
MEMORANDUM

From:	Tina Cuss Ecology Officer		
Service	WBC Ecology	App No:	260457
Address:	Land to the South West of 1 Norton Road, Riseley, Wokingham, RG7 1SH.		
Proposal:	Full application for the proposed erection of 1no. 4 bedroom detached dwelling to include rooflights and 7no. dormers plus double carport, parking and access.		
Type of Development:	Minor Dwellings (1-9)		
Site Visit Made:	No		

Summary Of Recommendations

- ☐ No objection
- ☒ No objection subject to conditions (and reasons) **stated below**
- ☐ Request further information before determination as **stated below**
- ☒ Negotiate the amendments **stated below**; or
- ☐ Objection due to the reason(s) **stated below**

Comments On Proposal

I have read the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (SJ Stephens, Ref 2545, February 2026). (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (John Wenman Ecological Consultancy, Ref R11844_BNG_a, February 2026), Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (JWEC, Ref R3091_PEA_a, February 2026), Planning Design & Access Statement (Spires, Ref 23.24-DAS1 RevA, February 2026). I have also reviewed the submitted Highways Consultant's email, Biodiversity Metric, Habitat Condition Assessments, Tree Protection Plan and the plans and elevations. I have also reviewed local habitat and protected species records, aerials and Streetview, and local planning history including the Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (GS Ecology ref ECO3450, April 2024), Bat Survey (GS Ecology ref ECO3450b, August 2024), GS Ecology breach of planning condition letter, and site photos (Spires Architects) provided in support of 240471 and 250915.

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal

The PEA confirms that the site supports habitats of ecological value at the site level that are not designated for their wildlife interest and that the boundary hedges meet the criterion for classification as Hedgerow Priority Habitat.

Desk Study

No local planning history search appears to have been undertaken by the ecologist. The site habitat survey, bat foraging and commuting data and the record of a Brown

long-eared bat roost at 1 Norton Road have therefore not been considered. I am concerned TVERC data failed to include local dormouse records. Hazel dormouse has also recently been recorded at Land North of Sun Lane 70m to the east, and closest Dormouse record is less than 100m to the south.

Protected and Notable Species

Due to lack of consideration of local planning history, the degradation and the refugia created, I am not satisfied that the Ecologist has fully assessed the potential and the direct and indirect impact of the proposals on European protected species including bats and dormice on-site and in the Zone of Influence.

JWEC have not been provided with the Bat Survey, Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment, and GS Ecology's letter of 25 February regarding breach of 240471 condition 4. As the developer failed to apply for a Bat Class Mitigation Licence to destroy the Brown long-eared roost JWEC's search of EPS Licences did not include the record next to the application site.

The impact of the site clearance undertaken by the Owner Balforton Developments during April-May 2024 and prior to January 2025 on amphibians, invertebrates, hedgehog dormouse, breeding birds and bats, and the ability to the site to maintain populations must be taken into account and compensation proposed in line with Local Plan and MDD policies.

GS Ecology advised the developer *"Bats, especially the smaller species, tend to follow linear features (such as hedgerows and tree lines) to their foraging habitats and will often not cross open spaces. A gap of 10m in a linear feature will often not be crossed by bats, and it is important that developments do not create such gaps if linear features are used by bats"*. The impact of removal of the front hedge and light spill on commuting and foraging routes must be taken into account, avoided and mitigated to ensure that the conservation status of bats using the site and 240471 site area are maintained and enhanced in accordance with local plan policy. The impact of predation by cats on Dormice, bats and breeding birds of the additional dwelling is not considered and the negative impact on the boundary hedge habitat condition has not been assessed.

To ensure the Ecologist's advice that in the long-term dark corridors should be retained to maintain foraging and commuting opportunities for bats across the site, lighting along the driveway alongside the linear trees must be avoided wherever possible. Submission and approval of a biodiversity-sensitive external lighting scheme must be secured by condition lighting which the applicant demonstrates is essential. Lighting shall be design in accordance with ([Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night Guidance Note GN 08 / 23](#) (BCT and ILE) and must shall ensure use of passive infra-red motion sensors, and warm white LED lamps (2700K or less) and that limits height of lighting, specifies light source, flat glass directional low watt/lux and use of shields/cowls to ensure that all light spill onto the scattered trees is avoided.

