


LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & DAGENHAM
PLANNING COMMITTEE
25 March 2021

 Application for **Planning Permission**

Case Officer:	Grace Liu	Valid Date:	12 th January 2021
Applicant:	Thames 21	Expiry Date:	13 th April 2021
Application Number:	20/01941/FULL	Ward:	Eastbrook
Address:	Eastbrookend Country Park, River Rom, Romford		

The purpose of this report is to set out the Officer recommendations to Planning Committee regarding an application for planning permission relating to the proposal below which seeks to restore parts of the River Rom.

Proposal:

The proposed creation of 5 swales and 3 ponds, involving 2 embankment breaches, to create new wetland habitats as part of the river restoration of the River Rom.

Officer Recommendations:

1. Agree the reasons for approval as set out in this report; and

Conditions Summary:
Mandatory Conditions

1. Statutory Time Limit
2. Development in Accordance with Approved Plans

Prior to Works

3. Ecological Assessment
4. Great Crested Newt -Reasonable Avoidance Measures Report
5. Reptile- Reasonable Avoidance Measures Report
6. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Monitoring and Management Conditions

7. Monitoring Strategy

OFFICER REPORT

Planning Constraints:

- Public open space
- Green belt
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation
- River Rom is a strategic waterway

Site, Situation and relevant background information:

The application site is located within the Eastbrookend Country Park. The country park is adjacent to and connects directly with The Chase Nature Reserve. Along with Central Park to the North, and Beam Valley and Beam Parklands to the South, these parks form the 'Dagenham Corridor' which provides people and wildlife with over 250 hectares of green space in the borough.

The River Rom which is the subject of the application forms the Borough line with The London Borough of Havering to the east. It is understood that river restoration works are proposed to The River Rom and will be extended to the River Beam. It is understood these works will be determined separately by The London Borough of Havering.

The red line boundary of the application is located within the section of the Country Park that includes the River Rom to the east. To the west of the application site lies the residential area of Rush Green with Dagenham Road further to the west in terms of identifying its location within the County Park.

Key issues:

1. Principle of Development
2. Flood Management
3. Biodiversity and Ecology Enhancement
4. Impacts to Neighbouring Amenity
5. Archaeology

Planning Assessment:

1.0 Principle of the development:

Proposal

- 1.1 London Plan Policy G1 states London's network of green and open spaces, and green features in the built environment, should be protected and enhanced. Green infrastructure should be planned, designed and managed in an integrated way to achieve multiple benefits. Emerging Local Plan Policy SP6 green and blue infrastructure states that the Council will protect and enhance the quality of the natural environment and will work with a range of stakeholders to maximise the creation of new green and blue infrastructure and address deficiencies in quantity, quality and access. This will be achieved through ensuring development protects and enhances significant ecological features and achieves biodiversity net gain.
- 1.2 River restoration is the process of managing rivers to reinstate natural processes to restore biodiversity, providing benefits to both people and wildlife. The river restoration of the River Rom will return stretches of the river to its original state, making it more visually pleasing but also will improve the health of the river, and the quality of the green space around it. In the past unnatural high banks were engineered onto the River Rom, which limits biodiversity and increases the risk of flooding. These man-made banks will be removed in three locations. It is then the intention to create 3 ponds beside the river which will connect from the river breaches. These will soak up water during high flows and also increase habitats for a number of species, including Great Crested Newts and improve the experience of visitors to the park.

- 1.3 The river restoration of the River Rom is also proposed to the connected Beam River which does not form part of this application. This part of the river restoration will be regulated by the neighbouring authority of The London Borough of Havering as it lies within their borough. The neighbouring borough has been consulted as part of this application.
- 1.4 The application seeks the breaching of the river bund in 3 locations, the creation of 5 swales and 3 ponds in the open space adjacent to Great Cullings.
- 1.5 For clarity, a summary of the technical terms are noted below for convenience:
- **Bund:** Man made areas embankments which run parallel to the river which were originally installed as flood protection.
 - **Scrapes:** Wide shallow holes dug into the ground, intended to be muddy and boggy to encourage wetland plants to grow.
 - **Swales:** Slight depressions dug into the ground designed to funnel water from bund breaches, to ponds, and back into the river.
 - **River Breach:** where the river bund is partially removed to allow water to flow into ponds, scrapes and swales.
- 1.6 It should be noted that the River Restoration also proposes large wood structures to be incorporated within the river channel to control the flow of the river. These structures do not form part of this application. To whether these structures constitute planning permission will need to be assessed outside of this application with additional details being provided by the applicant. If planning permission is required, then the applicant would need to submit a separate planning application for these elements.

