Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 8, 9, 10, 11, 15 September 2026

Site visit made on 8 September 2026

by H Porter BA(Hons), PGDip, MSc, IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 November 2026

Appeal Ref: 6007555
Land North West of Little Tew, OX7 4JB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
- The appeal is made by R Burkle against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
- The application Ref is 24/01861/FUL.
- The development proposed is a country house and gardens, stables courtyard, new highway accesses, solar array, drainage works and landscape proposals, including new lake and tree nursery.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 'country house and gardens, stables courtyard, new highway accesses, solar array, drainage works and landscape proposals, including new lake and tree nursery' at Land North West of Little Tew, OX7 4JB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01861/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Procedural and Preliminary Matters

2. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) came into effect on 17 August 2026, after the Council's decision and the submission of the appeal. The parties addressed its implications at the Inquiry and I have taken these matters into account in determining the appeal.

3. The terms of a draft planning obligation pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the s106 Agreement) were discussed during the round-table session. A completed and executed s106 Agreement[1] was subsequently submitted on 30 September 2026 in accordance with an agreed timetable. The s106 Agreement contains a number of obligations associated with the proposed development, which I consider later in this decision.

4. I undertook an accompanied site visit on the first day of the Inquiry. I also undertook two further unaccompanied visits to the site's surroundings, Little Tew and the wider landscape context, following routes suggested by the main parties.

5. Following a review of its case and after evidence was heard on Days 3 and 4 of the Inquiry, the Council confirmed in a Position Statement[2] (PS) that it would no longer contest the appeal or defend its reason for refusal[3] (rfr) and would instead adopt a neutral position. The PS also confirmed that the Council no longer relied upon any written or oral evidence previously presented to the Inquiry, including its

[1] ID 19 Planning Obligation dated 30 September 2026
[2] ID 9 WODC Position Statement 11 September 2026
[3] CD C2 WODC Notice of Decision 14 July 2024

opening submissions and matters previously identified as being in dispute within Statements of Common Ground (SoCG). After submitting the PS, the Council was no longer represented by Counsel and made no closing submissions. The Council's Senior Planning Officer continued to assist the Inquiry for procedural, s106, and conditions discussions, and its Biodiversity Officer for the ecology round-table.

6. The Little Tew Conservation Area (LTCA) was the only heritage asset cited within the Council's rfr. Subsequently, the Heritage Statement of Common Ground[4] identified additional designated heritage assets whose settings were said potentially to be affected by the proposal[5]. At my request, further submissions were provided in relation to Little Tew Grounds Farmhouse and the Church of St Nicholas[6].

7. Matters of ecology and biodiversity did not form part of the Council's rfr. However, interested parties raised concerns in relation to the Little Tew Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). Those matters were also discussed during the Inquiry ecology round-table session, at which interested parties participated.

8. In light of the above, including the issues raised by interested parties and the extent of the discussions at the Inquiry, I consider the main issues to be:

   1) Whether the proposed development satisfies the exceptional design requirements of Policy HO11(e) of the Framework, having particular regard to whether its design would be truly outstanding, reflect the highest standards of architecture, help raise standards of design more generally in rural areas, and significantly enhance its immediate setting whilst being sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area, including landscape character.

   2) The effect of the proposed development on the significance of relevant designated heritage assets.

   3) The effect of the proposed development on ecological interests and whether the scheme would secure satisfactory biodiversity enhancements.

Reasons

Main Issue 1

9. The appeal site extends to approximately 35 hectares of agricultural land, comprising field parcels enclosed by mature hedgerows and trees. Its northern boundary adjoins the road linking the A361 Banbury Road with Little Tew. A public bridleway runs adjacent to part of the site boundary, which continues to a wider network of public rights of way (PRoWs) across the Dorn Valley and countryside surroundings of Little Tew.

10. Although the appeal site lies relatively close to Little Tew in distance terms, it is physically separate from the village and its character is unequivocally rural. There is a transition from open agricultural countryside, punctuated by only sporadic development, to a gradually increasing concentration of buildings before the built-

[4] CD L2 Heritage Statement of Common Ground, 21 August 2026
[5] Grade II Great Tew Registered Park and Garden (RPG) (List Entry Number 1001550); Grade II* Listed Heythrop Park Registered Park and Garden (List Entry Number 1000489); Grade II* Listed Heythrop House (List Entry Number 1052781); Grade II Listed Great Tew House (List Entry Number 1368164).
[6] ID 18 Heritage SoCG Addendum, 15 September 2026

up form of the settlement of Little Tew. The proposal includes the construction of a substantial dwelling together with ancillary accommodation, stables, formal gardens, a lake and extensive landscaping. Having regard to the appeal site's physical separation from Little Tew and the character of its surroundings, the proposal would realise the development of an isolated home in the countryside, where new homes are normally resisted.

11. The development plan for the area includes the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031, September 2018 (the WOLP)[7], under which Policy OS2 of the WOLP forms part of the spatial strategy of the development plan, directing the majority of housing towards the District's settlements. Policy H2, however, provides specific exceptions for the delivery of new homes, including, criterion (g) where they comprise residential development of exceptional quality or innovative design. To satisfy the first part of Policy HO11(e) of the Framework, the design of the proposal must be truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards of architecture and helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas.

12. The proposed development has been subject to an extensive and iterative design process extending over several years involving the architect, Francis Terry and landscape architect and designer, Christian Sweet. Following the refusal of an earlier scheme in December 2022, the Appellant engaged with the Design South East Review Panel (DSERP), whose observations over four rounds of consultation informed revisions to both the architecture of the proposed dwelling and the wider landscape proposals[8].

13. Speaking to the Inquiry, Mr Terry described the design process, which drew on Baroque and Palladian traditions and informed the evolution of the central 'Pantheon' hall and curved north elevation. He also explained the technical challenges involved in integrating Passivhaus standards within a traditionally inspired Classical design, including through its fenestration and detailing. The result is an evidently ambitious architectural response which, ostensibly, would represent the first Passivhaus-certified traditionally-inspired Classical building. It also demonstrates how demanding contemporary sustainability standards and technologies can be successfully integrated within a Classical architectural composition, rather than appearing as separate or visually intrusive additions.