The applicant has not provided the Ecologist with that the Site Photographs - 1 Norton Road, Riseley (Spire Architects) submitted with application 240471. The site and bat surveys undertaken by GS Ecology, and architect's photos should have

been used to inform the assessment of baseline habitat condition and proposed a suitable relevant date.

Site clearance started in April 2024 and the reckless loss of the Brown long-eared bat roost was reported to the Owner in January 2025. I am concerned that the contractor still has not installed and the has failed to implement the proposed precautions of storage of materials on palettes or hardstanding, has created new refugia and has not provided ecological supervision of dismantling the roof or hibernacula to reduce and avoid impacts for GCN. Tree works have been carried out during bird breeding without evidence of checks to ensure nesting birds are not disturbed. I therefore do not have confidence that compensation habitat would be provided prior to substantial completion of the proposed dwelling, or that construction and provision of landscaping would not take significantly longer than the slow rate of progress being made on the blueline land. I understand there is evidence of burning on the site area.

Habitat Survey

I disagree with PEA paragraph 8.2.1 that the *“site is primarily garden”* or that aerial imagery over the last 25 years *“shows it has been consistently garden habitat within in recent years up to 2025”*. While I agree with paragraph 6.4.1 that the site was increasingly overgrown, the tree felling, habitat removal, and stripping vegetation undertaken in both 2024 and 2025, cannot accurately be described as *“some clearance”*. No evidence is currently provided that grassland was cut even *“infrequently”* since the dwelling was demolished in the mid-1970s. I must disagree with paragraph 7.1.1 that the degradation of the site is described only as *“recent disturbance”* or that recent clearance is as result of temporary storage of building materials associated with work at 1 Norton Road. The clearance undertaken after May 2024, the tree felling, vegetation strip, and piling of demolition material must be considered as deliberate degradation, potentially in an attempt to reduce habitat value and to facilitate an application on the current site area not construction of the permitted extension of 1 Norton Road.

According to the site Bat Survey (GS Ecology, Ref ECO3450b, August 12024) *“at the time of the initial survey the garden was unmaintained at the time of the survey and had been colonised by bramble scrub throughout, with some self-set hazel. There are a number of trees within the garden, notably a semi-mature goat willow adjacent to the drive, several ash and horse chestnut at the west of the garden, and, a birch tree at the north of the garden. Along the boundary of the garden is a beech and privet hedge”*. I contend that Streetview and Google Earth photos demonstrate no part of the site has been managed as formal or ornamental garden since at least 2009. According to historic OS maps a dwelling was demolished on the site between 1970 and 1977. The majority of the site area has therefore been unmanaged for over 50 years. GS Ecology state *“At the time of the first dusk emergence survey most of the overgrown garden had been cleared to bare ground and the goat willow had been cut back”*.


From the Planning Design Access Statement (PDAS) and Title Plans provided, and Streetview prior to 2011, the parcel separated by a post and wire fence on southeast of Basingstoke Road, was grassland. However, Streetview photos show this was also unmanaged in 2020 and supported scrub and small trees.

Based on the habitat and tree and shrub species recorded in 2024, available aerial and site photos and other evidence, I conclude that the site should be assessed as medium distinctiveness habitat e.g. to Hazel scrub or broadleaved woodland. If in addition to the hazel coppice, there is evidence of fruit trees, the habitat may could potentially be classed as high distinctiveness traditional orchard.

The Baseline Habitats Plan Fig 1 is based on a 2025 aerial photo. I disagree with PEA paragraph 5.3.1 that the 2025 shows overgrown garden habitat and the assessment fails to take account of the clearance undertaken between 2020 and 2025. In particular the clearance undertaken since April 2024.

The sections of retained hedge on the site boundary meet the criteria to classify it as priority habitat. The hedge height has been reduced and the impact of isolation referred to in paragraph 8.2.3 fails to take account of the clearance of shrubs, fruit and small trees which the site previously supported. The Ecologist has not assessed the impact of removal of the hedgerow to improve visibility or the reduction of T3 in the metric or PEA. I note the neighbouring properties on the northwest side of Norton Rd do not have such wide visibility sprays.

