

**APPLICATION REFERENCE: PL/2022/00166/PPFL****Site Address:** 213 Tanworth Lane Shirley Solihull B90 4BZ

<b>Proposal:</b>	Demolition of existing dwelling and replacement with 2 No. 4 bedroom detached houses (Resubmission of withdrawn planning application PL/2021/01753/PPFL).
<b>Web link to Plans:</b>	<b>Full details of the proposal and statutory consultee responses can be found by using the above planning application reference number at:</b>  <a href="https://publicaccess.solihull.gov.uk/online-applications/">https://publicaccess.solihull.gov.uk/online-applications/</a>

<b>Reason for Referral to Planning Committee:</b>	<b>Called in by Head of Development Management Manager</b>
---	--

<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>APPROVAL</b>
------------------------	-----------------

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The principle of this residential development is policy compliant, creating two residential units (2 instead of 1) on a site currently in residential use (Class C3) in an established accessible residential area, and would help to meet an identified need for dwellings in an accessible location within the Borough. The principle of development is acceptable and in compliance with Policy P5 of the Solihull Local Plan (SLP). The design and layout respects the local distinctiveness of the area and the proposal therefore accords with Policy P15 of the SLP.

The proposal, as demonstrated by the content of this report, is deemed acceptable in all other respects and no material harm has been identified that outweighs the benefits of the scheme. The proposal should therefore be approved, subject to conditions.

**MAIN ISSUES**

The main issues in this application are:

- The first main issue is whether the proposal provides an appropriate residential use in accordance with relevant planning policy;

- The second main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety and the free flow of the road network;
- The third main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character of the area and appearance of street scene;
- The fourth main issue is the effect of the proposal on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties; and

#### Other material considerations

- Landscape,
- Ecology,
- Drainage,
- Climate Change,
- CIL
- Planning balance and conclusions

## CONSULTATION RESPONSES

### Statutory Consultees

None

**Non Statutory Consultees** The following Non-Statutory Consultee responses have been received:

- SMBC Drainage - No comment
- SMBC Ecology – Final comments awaited
- SMBC Highways – No objection subject to conditions
- SMBC Landscape – No objection subject to conditions

## PUBLICITY

The application was advertised in accordance with the provisions set down in the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 2015.

2 residents have objected to the original plans for this application. Both have further objected to the amended plans submitted. All correspondence has been reviewed and the main issues raised are summarised below (Planning Committee Members have access to all third party correspondence received):

### Highway safety

- No room for two cars to pass on service road;
- Vehicles have to reverse onto Tanworth Lane;
- Construction management plan should be upfront;
- Traffic situation is dangerous;
- Service road offers no parking or turning;
- Access was designed for three dwellings;
- Existing site provides garaging, parking and turning;

- Lack of parking;
- Two spaces per dwelling not sufficient;
- Blind spots dangerous;
- Increased traffic; and
- Complexity of deliveries and traffic management

#### Design and character

- Out of keeping with streetscene;
- Impact on Local quiet area;
- Overdevelopment; and
- Undesirable type of development

#### Neighbour amenity

- The proposed buildings will be imposing;
- Loss of light;
- Impact and stress on residents; and
- Loss of privacy.

#### Others

- Impact on nesting/roosting birds and bats; and
- Impractical to build and unsafe

### **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- PL/2021/01753/PPFL - Demolition of existing executive home and three replacement dwellings – Withdrawn

### **PLANNING ASSESSMENT**

Section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that: -

‘Where in making any determination under the planning acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise’.

The National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 2 states that planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account in preparing the development plan, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Planning policies and decisions must also reflect relevant international obligations and statutory requirements.

On the 13th of May 2021 the Local Plan Review was submitted (via the Planning Inspectorate) to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

This marks the next stage in the preparation and adoption of the plan. The advice in the NPPF at paragraph 48 states “Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)”.

Greater weight, but not full weight, can therefore be given to the submitted plan, but this may still be dependent on the circumstances of each case and the potential relevance of individual policies. In many cases there are policies in the new plan which are similar to policies in the adopted plan which seek the same objectives, although they may be expressed slightly differently.

