffic and parking, and other matters

29. The Secretary of state agrees with the Inspector's reasoning and conclusions on those matters addressed in IR104-109. She agrees that the contributions to infrastructure are necessary and meet the tests of Circular 5/2005 (IR104-105). She also agrees that there would be no unacceptable impact in respect of the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers (IR106). She further agrees that the proposal would accord with maximum parking standards and with respect to the impact of traffic (IR108).

**Overall Conclusions**

30. For the reasons given in paragraphs 13-21 above, the Secretary of State considers that the internal design of the proposal is acceptable and that, overall, the development would have a satisfactory relationship with its surroundings. She also considers that the proposal is in a particularly sustainable location for the reasons set out in paragraph 20. In housing terms she is satisfied that releasing this site now would conform with the objective in PPS3 of delivering a flexible supply of land for housing, would not undermine other policy objectives in the development plan, and that the density of the proposal is acceptable. She does not consider that the proposal meets the requirements of the IPNAH and she has taken this into account in determining the application.

31. The Secretary of State concludes that the proposal would meet development plan policies SE4, BE2 and HO9 and would be in line with PPS3 (except with respect to delivering affordable housing) and design policies set out in PPS1. Despite the conflict with the IPNAH and PPS3 (with respect to affordable housing), the Secretary of State is satisfied that these conflicts do not outweigh the compliance with development plan and national plan policies in other respects. She therefore concludes that there are no material considerations of sufficient weight which would justify refusing planning permission.

**Formal Decision**

32. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, the Secretary of State disagrees with the Inspector's recommendation. She hereby allows the appeal and grants outline planning permission for redevelopment of the site for residential use (comprising 191 dwelling units) and 272 sq. m of retail floorspace, with 134 car parking spaces, on land at former Safeway store, Station Road, Addlestone

Road, Surrey, KT15 2PH, in accordance with application number RU.07/0547, dated 18 May 2007, subject to the conditions set out at Annex A.

33. An applicant for any consent, agreement or approval required by a condition of this permission has a statutory right of appeal to the Secretary of State if consent, agreement or approval is refused or granted conditionally or if the local planning authority fail to give notice of their decision within the prescribed period.

34. This letter does not convey any approval or consent which may be required under any enactment, bye-law, order or regulation other than that required under section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

35. This letter serves as the Secretary of State's statement under Regulation 21(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999.

**Right to challenge the decision**

36. A separate note is attached setting out the circumstances in which the validity of the Secretary of State's decision may be challenged by making an application to the High Court within 6 weeks of the date of this letter.

37. A copy of this letter has been sent to Runnymede Borough Council and all parties who appeared at the inquiry.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Lynch  
Authorised by the Secretary of State to sign in that behalf

## **ANNEX A**

### **Conditions**

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the external elevations of all buildings and structures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) No development shall take place until details of the modified access to the site from Victory Park Road and details of surfacing materials for all roads and footways within the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access to Victory Park Road shall be modified and the roads and footways within the site shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details before any of the new development is occupied. The footways linking to areas outside the site shall be constructed to the site boundary before any dwelling is occupied.
- 6) No development shall take place until details of the layout and surfacing of 134 parking spaces have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The layout shall enable cars to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. It shall indicate two parking spaces that are to be reserved for use by members of a car club.
- 7) The approved parking/turning areas shall be completed before any of the dwellings that they serve are occupied. The parking spaces shall be used only for the parking of vehicles incidental and ancillary to the residential use of the dwellings hereby permitted and shall thereafter be maintained solely for parking purposes and made available to the occupiers of those properties at all times for such purposes. The two spaces for use by members of a car club shall be retained available for that purpose at all times. No parking space shall be used for the parking/storage of boats, caravans or trailers.
- 8) The reserved matters of landscaping shall include (a) hard landscape details including proposed finished levels, hard surfacing materials, minor structures, existing features to be retained and a timetable for implementation; (b) soft landscape details including planting plans, written specifications, schedules of plants and trees, noting species, plant sizes, proposed numbers and densities of planting and a timetable for implementation. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out as approved and completed in accordance with the approved timetables.
- 9) No development shall take place until details of a scheme for the management and maintenance of the open space and amenity areas within the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the approved scheme has been commenced and it shall be retained as approved thereafter.
- 10) No development shall take place until details of all screen and boundary walls, fences and any other means of enclosure have been submitted to and approved in

writing by the Local Planning Authority, together with a timetable for their provision in relation to the new dwellings. The approved means of enclosure shall be erected in accordance with the approved timetable and retained thereafter as approved.

11) No development shall take place until details of the servicing of the retail units and the storage and collection of refuse for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved refuse storage facilities and servicing space shall be provided before any retail unit is occupied. The servicing space shall be kept available for the loading and off-loading of delivery and service vehicles and shall not be used as a parking area.

12) No development shall take place until details of any external lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before the buildings to which the lighting relates are first occupied.