14. Architectural taste is subjective. In my view, the quality of the proposed development does not arise from the adoption of a Classical or Baroque architectural language in isolation, nor from stylistic detailing alone. Rather, it is informed by the combination of a highly resolved architectural composition and a process of observation, critique and refinement following independent design review. The evidence demonstrates that considerable thought has been given to the relationship between the proposed dwelling's internal arrangement, elevational treatment and external coherence. The DSERP ultimately concluded that the proposal represented an outstanding piece of architecture and landscape design, even supposing that it could one day be a 'future heritage asset'[9]. While that assessment is not determinative, it speaks to the quality of the design as being truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards of architecture.

15. Taking these matters together, I am satisfied that the design of the proposed development comfortably meets the high bar set by the first limb of Framework

[7] CD E1
[8] CD K13
[9] CD K13 para 4.2

Policy HO11(e) insofar as it would be truly outstanding and would reflect the highest standards of architecture. This Policy further requires the proposal to help to raise the standards of design more generally in rural areas. It has been argued that the standard of design within and around Little Tew is already high, such that there is limited scope for the proposal to raise standards further. However, my reading of this element of the policy does not confine the assessment of a proposal to whether it would improve upon the design of existing buildings in the locality. Instead, it requires consideration of whether the proposal is of such exceptional quality that it would help raise standards more generally in rural areas. The assessment is therefore one of wider architectural merit and influence, rather than a comparison with nearby buildings.

16. Many of the country's great country houses were not necessarily constrained by local or established building traditions, nor were they rigidly confined to a single architectural idiom. Instead, they often reflected an evolving synthesis of influences, drawing upon different stylistic traditions and contemporary techniques whilst frequently creating designed landscape settings. The appeal scheme would likewise reflect a broader country house tradition that, alongside its architectural influences, incorporates contemporary sustainability technologies, quality materials and craftsmanship, and a highly conceived landscape setting as part of a unified overall composition.

17. The favourable assessment of the DSERP lends independent support to my assessment of the architectural quality of the proposal and its potential to act as an exemplar of how demanding sustainability standards can be successfully integrated within traditionally inspired Classical architecture[10]. Furthermore, the proposed apprenticeship opportunities in traditional construction trades, including plastering and stonemasonry, would help maintain and pass on specialist skills. Whilst apprenticeship opportunities are not a measure of design quality in themselves, conditions and the s106 Agreement would ensure that the proposal would be delivered to a high standard of materials, detailing and workmanship. Collectively, these factors reinforce my view that the proposal would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas.

18. Taken together, I consider these qualities go beyond making the proposal an exceptionally well-designed building on this particular site. The scheme would provide an example of how traditional architecture and craft approaches, an iterative design process and demanding contemporary sustainability standards can be successfully integrated into a coherent whole in a rural context. In so doing, it would demonstrate an approach capable of informing and raising expectations for high-quality design standards more generally in rural areas. Therefore, this element of Policy HO11(e) would be satisfied.

19. The second limb of Policy HO11(e) requires that the proposal would significantly enhance its immediate setting whilst being sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. The appeal site is experienced within an attractive and predominantly unspoilt rural landscape. Although partly in arable use, the site retains elements of a historic landscape, with field patterns deriving in part from the historic enclosure of a former open field system characterised by a strong framework of boundary hedgerows and mature trees. Whilst the appeal site occupies elevated ground close to the main road it also contains a notable fold in the landform towards its centre before descending towards the Dorn Valley.

[10] CD K13 para 3.1

Consequently, despite its size, the site is not experienced as a single open expanse but as part of a varied, undulating and compartmentalised landscape. Although there are glimpsed views into the site from parts of the surrounding highway and PRoW network, opportunities for more extensive views are generally constrained by the combination of landform and vegetation.

20. For the purposes of the West Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment (WOLA), the appeal site falls within the 'Ironstone Valleys and Ridges' Character Area, which is not covered by any statutory landscape designation but is identified as being of high landscape value[11]. The Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (OWLS) identifies the appeal site as lying partly within the 'Farmland Plateau' and partly within the 'Wooded Pasture Valleys and Slopes' landscape types[12]. The West Oxfordshire Design Guide (WODG) identifies the Ironstone Valleys and Ridges as a landscape characterised by a patchwork of fields, hedgerows and woodland, abundant tree cover and a sparse settlement pattern[13]. My on-site observations were broadly consistent with that description. The wider area is therefore not wholly undeveloped and includes a mix of farmed, planted and more managed landholdings together with a dispersal of farmsteads, dwellings, substantial country houses and ancillary estate buildings between settlements.

21. The proposed dwelling has not been conceived in isolation and then arbitrarily imposed on the appeal site. Rather, the architecture and landscape have been developed as a single design exercise through a collaborative and iterative process involving the architect, landscape architect and other specialist advisers, informed by review and refinement through the DSERP. Careful consideration has been given to the site's topography, setting and wider built context together with the relationship between the dwelling's internal arrangement, external expression and landscape setting.

22. The proposal cannot properly be understood solely by reference to the red-line application site. The principal house would sit within a carefully orchestrated framework of formal and informal gardens, terraces, water features, retained field boundaries and new planting, whilst the stable courtyard would remain subordinate to the main dwelling and reinforce its visual and functional primacy within the site. As the DSERP observed, the proposal successfully embeds the dwelling within its landscape setting, resulting in a coherent and highly resolved overall composition[14].

23. Overall, the immediate setting of the proposed dwelling would be significantly enhanced through the creation of a rich and carefully integrated landscape structure comprising gardens, woodland, pasture, water features and retained field boundaries, creating a setting of considerably greater visual, ecological and experiential interest than presently exists. The proposed permissive path would also increase opportunities for the overall design composition to be appreciated from public vantage points. In my view, this too would contribute positively to the quality and appreciation of the proposal's setting.

24. The site's characteristic features would largely be retained and reinforced through additional hedgerow and tree planting, while the overall landform, vegetation structure and historic field pattern would be respected. The proposal would also incorporate a number of the enhancement priorities and recommendations

[11] CD H1 p. 25
[12] CD H7
[13] CD E5.4
[14] CD K13

identified within the local landscape and conservation area evidence base[15]. These include the retention and reinforcement of hedgerows, the introduction of additional hedgerow trees, the conversion of arable land to pasture, and the creation of woodland planting that would help reinforce the characteristic mosaic of woodland, grassland and farmland.