It is considered that relevant policies pertinent to this application have limited weight in the planning balance, and as a result do not alter the recommendation of approval reached in this report.

This report also considers the proposal against the Development Plan (Solihull Local Plan), the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) 2019, the National Planning Practice Guidance.

#### Whether the proposal provides an appropriate residential use in accordance with relevant planning policy

Policy P5 of the Local Plan supports new housing on unidentified sites in accessible locations where they contribute to meeting borough wide needs and towards enhancing local character and distinctiveness. Policy P5 of the Local Plan is consistent with policies set out in the Framework and full weight can be attributed to this Local Plan Policy.

In order to find support in Policy P5, developments should; (a) be located in accessible locations; (b) contribute to meeting borough wide housing needs and; (c) enhance local character and distinctiveness.

#### *- (a) Accessibility*

In terms of the first test, Policy P7 of the Local Plan provides accessibility criteria in relation to local circumstances. Policy P7, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that new development is focused in the most accessible locations and promotes ease of access. When looking at housing development, this Policy sets out criteria of walking distances that new development should seek to achieve and comments on distances from primary schools; doctor’s surgeries and food shops as well as distances from bus stops and railway stations. The intention is that development should be easily accessible and linked to existing amenity facilities that are capable of being arrived

at on foot. Policy P7 of the Local Plan is consistent with policies set out in the Framework and full weight can be attributed to this Local Plan Policy.

	Policy P7 distance requirement	Local Authority calculation of distance
Bus stop	400m	84m
Rail station	800m	2896m
Food store	800m	643m
Primary School	800m	804m
GP surgery	800m	169m

Policy P7 expects development to meet certain accessibility criteria (as shown in the table above) “unless justified by local circumstance”. It is recognised that the development falls outside several of the ideal distances that Policy P7 aspires to, but the differences are not considered to be significant. Importantly, the application site is located within an existing residential area of Shirley, close to the A3400 Stratford Road, which is well served by services. As such, the application proposal is considered to accord with the spirit of Policy P7.

For the reasons set out above, the spirit of Policy P7 is met, and the principle of the redevelopment of this site for residential purposes within the C3 Class of the Use Classes Order (1987) (as amended) meets the accessibility test in Policy P5.

*- (b) Contribute to meeting borough wide housing needs*

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF indicates that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The correct test to apply is based upon whether an authority can demonstrate a 5-year land supply (5YHLS) or not. If it can't then for decision making the presumption means granting permission unless (i) the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance (that are listed in foot note 6 of the NPPF) provides a clear reason for refusal or (ii) any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole. This is often referred to as the ‘tilted balance’. The latest figures the Council has published in relation to the 5YLS indicates that the Council can demonstrate a supply of 3.60 years (as of 1st April 2021) and therefore the tilted balance is engaged. This shortfall is considered to be substantial on a scale of marginal-limited-modest-substantial-severe. As the shortfall is considered to be substantial this should be given significant weight.

Policy P5 of the Solihull Local Plan (SLP) supports new housing on unidentified sites in accessible locations where they contribute towards meeting identified housing needs and towards enhancing local character and distinctiveness. The proposal seeks to erect one additional bungalow thus enhancing local character and distinctiveness. Issues of character and design are considered in greater depth later on in this report.

- (c) *Enhancing local character and distinctiveness*

Finally, considering the third test, Policy P15 of the SLP provides guidance on Securing Design Quality. Policy P15 of the SLP requires all development to achieve good quality, inclusive and sustainable design, which conserves and enhances local character, distinctiveness and streetscape quality and ensures the scale, massing, density, layout, materials and landscape of the development respects the surrounding natural, built and historic environment.

The principle of the redevelopment of this site for residential purposes within the C3 Class of the Use Classes Order (1987) (as amended) would contribute to meeting borough wide housing needs and therefore meets the housing test in Policy P5, which gains significant weight in the planning balance.

- Summary

For the reasons set out above, the principle of the redevelopment of this site for residential purposes within the C3 Class of the Use Classes Order (1987) (as amended) is compliant with Policy P5 of the Local Plan.