I don't agree that there is enough evidence to conclude that the grassland species existed prior to site clearance operations and don't arise from the blueline land or been imported from off-site. I support the precautionary approach in the BNG Assessment of that the site supported moderate distinctiveness habitat i.e. neutral grassland.



The ecologist has not demonstrated that the habitat clearance and site degradation, have not decreased the importance of the site for hedgehogs. Or that the habitat loss will be compensated and breeding hedgehogs could be maintained and enhanced on the site. The impact of closeboard fencing on hedgehog, dormouse, invertebrate and amphibian movements is not considered and the assessment does not demonstrate that the development would be ecologically permeable, and the ability of the site to support wild fauna will be maintained or enhanced. The Ecologist has not suggested closeboard fencing would reduce or mitigate negative impacts of predation on birds or small mammals.

The mitigation hierarchy has not been adequately considered including retention of semi-mature Ash T2 and insufficient avoidance measures and alternative layout have been proposed to minimize impacts to protected species, including foraging bats. The Ecologist has not assessed the impact of dismantling the mound feature has been created by the contractor since 2023 and excavating flood attenuation tanks taken account of the mound, assessed whether there may be hibernacula and suitable habitat to support reptiles, toads or stag beetle within this. If possible the mound is retained and the flood storage is relocated to the east side of the proposed dwelling underneath proposed car parking.

The PDAS states that a total of four parking spaces will be provided on the site. *“Whilst this exceeds the maximum requirements of local planning policy, this level of provision will help prevent overspill parking onto the public highway”*. The alternatives of including bin and cycle stores within the carport, reducing car parking, or a smaller dwelling with integral or attached garage have not been considered as required by CP1, CP3 and CP7 and BS42020.

According to the Riseley Village Design Statement (amended 2009) many houses are served by septic tanks or sewage plants, so large areas of hard-standing can create on-going difficulties. I request confirmation that no septic tank or foul drains will be excavated within the proposed vegetated garden habitat, and the connection to existing mains sewage is in Norton Road on the southeast side of the site.

The Agent and the Owner's Ecologist should be aware that the LPA are still waiting for a qualified Ecologist's report confirming that permanent roost provision has been installed. JWEC's Ecologist didn't record any bat boxes have been erected in trees to compensate loss of the Brown long-eared bat roost. According to the PEA, the 3 remaining trees on-site currently have no potential roost features, however details of tree inspection methods are not provided. I am not satisfied that the AIA provides adequate justification for the removal of Ash T2.

Local Plan policy CP3 states planning permission will be granted for proposals that :

- c) Have no detrimental impact upon important ecological, heritage, landscape (including river valleys) or geological features or water courses. And
- d) Maintain or enhance the ability of the site to support fauna and flora including protected species.

Development proposals will be required to demonstrate how they have responded to the above criteria clear and informative plans, elevations and streetscenes. According to CP7 development which may harm habitats or, species of principle importance, veteran trees or features of the landscape that are of major importance for wild flora and fauna, whether directly or indirectly, will be only permitted if it has clearly demonstrated that the need for the proposals outweighs the need to safeguard the nature conservation importance, that no alternatives site that would result in less or no harm is available which will meet the need; and mitigation measures can be put in place to prevent damaging impacts. Or appropriate compensation measures to offset the scale and kind of losses must be provided.

Onsite replacement of a single tree and immature hedgerow is not in line with planning policy and inadequate to compensate loss of T2. The hedgerow shown as lost in Fig 2 Post-Development Habitat Plan is inconsistent with the Proposed Site

Plan Ref 152 Rev B and has failed to take account of the habitat loss resulting from visibility spray creation proposal (or vehicle/plant access and storage during construction).

The WBC Design Guide SPD states existing mature landscape, such as hedges and mature trees, should be retained wherever possible. *“Designers should make sure that the gardens to proposed new housing will not be completely overshadowed by existing trees”...* *“There should be sufficient space to provide areas of soft landscape as well as hard landscape”*. *“If tree felling is necessary or appropriate then semi mature replacements must be planted and maintained”*. The SPD states planting species should be selected to relate to the character of the area, using native or characteristic species wherever appropriate, support biodiversity, and suit the proposed arrangements for management and maintenance.