25. Strengthening the site's existing vegetated framework along the route to Little Tew would neither enclose that approach nor detract from wider views across the surrounding landscape. The route itself would continue to be characterised by mature vegetation, occasional gateways and filtered views across the countryside. Positioned back and down from the higher ground adjacent to the highway, the house itself would generally be experienced only fleetingly. The stable courtyard would be more apparent, yet would be close to the extant cluster of development and of a form not uncharacteristic of its countryside surroundings and would employ materials identified within the WODC as a characteristic of the Ironstone and Ridges landscape character area.

26. The proposal would be most apparent from the opposite side of the Dorn Valley and parts of the surrounding PRoW network, including the adjacent bridleway. However, it would be positioned within a wider landscape framework of retained historic field boundaries, mature hedgerows, undulating landform and would be revealed sequentially. I do not consider that the proposed dwelling would appear as a visually intrusive or incongruous feature within the wider plateau landscape, while the sparsely settled and predominantly open character of the wider landscape would be safeguarded. Consequently, the proposal would be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area, including landscape character.

27. Drawing together my findings, I have found that the proposal satisfies the exceptional design requirements of Policy HO11(e) of the Framework and consequently comprises residential development of exceptional quality and innovative design for the purposes of WOLP Policy H2(g). I am also satisfied that, whilst located in the open countryside, the proposal is appropriate to its rural location and would respect, conserve, and where possible enhance, the quality, character and distinctiveness of the District's natural environment, the historic, architectural and landscape character and the quality of the surroundings. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies OS2, OS4, H2, EH2 or EH13 of the WOLP.

Main Issue 2

28. The significance of the LTCA derives principally from its special architectural and historic interest as a small rural settlement whose historic development has been shaped by agriculture. The Little Tew Conservation Area Appraisal (LTCACA)[16] identifies Little Tew's distinctive 'tucked-away' character, arising from its folded landform, strong framework of trees and hedgerows, historic settlement pattern and collection of traditional buildings, many of which are listed. Whilst prepared almost 20 years ago, my observations were consistent with its finding that views are generally constrained by topography, trees and hedgerows. Although the LTCA designated boundary[17] is largely confined to the historic settlement itself, the surrounding countryside contributes to an understanding of the village's agricultural origins, rural identity and relationship with the wider landscape. Consequently, the

[15] WOLA, OWLS and Little Tew Proposals for Enhancement and Preservation (CD I13)
[16] CD I2
[17] CD I4

countryside surrounding the LCTA forms part of its setting and contributes positively to its significance as a designated heritage asset.

29. The appeal site lies outside the designated boundary of the LTCA and is not visible from within it. As part of the wider rural landscape surrounding Little Tew, it forms a small component of the LCTA's setting. However, the appeal site does not form part of the village's historic settlement, nor does it contribute to the buildings, spaces or features that underpin its special architectural and historic interest. It is also not within any of the 'significant views' identified within the LTCACA[18]. Consequently, whilst the appeal site forms part of the wider setting of the LTCA, the contribution it makes to the significance of the asset is limited.

30. The proposal would introduce a substantial dwelling, associated stable courtyard and a more managed landscape into the appeal site, thereby changing part of the setting of the LTCA. The Council previously considered that the proposed development would 'result in a high level of less than substantial harm to the setting of the LTCA'[19]. However, the relevant question is not whether there would be change within the setting of the asset, but whether that change would harm the significance of the designated heritage asset. In this case, it would not.

31. The extent of that change should not be overstated as resulting in suburbanisation or the wholesale urbanisation of the site. The principal developed areas would not be perceptible from within the LTCA and those elements experienced on the approach to the village would be viewed within surroundings already characterised by mature hedgerows, trees, occasional dwellings and glimpsed views across the wider countryside. Moreover, a substantial proportion of the wider landholding would remain open, green and largely undeveloped and rural in character.

32. More importantly, although there would be change to part of the wider setting of the LTCA, the proposal would not diminish aspects of setting that contribute positively to its significance. Rather, its fundamentally rural identity, vernacular architecture, listed buildings, distinctive 'tucked away' character and legibility as a historic settlement within a wider agricultural landscape would all be conserved. Accordingly, I find that the proposal, as development within the setting of the LTCA, would not harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.

33. The significance of the Grade II listed Great Tew House derives, in part, from its special architectural and historic interest as an evolving country house with eighteenth-century origins that was subsequently altered and enlarged. Its significance is informed by, amongst other things, its architectural composition, historic fabric and detailing, together with its historic associations with the development of the Great Tew village and surrounding estate landscape.

34. The significance of the Great Tew Registered Park and Garden (GTRPG) derives principally from the historic relationship between Great Tew House, its designed parkland landscape and the wider estate. An appreciation of the significance of the GTRPG is informed by the survival of its planned parkland, estate buildings and designed landscape features. The interrelationship between the principal house and its historic landscape setting is fundamental to the way that significance is experienced and understood.

[18] CD E4 p. 4
[19] CD C2

35. The significance of the Grade II* listed Heythrop House derives principally from its exceptional architectural and historic interest as a major early eighteenth-century country house designed by Thomas Archer. Its significance is informed, in part, by its Baroque architectural composition, surviving historic fabric, plan form and detailing. Notwithstanding its current use as a hotel and golf club, the asset also derives significance from its historic role as the principal house of the wider Heythrop Estate and its relationship with the surrounding designed landscape.

36. The significance of the Grade II* Heythrop Park RPG (HPRPG) is intrinsically linked to Heythrop House and derives from its survival as an extensive and meticulously planned early eighteenth-century country house landscape. An appreciation of its significance is informed by the survival of its designed landscape and wider estate components, which together illustrate its development and evolution as a high-status country house estate.

37. Parts of the appeal site have, at various times, been associated with a range of owners, including the Vicar of Little Tew, Albert Brassey of Heythrop Park, Eton College and, from 1920, the Great Tew Estate. However, historic ownership alone does not establish a setting relationship. The appeal site is physically separate from those assets and there is no readily appreciable visual, functional or associative relationship between it and the way in which they are experienced or understood today. Nor am I persuaded that evidence of historic routes from the great estates and Little Tew establish a meaningful contemporary setting relationship with the appeal site. I therefore conclude that the appeal site does not comprise part of the setting of either Great Tew House, the GTRPG, Heythrop House or the HPRPG.