This should be accorded significant weight in the planning balance.

The effect of the proposal on the character of the area and appearance of the street scene

Policy P15 of the SLP is a wide ranging design policy that sets out the relevant guidelines by which development proposals will be assessed. Amongst other things, it states that all development proposals will be expected to achieve good quality, inclusive and sustainable design. The policy is consistent with the NPPF and thus carries significant weight.

To supplement the above policies the Council's Housing in Context SPG aims to maintain and enhance the local distinctiveness, character and quality of Solihull's residential areas, encouraging the most efficient use of land, whilst complementing surroundings. It identifies a number of key characteristics and common elements that lead to local distinctiveness and character that should be taken into account in the determination of applications. The guidance also highlights other considerations in assessing applications for residential development, such as impact on amenity, car-parking standards, and access to the site and other relevant planning considerations whilst recognising that its methodology does not require proposals to be a copy or pastiche of existing styles & development. Furthermore, development not in harmony with its context will exceptionally be allowed but only where it is of outstanding individual quality and where it is appropriately located

The proposal seeks to demolish the existing dwelling and erect 2 detached properties on the site. These would be 4 bedroomed properties with associated parking spaces on the frontage.

Number 213 Tanworth Lane is an existing detached two storey dwelling located on a service road serving two further dwellings. The property dates from the 1950s and constructed of predominately brick. The back garden is between 4.1m to 21m in depth and backs onto 106 Blackford Road. The site area is 0.08 hectares

There are a variety of house types and plot sizes within the immediately surrounding area along Tanworth Lane and Blackford Road. The service road that leads to the application site off Tanworth Lane serves plots occupied by three detached two storey properties. Opposite the application site there are bungalows and a doctors surgery. There are semi-detached properties further up Tanworth Lane. There is therefore no one distinct type or form of development that provides for an overriding character, though it is recognised that surrounding development generally consists of dwellings with similar plot sizes to that proposed.

The new dwellings would have a width of 10.5m at ground floor reducing to 7.5m at first floor level and depth of 10.9m. The Plot number 1 nearest the neighbouring properties would be set in from side site boundary with number 211 by approx. 6m at ground floor and reducing to 2.4m towards the front of the property. There would be a 1.5m gap at ground floor increasing to 4.5m at first floor between the two dwellings and Plot 2 would be off the side boundary of the site by 1.5m at the closest point. Rear garden depths of approx. between 4.5m and 10m (Plot 1) and 8.5m and 12.5m (Plot 2) and between 6.5m and 14m frontages to each plot. The dwellings are therefore of a size, and are of a building-to-plot ratio, that is very similar to other development within the area.

In design terms, the dwellings are to be relatively simplistic and unfussy in appearance, maintaining a predominantly horizontal emphasis, incorporating front hipped roofs to both plots and a suitable scale of development. Having regard to the variation of building typologies including predominantly two storey and some three storey within the immediate area, it is considered that the proposed dwellings will integrate successfully into the fabric of the area.

Having regard to the above it is considered that the proposal will create a legible and cohesive development that reflects the form, scale and pattern of other development within the area and will resemble dwellings of an enhanced character and appearance than the existing property. As such it will add to the diverse range of built form within the area, will enhance the character and appearance of the area, and is therefore compliant with Policy P15 of Solihull Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.

Significant weight should be attributed to this in the planning balance.

#### The effect of the proposal on highway safety and the free flow of the road network

The current development proposals include the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of two dwellings in its place. The application site is located at the end of a cul-de-sac, which currently serves three dwellings and is accessed off Tanworth Lane. The existing vehicular access onto Tanworth Lane measures approximately 4.5m in width, which is typically the minimum width the Highway Authority would require for an access serving multiple dwellings. This should enable

two vehicles to pass each other within the vehicular access, without obstructing the flow of traffic along the main arm of the junction. Visibility splays commensurate with the posted 30mph speed limit appear to be achievable at the existing vehicular access onto Tanworth Lane.