13) No development shall take place until details of a scheme to protect the development, including the amenity space between blocks F and G, from noise from the railway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No habitable rooms within Block E shall face the railway. The scheme shall comprise acoustic fencing along sections of the eastern boundary with the railway and acoustic glazing with ventilation in Block E and any other means to protect the development from noise, in accordance with the recommendations of the report by MoirHands contained in the Environmental Statement dated May 2007. The scheme shall then be implemented in accordance with the agreed details and shall be retained and maintained thereafter.

14) No development shall take place until details of a scheme to protect the development from vibration have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the recommendations of the report by MoirHands contained in the Environmental Statement dated May 2007. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details. Blocks E, F and G shall not be occupied until a validation report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which shall include measurements taken on upper floors as well as the ground floor.

15) No development shall take place until details of measures to achieve a minimum of 10% of the predicted energy consumption through renewable energy technologies has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained and maintained to provide the approved level of generation.

16) No dwelling shall be occupied unless it has been provided in accordance with the Predictive Assessment prepared by RPS dated April 2007 to achieve a minimum of Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.

17) No development shall take place until details of the proposed service bay and bus stand/stop on Victory Park Road have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling or retail unit shall be occupied until the service bay and bus stand/stop has been constructed as approved.

18) No development shall take place until a scheme for secure cycle storage that is covered and lit, at a ratio of 1 space per residential unit, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle storage to serve each block shall be provided as approved before the any dwelling in that block is occupied and it shall be retained thereafter exclusively for its designated purpose.

19) (a) No development shall take place until a detailed Intrusive Investigation Report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The site investigation shall include gas and groundwater monitoring and further

investigation of identified hotspots, and the report shall include a conceptual site model, identifying all potential pollutant linkages and quantitative analysis where necessary.

(b) If the results of the site investigation indicate the need for remediation of the site, a suitable remediation strategy shall be submitted as a Remediation Report to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing prior to commencement of development. The Remediation Report shall include details of how each pollutant linkage will be adequately severed, and shall be fully implemented.

(c) Prior to occupation of the first residential unit, a Validation Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Validation Report shall provide evidence that each element of the agreed remediation strategy has been carried out to an adequate standard and that all pollutant linkages have been broken.

(d) Should any previously unidentified contamination be discovered during the course of the construction of the development hereby approved, the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately. The additional contamination shall be fully assessed by a person deemed competent by the Local Planning Authority, with associated amendments made to the remediation strategy where appropriate. Any additional assessment and amendments shall also be subjected to the processes described in (a)-(c) above.

20) No development shall take place until a detailed scheme for surface water drainage works and timetable has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the recommendations of the Flood Risk Assessment prepared by RPS dated May 2007. The drainage works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and timetable. Any soakaway must be constructed in natural ground, such that its base is at least 1m above the highest seasonal water table and in any case no deeper than 3m.

21) No development shall take place until a Method of Construction Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of:

a) Parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors.

b) Loading and unloading of plant and materials.

c) Storage of plant and materials.

d) Programme of works (including measures for traffic management).

e) Details of cleaning facilities to prevent the deposition of extraneous matter on the public highway.

The approved details shall be implemented and retained during the construction period. No construction works, including contamination treatment, shall take place outside the hours of 0800-1800 on Mondays to Fridays, 0800-1300 on Saturdays or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

22) The air quality mitigation measures, including dust deposition monitoring, shall be carried out during construction of the development hereby approved in accordance with the recommendations in paragraphs 5.49 to 5.54 of the Environmental Statement dated May 2007.

23) No dwelling shall be occupied until a Travel Plan, prepared in accordance with Surrey County Council's Travel Plan Good Practice Note, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall include details of the information to be provided to occupiers of the new dwellings and details of the management of the Travel Plan, including any car club. The approved Travel

Plan shall be implemented when the first dwelling is occupied and carried out thereafter in accordance with the approved details.

24) No doors on the ground floor of Blocks F and G on the western elevation facing the servicing and bus bay shall open onto the public highway.

25) No windows or other openings shall at any time be provided on the western flank elevation of Block D at first floor and above, and on the western flank elevation of Block A at second floor and above, including the roof in either case.

26) There shall be no more than 191 units within the development hereby approved which shall be provided in the following mix: 5 studio units, 58 x 1 bed units, 126 x 2 bed units, and 2 x 3 bed units.

27) The heights of the buildings hereby approved, measured from the immediate adjoining finished ground level, shall not exceed the following:

Block A: Three storey element 10.7m, four storey element 14.2m

Blocks B and C: 10.7m

Block D: Two storey element 8.3m, four storey element 14.2m

Block E: Three storey element 9.6m, four storey element 12.6m

Block F: Four storey element 12.85m, six storey element 19.58m

Block G: 14.2m

28) The development shall not begin until a scheme for the provision of affordable housing as part of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The affordable housing shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme and shall meet the definition of affordable housing in Annex B of PPS3 or any future guidance that replaces it. The scheme shall include:

(a) the numbers, type, and location on the site of the affordable housing provision which shall consist of not fewer than 67 dwellings;

(b) the timing of the construction of the affordable housing;

(c) the arrangements to ensure that such provision is affordable for both first and subsequent occupiers of the affordable housing; and,

(d) the occupancy criteria to be used for determining the identity of occupiers of the affordable housing, and the means by which such occupancy criteria shall be enforced.