38. Ultimately, for harm to the significance of a heritage asset, there would have to be a detrimental effect on the ability to appreciate that significance. Whilst the proposed development would introduce a substantial country house and represent a further evolution of the rural surroundings of these historic country house estates, it would not introduce a false or corrupting historic narrative. Nor would there be any diminution of the architectural or historic significance of the substantially larger and considerably earlier Heythrop House, which was conceived during the formative phase of the Baroque tradition in England. Instead, the integrity of the listed buildings and their associated designed landscapes would remain unharmed, while the planned parkland, estate buildings, designed views and landscape composition from which these assets derive part of their significance, as well as wider historic ownership associations, would continue to be experienced and understood. Accordingly, I find that the proposed development would have no effect upon the significance of Great Tew House or the GTRPG, Heythrop House or the HPRPG. None of the elements that contribute to their significance, including through their settings, would be diminished and no harm would arise.

39. Owing to the intervening distances and an absence of clear functional or historic links, I am satisfied that the proposal would also preserve the significance of the Church of St Nicholas and Little Tew Grounds Farmhouse. Having considered all of the evidence, and mindful of my duty under section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I am also satisfied that the settings of the listed buildings would be preserved and their significance conserved.

40. Drawing all of the above together, I find that the proposed development would not harm the significance of any designated heritage asset. Accordingly, it would accord with Policies EH9, EH10, EH11 and EH14 of the WOLP insofar as they seek to conserve the significance of heritage assets, including ensuring that

development within the setting of a conservation area conserves or enhances that setting and does not detract from important views into, out of and within it; conserves the setting of listed buildings; and does not detract from the setting of RPGs. Nor would there be any conflict with the historic environment policies within the Framework, which seek to avoid harm to the significance of heritage assets and instead conserve that significance[20].

Main Issue 3

41. Natural England (NE) initially sought further information regarding surface water, foul drainage and potential effects on the Little Tew Meadows SSSI[21]. Those matters were subsequently addressed following submission of additional hydrological and drainage information, and NE ultimately raised no objection to the proposed development, subject to appropriate mitigation being secured[22].

42. The SSSI designation comprises agriculturally unimproved grassland supporting species-rich grassland and wet flush habitats. The appeal site slopes generally southwards towards the River Dorn, beyond which the land rises again to form the opposite valley side and the SSSI. Of particular concern to interested parties is the potential for the site's topography and existing drainage characteristics to facilitate the movement of surface water, contaminants and nutrients towards the River Dorn and, ultimately, the SSSI.

43. The appeal scheme has been supported by extensive ecological, hydrological and drainage evidence. This demonstrates that a considered and iterative design process has informed the evolution of the proposed drainage and wastewater treatment systems. In particular, sustainable drainage measures would be introduced, including a series of swales leading to a new lake at the bottom of the site. These features would not only control surface water flows and restrict runoff to greenfield rates, but would also allow sediments to settle and pollutants to be filtered before discharge. Suitably worded conditions would also secure further details of the drainage scheme and foul water treatment.

44. At present the majority of the appeal site is in arable use, with the potential for existing fertilisers, herbicides and pesticides to add nutrient-rich and chemical-laden run-off through and beyond the site. Beyond its red-line boundary, the appeal scheme would realise the conversion of substantial areas of land currently in arable use into grazed pasture, woodland and wildflower grassland. While noting the concerns regarding potential nutrient enrichment arising from the proposed equestrian facilities, I note that NE accepted that the proposed liquid and waste management arrangements were capable of avoiding or mitigating impacts associated with the keeping of horses at the site[23]. I am therefore satisfied that suitably worded conditions would control proper management of horse-related activities and ensure that associated nutrients and pollutants do not adversely affect the SSSI.

45. I do not diminish the concerns raised by interested parties regarding the sensitivities of the SSSI, which requires careful ongoing management, including restrictive grazing practices. As the appeal site lies outside the SSSI, the proposed development would result in no direct loss of, or physical damage to, the designated site. I am satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to

[20] Framework Policy HE4 1.b
[21] CD K12, CD K19
[22] CD K26
[23] CD K26 p. 2

enable the likely effects of the proposal to be properly assessed and that the remaining matters related to drainage, wastewater treatment and nutrient management are capable of being appropriately secured through planning conditions. Consequently, I am satisfied that the River Dorn, local water quality, flood risk and the ecological interests of the SSSI would not be harmed or adversely affected by the proposed development.

46. Interested parties have also queried the extent of biodiversity benefits claimed by the Appellant, particularly where reliance has been placed on Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) delivered beyond the appeal site's red line boundary. Questions were also raised regarding the submitted biodiversity metric, including habitat classifications and the treatment of certain habitat features. However, the appeal scheme, in its entirety, would involve the creation and enhancement of a substantial area of habitat across the wider blue-line area. This includes the conversion of fields in largely arable use and some modified grassland to woodland, wildflower grassland, a native tree nursery, and supplementary hedgerow planting.

47. Even if some aspects of the submitted BNG metric inputs were recalculated, the scale of habitat creation and enhancement proposed is such that substantial biodiversity gains would still be delivered in any event. The delivery of biodiversity enhancements would be secured through the planning obligations contained within the s106 Agreement, including a Biodiversity Gain Plan and habitat management and monitoring arrangements for a period of not less than 30 years.

48. Concerns have been raised regarding protected and notable species, including bats, great crested newts, dormice and breeding birds. However, I have not been presented with substantive evidence indicating that the appeal site supports populations of such species that would be adversely affected by the proposed development. Updated survey work found no evidence of territorial skylarks within either the appeal site or the proposed off-site habitat land. Furthermore, conditions would secure ecological mitigation and enhancement measures including a construction environmental management plan, landscape and ecological management plan, a sensitive lighting strategy, and details of bird nesting and bat roosting features. Consistent with the findings of the Council's Officers and NE, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to protected species or their habitats.

49. For the reasons given above, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not adversely affect the ecological interests of the Little Tew Meadows SSSI, protected species, water quality or biodiversity interests more generally. Rather, subject to suitably worded conditions and the obligations secured through the S106 Agreement, the development would deliver significant and enduring biodiversity enhancements, including a substantial net gain in biodiversity. Furthermore, the proposed drainage and sustainable drainage measures would appropriately manage flood risk and surface water runoff. The proposal would therefore accord with Policies EH3, EH7 and EH8 of the WOLP, together with nature conservation and flood risk objectives of the Framework.