The Highway Authority notes that there are two bus stops along Tanworth Lane, approximately 70m south of the existing junction onto Tanworth Lane. Public footpath SL71 and Tanworth Lane Surgery are both located on the opposite side of Tanworth Lane to the application site, approximately 10m and 85m south of the junction onto Tanworth Lane respectively. Paragraph 112a) of the NPPF (July 2021) states that development should “give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas...”. The Highway Authority therefore recommends that a pedestrian crossing (in the form of dropped kerbs with tactile paving) is provided along Tanworth Lane to provide existing and future residents a safe and suitable crossing point to access the facilities on the opposite side of the carriageway.

Subsequently, additional plans have been submitted in support of the development proposals, with slight revisions to the parking layout, and a vehicle tracking plan (drawing no. 150062-FRH-XX-XX-DR-C-1000 Revision P02) has also been provided. The plan demonstrates that for each dwelling there is turning space within the curtilage of the site for vehicles to turn and access/egress the site in a forward gear. Therefore, it is considered that the parking layout will not have a severe impact on public highway safety, or on the operation or capacity of the local highway network.

The development proposals should not generate a significant increase in vehicle trips to have a severe impact on public highway safety, or on the operation or capacity of the local highway network.

For the reasons as set out in this section of the report, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable on highways grounds because it is unlikely that the development proposal will generate a significant increase in vehicle trips to have a severe impact on public highway safety, or on the operation of the local highway network. SMBC Highway Authority is therefore satisfied that the proposals accord with Policies P7 and P8 of the Solihull Local Plan 2013. SMBC Highway Authority considers the development proposals to be acceptable and should not be refused on highway grounds as per Paragraph 109 of the NPPF, as the development should not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, nor will the residual cumulative impacts on the road network be severe.

Neutral weight should therefore be attached to this material consideration.

#### The effect of the proposal on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties

Policy P14 of the SLP seeks to protect the amenity of existing and potential occupiers of houses when considering new developments. Careful consideration must be made to amenity of both existing neighbours, as well as future occupiers of the proposed apartments. The policy is consistent with the NPPF and thus carries



significant weight.

Concern has been raised by the residents on the service road serving the application site and the two neighbouring properties. Their concerns are with regards to the access, overlooking and loss of privacy. The access concerns have been addressed in the previous paragraph of this report. With regards to separation distances there is a distance of 4.5m at ground floor increasing to 9.6m at first floor with closest property 211 Tanworth Lane. The existing dwelling is situated similar distances as proposed. This is felt to be an acceptable distance to not create any direct overlooking or impact detrimentally on the living conditions of the occupiers of these properties.

The proposed building does not infringe any 45 degree sightlines taken from the rear facing windows at the neighbouring property number 211. The outlook would not be altered to windows in the rear of No.211, the building at plot 1 would be outside the 45 degree sightline and the building would be positioned a distance from the shared boundary, alleviating potential concerns of overbearing impact. Number 211 has a landing window to the side facing the application however there would be no negative impact due to separation distances. There is a ground floor side conservatory to number 211 however the property closest has now been designed to follow similar if not more distance of the existing dwelling on the site.

Turning to number 106 Blackford Road there would be no infringement of the 45 degree sightlines. The proposed new dwelling closest would be a distance of 10m from this property. Therefore there would be limited impact on the living conditions of number 106.

In summary, the siting and relationship of the proposed dwellings and their associated infrastructure would not have an unreasonable impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties and thus the development would accord with Policy P14 in this regard. This carries neutral weight in the assessment and determination of this application.

With respect to the living conditions of future occupiers, the drawings submitted demonstrate that a sizable area of useable space would be located to the rear of the properties for use by occupants of the dwellings. As a consequence, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of future occupiers of the development in terms of external space provision.

In summary, it is considered that the proposed dwellings are appropriately proportioned and sited so as not to have an adverse effect on the living condition of the occupants of nearby dwellings or future occupiers of the development. In this regard, the development would accord with Policy P14 of the SLP, and neutral weight should therefore be attached to this material consideration

### Other issues

#### Landscape

Policy P10 of the SLP recognises the importance of a healthy natural environment in

its own right. Policy P14 of the SLP requires new development to safeguard important trees, hedgerows and woodlands. The policy is consistent with the NPPF and thus carries significant weight.