I note the limited useable garden and space for compensation planting outside the overhang of Ash T1. If the useable garden space outside of the canopy of T1 complies with Local Plan policies and the application is approved, further tree-planting proposals should be secured to compensate for the trees which were removed. Space should be provided within the site for a well-designed soft landscape scheme including native broadleaf mixed hedges that can support wildlife in the long term. The loss of trees and biodiversity habitat should be compensated on site and scale and footprint of the development reduced to avoid and mitigate the impact or the site area should be retained as garden for 1 Norton Road as assessed and approved in 240471.

To reduce the cumulative direct and indirect negative impacts on habitat for protected or notable species, taking into account the degradation of the site, indirect impacts and intensification of use of the site, predation and recreational disturbance, if the application is approved a CEMP biodiversity, landscaping and ecological enhancement conditions must be imposed.

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

The application form states that *“the earlier date has been used to take into pre-survey site clearance. The date refers to the most recent available pre-clearance aerial imagery on Google Maps and Google Earth”*. The BNG Assessment states Google Earth satellite imagery was consulted to provide insight into historic landuse.

I disagree with paragraph 5.3.1 and advise that all the degradation of the site and clearance of vegetation by the developer in 2024 and 2025 must be assessed to calculate the biodiversity baseline and the compensation that is required by local plan policy to support wildlife. Aerial photography from 2020 or prior to commencement of habitat clearance of the 240471 site area should have been used.

The Bat Survey (GS Ecology, August 2024) should have been provided to the Ecologist to inform habitat classification, potential for protected and notable species and habitat by the as the initial site survey was undertake prior to major site clearance and deliberate degradation in April 2024. GSE state *“the time of the initial survey the garden was unmaintained at the time of the survey and had been colonised by bramble scrub throughout, with some self-set hazel. There are a number of trees within the garden, notably a semi-mature goat willow adjacent to the*

drive, several ash and horse chestnut at the west of the garden, and, a birch tree at the north of the garden. Along the boundary of the garden is a beech and privet hedge". The photographs submitted by the Architect in support of 240471 also need to be reviewed by JWEC.

Photography from 2020-2023 should have provided evidence of habitat condition, and the biodiversity habitat and hedgerow habitat on the relevant date on 30 January 2020 (or September 2023). With the exception of Title BK254355, I disagree with in paragraph 5.3.1 that, that Google Earth provides evidence of "*areas of open grassland*". I note Title BK254355 on the northwest of the site area was previously separated by a post and wire fence. It may be appropriate to classify and assess habitat condition of this area, which in 2009 was grassland, as a separate parcel in the metric.

I am satisfied that the precautionary approach accords with metric guidelines, and that the site is assessed as medium distinctiveness habitat e.g. other neutral grassland. I request that the BNG Baseline Habitats Plan Figure 1 is revised, and all the scrub, shrubs and tree cover present in January 2020 (or relevant date prior to 2024) agreed with the LPA are shown.

Individual Trees

I disagree with the Ecologist that the trees visible from Google Streetview and 2020-2023 aerial photos are all young (small individual trees). Any medium or large individual trees present on the site in 2023 must be included in the metric and BNG assessment. Further detailed evidence should be provided to demonstrate that no additional trees have been felled during 2024 and 2025 vegetation clearance. According to BS5837:2012 the Arboriculturist should have recorded stumps in the AIA. I note tree stumps/coppice stools in the Case Officer's site visit photos, that some species removed were multi-stemmed and the extent of canopy cover in earlier aerals. However, the submitted AIA includes no details of tree stumps on the site. No evidence the site was managed as garden prior to 2024, therefore all trees present in September 2023 should be assessed as Rural Individual Trees.

An assessment of value of the tree habitat present on site prior to 2024 and value to wildlife is needed to ensure adequate on-site compensation in line with the Design Guide SPD and planning policy, as well as statutory biodiversity net gain. Yew T3 is a small tree proposed to be retained and the crown reduced. I suggest that the tree is included in the habitat condition assessment and the PEA, in order that long-term retention can be secured by AMS, landscaping and LEMP planning conditions and obligation is placed on the Landowner to retain and manage the tree for biodiversity.