Other Matters

50. Interested parties raised concerns regarding precedent and the potential implications of granting permission for other proposals advanced under the same exception policies. However, the proposal before me is highly site-specific and my findings turn on the particular circumstances of this case, including its design

quality, landscape response and environmental effects. As each proposal must be determined on its own merits, my decision does not indicate that other schemes would necessarily satisfy the same policy requirements.

51. I recognise that Little Tew contains very limited services and facilities and that future occupiers of the proposed dwelling would be heavily reliant upon journeys by private car. However, Policy HO11 expressly contemplates development in countryside where the relevant criteria are met. The locational characteristics of the site therefore do not alter my overall conclusions.

52. I have also had regard to concerns raised regarding the loss of agricultural land, the suitability of the local road network, and the potential presence of archaeological remains. Whilst the appeal site is presently in agricultural use, substantial areas of the wider landholding would remain undeveloped and subject to enhancement. Furthermore, the Highway Authority raised no objection to the proposal, subject to conditions[24]; while the County Archaeologist ultimately advised that there were no archaeological constraints[25]. In those circumstances, I do not consider these matters indicate that planning permission should be withheld.

53. Interested party representations emphasised the recreational, amenity and wellbeing value of the site, its surroundings and the enjoyment derived from the extensive network of PRoWs around Little Tew. I do not wish to underestimate the value local residents and visitors place on the countryside surrounding the appeal site. However, the site itself is not publicly accessible and no existing PRoW would be removed or diverted; instead, a new permissive path would be created. For the reasons already given, the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to landscape character, views or the wider countryside setting of Little Tew. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would not harm amenity or the continued enjoyment of the site's rural surroundings.

54. I have had regard to the Council's refusal of planning permission for a broadly similar proposal on the appeal site in 2022. Notwithstanding that I must determine the appeal before me on its own merits, I note that the current scheme differs in a number of respects, including further design evolution following engagement with the DSERP, together with the submission of additional ecological, hydrological and technical evidence. I have also been referred to other appeal decisions and legal judgements. I recognise the strength of local feeling regarding the proposal, including opposition expressed through the Parish Meeting and interested party representations. While I have had regard to those, my conclusions are based on the evidence before me and my assessment of the particular circumstances of this appeal.

Planning Balance

55. Drawing together my findings above, and subject to the imposition of suitably worded conditions, I have not found any conflict with the policies of the WOLP cited in the Council's rfr[26] and relevant to the main issues or other matters raised before me. Read as a whole, the proposal would accord with the development plan.

[24] CD K14
[25] CD K28
[26] WOLP Policies OS2, OS4, H2, EH2, EH9, EH10, EH11, EH13, EH14 and EH16

56. The Framework is a material consideration. The appeal proposal falls within the category of development addressed by Policy S5(3), which indicates that isolated homes outside settlements or groups of houses should not be approved other than in accordance with Policy HO11. For the reasons set out above, I have found that the proposal satisfies the requirements of Policy HO11(e). Accordingly, it is a form of development that is acceptable in principle under Policy S5.

57. Policy S5 further provides that such development should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the Framework. In this case, I have found no unacceptable effects in relation to landscape character, heritage assets, ecology, biodiversity, drainage or flood risk, or other matters addressed within the Framework.

58. Furthermore, the proposal would provide a number of benefits. Whilst only a single dwelling would be delivered, it would nevertheless make a small contribution to housing supply at a time when the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, to which I afford modest weight. Further benefits include the delivery of a dwelling of outstanding and innovative design, biodiversity enhancement, landscape enhancement and high standards of environmental performance. Policy DP3(5) indicates that substantial weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability or help raise standards of design more generally. I therefore attach substantial weight to the design quality, landscape and biodiversity enhancements, and sustainability credentials of the proposal, and moderate weight to the economic benefits arising from apprenticeship opportunities, construction activity and employment in maintaining the site. Taking these matters together I find that the benefits of the proposal would not be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects. Accordingly, and having already found that the proposal satisfies the requirements of Policy HO11(e), the proposed development finds support under Policy S5 of the Framework.

Obligations and Conditions

59. The completed s106 Agreement secures the submission and implementation of a Biodiversity Gain Plan (BGP) and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP), together with the long-term management and monitoring necessary to deliver and maintain the biodiversity gain associated with the development. It also secures the provision and ongoing management of the native tree nursery, apprentice opportunities and a permissive footpath route. The Agreement secures £12,000 towards the costs of monitoring compliance with the BGP and HMMP, and £500 for monitoring the obligations generally.

60. I am satisfied that the obligations contained within the s106 Agreement are directly related to the proposed development, necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to it. Accordingly, the tests set out in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) are satisfied and the obligations attract full weight in my determination of the appeal.

61. The Council suggested a number of conditions. In the interests of satisfying the conditions tests in the Framework and reflecting discussions during the conditions

round-table session, I revised and rationalised several of the suggested conditions. In doing so, I have sought to avoid duplication and overlap by grouping related matters within design details, landscaping and drainage conditions, whilst ensuring that the conditions are necessary, relevant, precise, enforceable and reasonable. The Council and Appellant were provided with an opportunity to comment on the revised conditions. The Appellant has confirmed agreement to the wording of all pre-commencement conditions.

62. Conditions setting out the timescale for commencement and identifying the approved plans are necessary in the interests of certainty. Conditions requiring a Construction Environmental Management Plan, a Construction Management Plan and a Japanese Knotweed Eradication and Management Plan are necessary to protect biodiversity interests, retained trees and habitats, prevent the spread of invasive species and minimise disruption arising from the construction process.

63. A condition requiring a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) is necessary to secure the management of the landscape and ecological compartments identified on the approved plans. Notwithstanding the obligations within the s106 Agreement securing habitat management and a Biodiversity Gain Plan, the LEMP condition would address matters which are not secured through the planning obligation alone, including the detailed management of the site's landscape, ecological mitigation and enhancement measures. I am therefore satisfied that there would be no duplication of any obligations contained within the s106 Agreement.

64. Conditions requiring contamination investigation, remediation and procedures for dealing with previously unidentified contamination are necessary to protect human health, groundwater, surface water and the wider environment. Separate conditions dealing with wastewater treatment, manure management and surface water drainage are necessary to ensure adequate safeguards in relation to pollution control, flood risk and ecology, having particular regard to the River Dorn and the integrity of the Little Tew Meadows SSSI. I have imposed individual conditions to provide greater precision and certainty and to ensure that appropriate details are secured before development proceeds or the relevant uses commence. In my view, these matters raise distinct environmental considerations and are more appropriately addressed through separate conditions.