In respect of trees on and around the development site, SMBC Landscape Architects have considered the landscape plan submitted with the application and have concluded that proposal can be undertaken without compromising the health or longevity of important trees on and around the site. All works, to trees and within the vicinity of tree Root Protection Areas (RPA) including construction methods, tree protection Arboricultural supervision etc. are to be carried out strictly in accordance with the Arboricultural information that accompanies the application. Hard and soft landscaping for the wider site can be secured by condition.

The proposal is therefore compliant with Policies P10 and P14 of the SLP and neutral weight should therefore be attached to this material consideration

### Ecology

Policy P10 of the SLP seeks to protect habitats and to conserve, enhance and restore biodiversity. The policy is consistent with the NPPF and thus carries significant weight.

SMBC Ecologists have considered submitted bat and bird survey and requested additional surveys. These have now been submitted and a full response is awaited. A Small Sites metric has now been submitted which shows that the development can secure a net gain to biodiversity.

This again will be updated by way of an update note.

### Drainage

Policy P11 of the SLP advises that new development will not normally be permitted within areas at risk of flooding. The policy is consistent with the NPPF and thus carries significant weight. The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

SMBC Drainage Engineers have considered the proposal and raises no objection. The proposal is therefore compliant with Policy P11 of the SLP and neutral weight should therefore be attached to this material consideration

### Affordable housing

In terms of affordable housing, the proposal would create 2, four bedrooed dwellings which would not exceed the 1,000 sq. m 'floor space' threshold set out in Policy 4a of the SLP. Thus, no affordable housing provision is required to be provided by the proposal. The proposal is therefore compliant with Policy P4a of the SLP and neutral weight should therefore be attached to this material consideration.

### Climate Change

In October 2019 the Council made a climate emergency declaration and a statement

of intent to protect the environment. This was unanimously approved by the Council and has led to the development of the Council's Net Zero Action Plan and supported the evidence base to deliver new policies within the Solihull Local Plan Review (SLPR). As explained earlier in this report, the SLPR is currently going through the examination process and hearings have taken place with the Planning Inspectors. Once adopted, the plan will replace the Solihull Local Plan 2013 and will have full weight. Until that time, policies within the SLPR hold limited weight, but not full weight in the decision-making process. Whilst adopted policy P9 sets out measures to help tackle climate change through new development, it does not set clear requirements relating to new technologies and initiatives. As such, the updated policy P9 will provide the Council with greater leverage in requiring new development to meet up to date Climate Change and sustainable policies – responding to the aims and objectives of the Climate Change deceleration.

Nevertheless, existing planning applications such as this, are already required to perform well against wider climate change and sustainable policies. To this end, officers have sought to achieve the best solutions as part of this application within the remits of adopted policy. A net gain in biodiversity is achieved. Officers also note that new dwellings will be constructed to modern Building Regulation standards and will therefore have a far greater thermal efficiency than older dwellings. Whilst not yet reaching net zero, such standards will, by their very nature, help reduce energy demand for heating, lighting and cooling and minimise carbon dioxide emissions.

Furthermore, it is important to note that amended Building Regulations came into effect from 15th June 2022 and are applicable to new builds. This relates to Part L (conservation of fuel and power), Part F (ventilation) and a new Part O (overheating) of the Building Regulations. Part S (Infrastructure for the charging of electric vehicles) are also bolstered and become a building regulation requirement. Whilst new measures will not apply to schemes which are already subject to a building notice; full plans application to Building Control; or initial notice to Building control and which commence work for each building before 15 June 2023, it is our understanding that anything subject to such Building Control applications after the 15th June 2022 will need to meet these new regulations as standard. An informative is added to the recommended decision to alert the applicant to this.

## CIL

The proposal would be liable for the CIL charge if planning permission is granted. This would amount to a levy of £ 20,673.43 based on the contribution rate for new residential dwellings in a 'mature suburb' location.