Native Hedgerow

The hedgerow condition assessment should take account that there is no evidence of disturbance on the northwestern side for 40 years prior to commencement of clearance and change in ownership in 2024. Paragraph 5.4.1 inaccurately states that the section of hedgerow proposed for removal is only 7 meters long. The Proposed Habitat Plan Fig2 fails to show over 10m of further hedge in front of the house proposed to be removed across the drive/access to the carport to create the visibility splay.


For Fig 2 and any Biodiversity Gain Plan to be approved by the LPA, the Proposed Habitat Plan must be amended to show 18m of hedgerow loss or the development proposals should be revised to retain the west section of hedge as assessed by the Ecologist.


I'm not satisfied that the date used to calculate the pre-development biodiversity value. The application form should be amended and the revised agreed date on which pre-development biodiversity value must be calculated which must be prior to clearance undertaken in April 2024 facilitate the extension of 1 Norton Road (planning permission 240471). 0.24 hedgerow units must be added to the pre-development on-site value given in the application form fails to include 0.12 additional hedgerow habitat.

The change currently calculated by the Ecologist is a 70.06% loss in biodiversity habitat units and 24.14% loss in hedgerow units. If the application was approved, I agree that it would be impossible to compensate losses and deliver 10% net gain for biodiversity on-site. To meet the mandatory requirement for a minimum 10 % net gain for biodiversity, off-site gains will need to be made by purchasing credits or registering off-site land. In addition the final landscaping agreed by the LPA and long-term management and retention for 30 years from completion including native compensation tree planting and boundary hedge would have to be secured to ensure compliance with Local Plan, MDD and Design SPD guidelines. The planning authority must only take into account post-development on-site compensation where it is satisfied that the habitat creation or enhancements will be maintained for at least 30 years after the development is completed.

Summary

I support the Ecologist's conclusion, taking into account for clearance and degradation undertaken by Balforton Developments since 2023, that the site supported good condition moderate significant habitat. I agree that the baseline biodiversity habitat value is 0.9 **and** 0.12 linear habitat units. If the application is approved a planning condition securing details of the Biodiversity Gain Plan to show the steps to be taken to minimise the adverse effect on-site, pre- and accurate post development value and biodiversity credits purchased for the development. The recommended mitigation and enhancement measures provided in Section 9, and a detailed scheme of ecological enhancements must be secured by planning condition in addition to a biodiversity gain plan and compensation landscaping and long-term habitat retention.





Conditions & Reasons (if required)

The Statutory BNG condition and WBC informatives I17, I18 and I19 should be included in the decision notice. If approved a S106 planning obligation is need to secure contributions for TBH SANGS and SAMM, and I request the following should all be secured by planning condition:

Condition: The Biodiversity Gain Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Ref R3091_PEA_a dated February 2026 and prepared by John Wenman Ecological Consultancy and Proposed Site Plan Dwg 23.24-152 Rev? dated XXXX 2026 prepared Spire Architects and Statuary Metric Version XX May 2026.

Condition The Biodiversity Gain Plan must include:

- (a) information about the steps taken or to be taken to minimise the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the onsite habitat and any other habitat;
- (b) the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat;
- (c) the post-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat;
- (d) any registered offsite biodiversity gain allocated to the development and the biodiversity and the biodiversity value of that gain in relation to the development; and
- (e) any biodiversity credits purchased for the development.

Condition: Works are to be carried out in full accordance with the recommendations for mitigation and compensation for habitats, notable and protected Reasonable Avoidance Measures and biodiversity enhancement measures given in Section 9 of the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (John Wenman Ecological Consultancy, Ref R3091_PEA_a, February 2026) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the council. Within one month of substantial completion a short closing-out report demonstrating that the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures have been implemented to the satisfaction of the Ecological Clerk of Works/Supervising Ecologist is to be issued to the council.