65. I have imposed conditions requiring details of external materials, architectural detailing, external fittings, renewable energy equipment and other design elements, together with a separate condition requiring the submission of samples of certain materials. Together these are necessary to ensure the development, as built, is of the highest quality and in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

66. Conditions requiring details of hard landscaping, soft landscaping and associated external works are necessary to secure an acceptable final appearance and ensure that the landscaping proposals become successfully established. I have not adopted the Council's suggested reference to "substantial completion" within the implementation clause, which would introduce uncertainty as to the point at which compliance must be demonstrated. By contrast, linking the implementation of the soft landscaping scheme to occupation of the dwelling and the first available planting season provides a clear and enforceable trigger.

67. Conditions requiring the provision of bird nesting and bat roosting features and a lighting mitigation strategy are necessary in the interests of biodiversity

enhancement and species protection. Conditions requiring water efficiency measures and Passivhaus certification are necessary in the interests of sustainable development, reducing water consumption, improving energy efficiency and minimising carbon emissions. A condition requiring the provision and retention of the approved access arrangements and visibility splays is necessary in the interests of highway safety.

68. A condition removing specified permitted development rights is necessary and justified given the sensitivity and carefully designed nature of the proposal, and to ensure its architectural and landscape qualities are not undermined by unsympathetic alteration or additions. Finally, a condition restricting occupation of the staff annexe to purposes ancillary to the main dwelling is necessary to prevent its occupation as an additional independent dwelling. I do not consider it reasonable or necessary to extend this restriction to the stables themselves, as suggested by the Council.

Conclusion

69. I have found that the proposal accords with the development plan as a whole. Furthermore, my assessment under Policy S5 of the Framework supports the granting of planning permission. Therefore, material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

H Porter

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Charles Banner KC

Francis Terry (Architect)

Edward Bodsworth MA (Cantab) PhD MCIEEM, Windrush (Ecology)

Kathryn Ventham, Twenty5 Planning, MRTPI (Planning Matters)

Andrew Smith BSc (Hons), MSc, CMLI, Fabrik Ltd (Landscape and Visual matters)

Dr Chris Miele IHBC, MRTPI (Historic Environment and Design Matters)

Dimitris Linardatos, Price & Myers (Hydrology)

Nicola Gooch, Birketts LLP (S106 Agreement)

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Alexander Greaves of Counsel

Chris Wood, WODC Senior Planning Officer (Planning)

Melanie Dodd, WODC Biodiversity Officer (Ecology)

Carole Thorne (Landscape)

Emma Baxter BA MA (CANTAB) MSc IHBC (Heritage)

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Kieran Hedigan, of The Mullin (support)

Dominic Woodfield, Bioscan (UK) Ltd, on behalf of LTCG for ecology matters (object)

Michael Holland, Local Resident (object)

Kieth Reeve for, and on behalf, of Little Tew Conservation Group (object)

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

ID1 Appellant's Opening Statement
ID2 Opening Submissions on Behalf of the Local Authority
ID3 Francis Terry Design Sketches and Watercolours Book & Extracts
ID4 Transcript of Statement on Behalf of Little Tew Conservation Group, Keith Reeve
ID5 Transcript of Kieran Headagain's Statement in Support of the Appeal
ID6 Brighton Gasworks APP/Q1445/W/24/3353409 Decision and SoS Report
ID7 Brighton Gasworks APP/Q1445/W/24/3353409 Costs Report
ID8 Extract from Helen Lawrence-Beaton *Thomas Archer: A Forgotten Baroque Master* Chapter 5, Heythrop Park, Oxfordshire
ID9 Position Statement on Behalf of the Local Planning Authority
ID10 Draft Conditions with LPA/Appellant commentary
ID11 Email from Mr Wood reflecting principal ecologist comments on draft conditions
ID12 Final draft s106 Agreement for discussion during R-T
ID13 List of all plans submitted with the application to WODC
ID14 List of Plans for approval in plan number order
ID15 Email from Dominic Woodfield (Bioscan) relating to Ecology conditions
ID16 Email from Chris Wood outlining comments from Melanie Dodd on draft conditions
ID17 Appellant's Closing Submission
ID18 Little Tew Heritage SoCG update re. Little Tew Grounds Farmhouse and Church of St Nicholas, from the Appellant, 15 September 2026
ID19 Planning Obligation Relating to land at Little Tew dated 30 September 2026

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- LA/09 (Site Location)
- LA/10 (Site Boundary Shown on Survey)
- LA/301 Rev C (Estate Masterplan)
- LA/302 (Landscape Cross Sections A, B & C)
- LA/303 Rev A (Garden Masterplan)
- LA/304 (Garden Cross Sections 1, 2 & 3)
- LA/305 (Detailed Garden Layout)
- LA/306 (New Planting and Environmental Enhancements)
- LA/307 (Landscape and Ecology Management Plan Compartments)
- 2287-KC-XX-YTREE-TPP01 Rev 0 (Tree Protection Plan)
- 2287-KC-XX-YTREE-TCP01 Rev 0 (Tree Constraints Plan)
- 090 / PL102 / P1 (Ground Floor)
- 090 / PL103 / P1 (First Floor)
- 090 / PL104 / P1 (Second Floor)
- 090 / PL105 / P1 (Lower Ground Floor)
- 090 / PL106 / P1 (Roof Plan)
- 090 / PL109 / P1 (Elevations and Section)
- 090 / PL111 / P1 (Stables Plan)
- 090 / PL113 / P1 (Stables Roof Plan)
- 090 / PL114 / P1 (Stable Block – Elevations and Sections)
- 090 / PL115 (Pool House – Plan, Roof plan and Elevations)
- 090 / PL117 / P2 (Elevation Showing Venetian Window)
- 090 / PL118 / P2 (Elevation Showing Door, Walling and Quoins)
- 090 / PL119 / P1 (Typical Details)
- 090/SK101 P1 (Example Cornice Details)
- 090/SK102 P1 (Example Cornice Details)
- 090/SK103 P1 (Example Detail of Door)
- 090/SK104 P1 (Example Internal Opening)
- 090/SK105 P1 (Example Full Size Detail of Door)
- 090/SK106 P1 (Example Full Size Internal Opening)
- 090/SK107 P1 (Example Jamb Details to Windows)
- 090/SK108 P1 (Example Wall Treatment)
- 090/SK109 P1 (Example Window Cill Detail)
- J32 – 8095 – SK – 001 (Northern Access Arrangements and Visibility)
- J32 – 8095 – SK – 002 (Southern Access Arrangements and Visibility)