## Public Sector Equality Duty

In determining this application, Members must have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED) under s.149 of the Equalities Act. This means that the Council must have due regard to the need (in discharging its functions).

The PSED must be considered as a relevant factor in making this decision but does not impose a duty to achieve the outcomes in s.149 is only one factor that needs to be considered, and may be balanced against other relevant factors.

It is not considered that the recommendation to grant permission in this case will have a disproportionately adverse impact on a protected characteristic.

### Human Rights

In determining this request for approval, Members should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority to act in a manner that is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights.

Members are referred specifically to Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation to grant permission in this case interferes with local residents' right to respect for their private and family life, home and correspondence. The recommendation for approval is considered a proportionate response to the submitted request based on the considerations set out in this report.

### Planning balance and conclusion

Section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that: -

'Where in making any determination under the planning acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise'.

The Framework is an important material consideration. It advises that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development which, in the absence of an up-to-date Development Plan (as in Solihull) means granting permission unless adverse impacts of the scheme significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits (as assessed against the Framework as a whole), or specific policies in the Framework indicate otherwise. This is often referred to as the 'tilted balance'.

The outcome of this application therefore depends on:

- Whether there are any adverse impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits; and
- Whether the overall planning balance would be in favour or against the scheme.

In terms of the benefits of the scheme, the development would accord with Policies P5, P7, P8, P10, P11, P14, and P15 of the Local Plan and relevant criteria therein. The purchase of materials and services in connection with the construction of the dwellings, local employment during the construction period are all economic benefits that weigh in favour of the scheme. In terms of scheme's benefits, taken together, significant weight should be given to the economic, environmental and social benefits of the new homes.

In terms of adverse impacts, subject to conditions, the development would not conflict with Policies within the Local Plan or guidance in the Framework. This should

be accorded neutral weight in the planning balance.

In conclusion, for the reasons outlined above, the proposed development would benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the overall planning balance must be in favour for this proposal.

In coming to this recommendation, your officers have also taken into consideration all of the representations made in respect to the proposal. In view of the matters set out above however, they do not alter the overall conclusion.

The proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval is recommended subject to the following précis of conditions a full list of standard conditions is available using the following link:

<http://www.solihull.gov.uk/Resident/Planning/searchplanningapplications>:

- 1) CS00 – Plan numbers
- 2) CS05 – Time restriction
- 3) CS06 – Materials to be submitted
- 4) No development shall take place until a Demolition & Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and Local Highway Authority. The Plan shall be strictly adhered to and shall provide for: the anticipated movements of vehicles; the parking and loading/unloading of staff, visitor, and demolition/construction vehicles; the loading and unloading of plant and materials; hours of operation and deliveries; the storage of plant and materials used in demolishing/constructing the development; a turning area within the site for demolition/construction vehicles; and, wheel washing facilities and other measures to prevent mud/debris being passed onto the public highway.

In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy P8 of the Solihull Local Plan 2013.

- 5) The development shall not be occupied until details of a scheme for the provision of a pedestrian crossing on Tanworth Lane have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and has been implemented in accordance with the approved details and to the standard specification of the Local Highway Authority.

To promote the use of sustainable modes of travel and in the interest of public highway safety in accordance with Policy P8 of the Solihull Local Plan 2013.

- 6) All works, to trees and within the vicinity of tree Root Protection Areas (RPA) are to be carried out strictly in accordance with the Arboricultural information that accompanies the application.

To minimise the effect and enhance the character of the development in accordance with Policy P10 and P15 of the Solihull Local Plan 2013.

- 7) CL04 – Hard and soft landscaping scheme
- 8) CL06 – Implementation of landscaping scheme
- 9) CL07 – Replacement of lost hedging or trees
- 10) NOTE – EV charging point
- 11) NOTE - Condition 5 requires works to be carried out within the limits of the public highway. Before commencing such works the applicant / developer must enter into a

Section 278 Agreement. Applications should be made to the Highway Infrastructure Team, and can be contacted at [duljit.madhar@solihull.gov.uk](mailto:duljit.madhar@solihull.gov.uk) or 0121 704 6487.