Reason: To ensure that biodiversity, protected and priority species are not adversely affected by the proposals. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 15, Local Plan Core Strategy policies CP3 and CP7 and Managing Development Delivery policy TB23

Condition: Prior to the commencement of development hereby permitted, full details proposals of ecological enhancement and ecological permeability for the site proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This ecological enhancement scheme shall be based on recommendations in Section 9.7.1 of the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Ref R3091_PEA_a, February 2026) and shall include provision of minimum two integrated Habitatat bat box (or equivalent Bat brick/tube/box) and integral bird

boxes, bee bricks and permeability for hedgehog by avoiding gravel boards, and retention or creation of hibernacula for amphibians. This strategy shall be prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist. Once approved the strategy shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation and in accordance with approved timetable.

Reason: To secure a net gain for biodiversity and that biodiversity, protected and priority species are not adversely affected by the proposals. The NPPF section 15, Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3 CP7 and MMD Local Plan policy TP23.

Condition: No development shall take place (including site set-up, ground works, vegetation clearance, or material or machinery brought onto the site) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.

- a. Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
- b. Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
- c. Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
- d. The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- e. The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- f. Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- g. The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- h. Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. No development, earth moving shall take place, or material or machinery brought onto the site, until protective fencing and warning signs have been erected on site in accordance with the approved CEMP biodiversity. All protective fencing and warning signs will be maintained during the construction period in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that biodiversity, protected and priority species are not adversely affected by the proposals. Relevant policy: NPPF 2024 Section 15, Local Plan Core Strategy policies CP3 and CP7 and Managing Development Delivery policy TB23.

Condition: Prior to commencement of development full details of all external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the development. Such details designed in accordance with Guidance Note 8/23 Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night (Bat Conservation Trust/Institution of Lighting Professionals) shall include location, height, type and direction of light sources and intensity of illumination and through the provision of appropriate contour plans, curfews and technical specifications clearly demonstrate that any areas to be lit will not disturb or negatively impact biodiversity. The details shall demonstrate how the areas identified as the retained boundary hedgerows and trees are retained unlit. No further external lighting shall be installed without the written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To prevent an adverse impact from the development on wildlife, protected

and priority species and public amenity. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 15 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment) and paragraph 198, Local Plan Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3, CP6 and CP7, and MDD policy TB23.

CL7/8

To secure the protection throughout the time that the development is being carried out of trees shrubs or hedges growing within or adjacent to the site which are of biodiversity value to the area, and to allow for verification by the local planning authority & project arborist that the necessary measures are in place before development and other works commence Relevant policy: 2024 NPPF Section 15, Local Plan Core Strategy policies CP3 and CP7 and Managing Development Delivery policies TB23.

Condition: Prior to the commencement of the development, full details of both hard and soft landscape proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include, proposed contours, means of enclosure, car parking layouts, pedestrian access and circulation areas, refuse storage units, lighting, external services, etc). Soft landscaping details shall include planting plan, specification (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate, and implementation timetable.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a timetable approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of species, size and number as originally approved and permanently retained.

Reason: To ensure that biodiversity, protected and priority species are not adversely affected by the proposals. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP3 and CP7 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy TB23.

Condition: No retained tree, hedge or shrub shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the local planning authority. If within a period of **30 years** from the date completion development of any tree that tree, or any tree planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: Reason: To ensure that biodiversity, protected and priority species are not adversely affected by the proposals. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP3 and CP7 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy TB23

Condition: No building, enlargement or alterations permitted shall be carried out nor enclosure, swimming or other pool, or container for the storage of oil or liquid petroleum gas shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwelling house hereby permitted without the express permission in writing of the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure implementation in accordance with the Biodiversity Gain Plan and that biodiversity habitat is retained on-site in the long-term and protected and

priority species are not affected. Relevant policy: NPPF 2024 Section 15, Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. Local Plan Core Strategy policies CP3 and CP7 and Managing Development Delivery n policy TB23.

Date:	29/04/26	Signed:	T Cuss
--------------	----------	----------------	--------

Title BK254355



2 May 2024



March 2026



Photos 1 and 2 – 1 Norton Road viewed from the south east and south



Photos 3 and 4 – 1 Norton Road viewed from the south west and west