3) No development shall take place (including ground works or vegetation clearance) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan – Biodiversity (CEMP-B) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP-B shall include:
   a) a plan showing wildlife, habitat, retained tree and hedgerow protection zones;

b) details of construction methods within protection zones and measures to avoid or minimise impacts arising from construction or landscaping activities, including protective fencing, exclusion barriers and warning signs and measures to prevent pollution, dust, run-off and other indirect impacts on habitats and species;
c) details of the phasing and timing of works and any measures necessary to avoid harm during sensitive periods;
d) details of the persons responsible for overseeing implementation of the approved measures, including any requirement for supervision by a suitably qualified person;
e) procedures for monitoring compliance with the approved measures by a suitably qualified person throughout the construction period.

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

4) No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CMP shall include:
a) details of the routing of construction traffic and delivery vehicles to and from the site, including any temporary access arrangements required during the construction period;
b) details of wheel washing and other measures to prevent mud, debris and dust being deposited on the public highway;
c) details, including a plan, of site compounds, storage areas, security fencing and hoardings;
d) details of construction working hours and hours for deliveries to and from the site;
e) details of the persons responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the CMP.

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

5) No development shall take place until a Japanese Knotweed Eradication and Management Plan (JKEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The JKEMP shall include:
a) a survey identifying the extent and location of any Japanese Knotweed infestation within the site;
b) details of the proposed treatment, control and eradication measures;
c) measures to prevent the spread of Japanese Knotweed during site clearance, construction and landscaping works;
d) arrangements for the handling, storage, transport and disposal of contaminated soil and plant material;
e) a timetable for implementation of the approved measures; and
f) details of a monitoring, reporting and remedial action programme, including measures to be undertaken should eradication not be achieved within the anticipated timescale.

The approved JKEMP shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details and timetable. Any monitoring, reporting and remedial measures identified in the approved JKEMP shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Upon completion of the approved treatment and monitoring programme, a verification report confirming the

implementation of the approved measures shall be submitted to the local planning authority.

6) No development shall take place until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) for the management compartments identified on drawing LA/307 (Landscape and Ecology Management Plan Compartments) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The LEMP shall include:
a) management objectives for each management compartment;
b) details of the management and maintenance operations to be undertaken, including their timing and frequency;
c) details of habitat creation, enhancement and maintenance measures;
d) arrangements for monitoring and reviewing the effectiveness of the management measures;
e) details of the body or persons responsible for implementation of the LEMP; and
f) a timetable for implementation covering the 30 year period after first occupation.

The approved LEMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable and details.

7) No development shall take place until an assessment of the risks posed by any contamination shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This assessment must be undertaken by a suitably qualified contaminated land practitioner, in accordance with British Standard BS 10175: Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of Practice and the Environment Agency - Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination (CLR 11) (or equivalent British Standard and Model Procedures if replaced) and shall assess any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The assessment shall include:
a) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
b) the potential risks to:
    1. human health;
    2. property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes;
    3. adjoining land;
    4. ground waters and surface waters; and
    5. ecological systems.

8) No development shall take place where (following the contamination risk assessment required by Condition 7) land affected by contamination is found which poses risks identified as unacceptable in the risk assessment, until a detailed remediation scheme shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an appraisal of remediation options, identification of the preferred option(s), the proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, and a description and programme of the works to be undertaken including the verification plan. The remediation scheme shall be sufficiently detailed and thorough to ensure that upon completion the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to its intended use. The approved remediation scheme shall be carried out before the development hereby permitted is first occupied. Following completion of the approved remediation works, a Verification Report shall be submitted to and approved in

writing by the local planning authority demonstrating that the remediation has been carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

9) Any contamination that is found during the course of construction of the approved development that was not previously identified shall be reported immediately to the local planning authority. Development on the part of the site affected shall be suspended and a risk assessment carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Where unacceptable risks are found remediation and verification schemes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These approved schemes shall be carried out before the development is resumed or continued.

10) No development shall take place until details of the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP), Foul Water Management Plan (FWMP) and Sewerage Treatment System (STS) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted details shall include the location and specification of the proposed systems, including the location identified within the Price & Myers Hydrological Assessment (Rev 2, May 2025), together with arrangements for their long-term maintenance, inspection, monitoring, repair and replacement.

    The approved WWTP, FWMP and STS shall be fully implemented prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and retained, operated and maintained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

11) No part of the stable yard or paddocks shall be used for the keeping or grazing of horses until a Manure Management Plan (MMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The MMP shall include:
    a) a plan showing the location of manure storage areas within the stable complex;
    b) a scheme for the collection, storage and disposal of manure within the stable yard and paddocks;
    c) the management and disposal of wash-down water and other contaminated run-off; and
    d) measures to ensure run-off arising from the stable complex and paddocks does not adversely affect the River Dorn or the integrity of the Little Tew Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest.

    The approved MMP shall be implemented prior to the first use of any part of the stable yard hereby permitted and shall be retained and operated in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

12) No development shall take place until details of a final drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include:
    a) the layout and existing and proposed levels of all water and drainage features including the new lake, natural swimming pool, swales, ditches and any other features involving alterations to existing ground levels;
    b) final plans for the overall, house and stable drainage layouts;
    c) details of all surface water drainage infrastructure, including drainage channels, attenuation features, outfalls and measures associated with all hard surfaced areas, including accesses, driveways, parking and turning areas, paths, terraces and courtyards;

d) the methods employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water; and
e) details of the long-term management, maintenance and monitoring of the drainage scheme, including management responsibilities, inspection regimes and maintenance schedules.

The approved drainage scheme shall have been fully implemented prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted.

A Verification Statement, accompanied by an as-built drainage plan, photographic documentation including key stages of construction and completed works, and details of the management body or maintenance company responsible for the drainage scheme, confirming that the drainage system has been constructed in accordance with the approved details, shall be submitted to the local planning authority. The submitted information shall be in a form suitable for inclusion within the Lead Local Flood Authority's asset records.

13) Notwithstanding Condition 2 (approved plans), no development shall take place above slab level until the following design details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
a) an external materials plan accompanied by a schedule providing details (including manufacturer details, product references, product photographs, colour, texture and finish) of the proposed external materials to be used in the construction of all external elevations and roofs of the development hereby approved;
b) details, including elevation and section drawings at a scale between 1:5 – 1:20, together with details of materials and finishes, of external joinery within the dwellinghouse and stable buildings;
c) details, including elevation and section drawings at a scale between 1:5 – 1:20, together with details of materials and finishes, of architectural stonework within the dwellinghouse and stable buildings;
d) details, including elevation and section drawings at a scale between 1:5 – 1:20, together with details of materials and finishes, of all external ironwork;
e) details, including elevation and section drawings at a scale between 1:5 – 1:20, together with details of materials and finishes, of all minor structures within the site including timber pergolas and external storage structures;
f) details of all renewable energy installations, solar panels, plant, equipment and associated external enclosures, including plans and drawings at an appropriate scale showing their location, layout, dimensions, mounting systems, height above ground level, together with details of materials and finishes;
g) an external lighting plan accompanied by a schedule providing details (including manufacturer details, product references, product photographs, colour, materials and finish) of all external lighting; and
h) an external fittings plan accompanied by a schedule (including manufacturer details, product references, product photographs, colour, materials and finish) of all external fittings including pipework, downpipes, gutters, soil stacks, flues, vent grilles, entry systems, and security installations.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved design details and shall thereafter be retained and maintained in accordance with those details.

14) Notwithstanding Condition 2 (approved plans), no development shall take place above slab level until the following hard landscaping and external works details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include:
   a) a hard surfacing materials schedule providing details (including manufacturer details, product references, product photographs, colour, texture and finish) of the materials to be used in the construction of all areas of hard surfacing including terraces, stable courtyard, driveway, accesses, arrival forecourt, paths and steps;
   b) details, including plans at an appropriate scale, of the treatment of means of enclosure and boundaries including fencing, railings, gates, walls, retaining features and the ha-ha;
   c) details, including plans at an appropriate scale, of transitions in hard/soft landscape surfaces including kerbs, gulleys, edging to planting beds; and
   d) details, including plans at an appropriate scale, of all utilities infrastructure and other ancillary features visible above ground level including inspection chambers, drain covers, ventilation terminals and service boxes;
   e) details, including plans at an appropriate scale, of the means of access between the site and the highway, including the access layout, surface treatment and drainage arrangements demonstrating that loose material and surface water will not encroach or discharge onto the adjacent highway.

   The approved hard landscaping and external works details shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and retained and maintained thereafter.

15) Notwithstanding Condition 2 (approved plans), no development shall take place above slab level until the following soft landscaping details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include:
   a) planting plans for all soft landscaped areas, including the new lake and natural swimming pool, together with a schedule of all proposed trees, shrubs, hedges, herbaceous, aquatic and other plants, specifying species, sizes, numbers and densities;
   b) details of all grassland, pasture, and moss area planting, including seed mixes and sowing densities;
   c) details of planting methods, establishment methods, soil preparation and any necessary soil improvement measures;
   d) details of planting establishment and long-term management, including watering, protection and maintenance measures;
   e) an implementation programme, including phasing of soft landscaping works; and
   f) measures for the replacement of any planting that fails, becomes diseased or dies within five years of planting.

   The approved soft landscaping details shall be implemented in the first planting season following occupation of the development hereby approved and maintained thereafter. Any trees, grassland, pasture, shrubs or plants that die, become diseased or fail within five years of planting shall be replaced during the next

planting season with specimens of similar size and species unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

16) No development shall take place above slab level until details of bird nesting and bat roosting features have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include:
    a) the number, type and specification of all nesting and roosting features;
    b) details of their location, orientation and mounting height;
    c) details of their integration into the fabric of the dwelling or stable buildings where applicable; and
    d) a timetable for their installation.

The approved nesting and roosting features shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby approved and shall thereafter be retained.

17) No facing external stonework, roof coverings, or dressed stonework shall be installed within the development hereby approved until the following sample panels and samples have been erected and/or made available for inspection on site and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
    a) 1 square metre sample panels of each type of facing stonework, including the proposed mortar mix, colour, joint profile and pointing to be used in the elevations of the dwellinghouse, pool house, stable buildings, entrance gateways and external walls;
    b) samples of each type of roof covering, including for roof slopes, dormers, flashings, verges and eaves, to be used on the dwellinghouse, pool house and stable buildings;
    c) sample sections of external dressed stonework and architectural stone detailing, including quoins, jambs, lintels, cills and surrounds.

The sample panels and samples shall be made available for inspection on site by the local planning authority until completion of the relevant part of the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples and details.

18) No external lighting shown on the plan required by Condition 13 (g) shall be installed until a light mitigation strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall include the intensity, colour temperature, beam orientation and hours of operation of all external lighting and shall demonstrate measures to reduce light spillage onto foraging habitats for bats.

The external lighting shall thereafter be installed and operated in accordance with the approved light mitigation strategy.

19) No part of the development hereby approved shall be brought into use until details of a water efficiency scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of:
    a) rainwater harvesting, greywater recycling and water storage measures to be incorporated into the development;
    b) how a maximum water consumption rate of 110 litres per person per day (or subsequent Building Regulations equivalent) will be achieved.

The approved water efficiency scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and shall be retained thereafter.

20) Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby approved, a report prepared suitably qualified Passivhaus designer or certifier demonstrating that the dwelling has been constructed in accordance with the Passivhaus Energy Assessment (Edition 2, May 2024) and is capable of achieving Passivhaus Premium certification shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

    The final Passivhaus Premium Certificate shall be submitted to the local planning authority within six months of first occupation of the dwelling.

21) Prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby approved, the northern and southern access arrangements and associated visibility splays have been constructed in accordance with the details shown on plan nos. J32 – 8095 – SK – 001 and J32 – 8095 – SK – 002. The access arrangement and visibility splays shall thereafter be retained and maintained free from obstruction.

22) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development permitted by Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, AA, B, C, D, E, F, G and H; Part 2, Classes A, B, C and F; and Part 14, Classes A to I, shall be carried out other than that expressly authorised by this permission.

23) The stables staff annexe accommodation of the development hereby approved shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the main dwelling hereby approved.

END OF SCHEDULE