Development within the Green Belt

- 1.7 Section 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the government attaches great importance to Green Belts whereby the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is further supported policy G2 of the London Plan, policy CM3 of the Core Strategy DPD and policy SP6 of the Draft Local Plan Reg 19 which denote the Green Belt will be protected and maintained in accordance with national policy.
- 1.8 The 5 green belt priorities are as follows:
1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
 2. To prevent neighbouring towns (neighbourhoods) merging into one another
 3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
 4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
 5. To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land
- 1.9 The application site is located within green belt land designated within the Council's 2015 review as GB05: Eastbrook Park and the Chase. This parcel has an area of 135.17 hectares and formed of three different areas which are distinctive in their own right: The Chase Nature Reserve, Eastbrook Grove and Eastbrookend Country Park. The review states that this parcel should be seen as part of a wider green belt whereby the green belts sites help to resist and check the unrestricted sprawl of the two neighbouring areas of Dagenham to the west and Elm Park to the east. As such the parcel performs the duty of resisting unrestricted sprawl which could lead to the coalescence to the two neighbouring areas. It therefore prevents coalescence of neighbouring areas; thus, it is denoted with a score of 1 for priority 2. As such, it is evident that this parcel provides a green belt purpose. Consequently, the review recommended that this parcel of green belt is retained in full.
- 1.10 As noted above the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. It is considered that the proposal accords with this objective.
- 1.11 The aim to promote biodiversity and ecology in the area will fortify the objective of the green belt in this location and in turn will maintain and enhance its permanence and openness.
- 1.12 The application does not propose any physical structures or buildings. The proposal seeks works to the existing landscape to bring about biodiversity, ecological and flood management benefits to

the area. Officers consider that the proposal does not impact on the role of the green belt in this location but in fact strengthens its permanence and overall role.

Development in a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Area of Public Open Space

- 1.13 Policy G6 of the London Plan protects Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs). It also states that Boroughs should seek opportunities to create other habitats, or features such as artificial nest sites, that are of relevance and benefit in and an urban context. Emerging local plan policy DMNE 3 Nature Conservation and biodiversity states development should not lead to loss or degradation of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs).
- 1.14 It is clear that the proposal that seeks to improve, enhance and create new habitats along watercourses would accord with the above policy objectives.
- 1.15 London Plan Policy G4 protects public open spaces. The site is located within a designated open space. Emerging Local Plan Policy DMNE 1: Parks, open spaces states “The Council will protect and enhance the borough’s parks, public open spaces”.
- 1.16 The proposal does not result in the loss of any public open space but in fact makes improvements to the space for the overall benefit to the members of the visiting general public.
- 1.17 In principle, officers consider that the development is supported by the above environmental and community, recreational policies and meets their objectives. The scheme is therefore supported in principle.

2.0 Flood management

- 2.1 Policy SI 12 -Flood risk management states natural flood management methods should be employed in development proposals due to their multiple benefits including increasing flood storage and creating recreational areas and habitat. Policy SI 13 -Sustainable drainage states drainage should be designed and implemented in ways that promote multiple benefits including increased water use efficiency, improved water quality, and enhanced biodiversity, urban greening, amenity and recreation.
- 2.2 Policies CR4 and BR4 of the Core Strategy and Borough Wide Policies and Emerging Local Policies DMNE 4 DMSI6 of the emerging Local plan (Reg 19 stage) reiterate the regional policy drive as noted above in terms of the water environment and reducing flood risk.
- 2.3 The primary objective of the restoration design is to reconnect the channel with its floodplain and facilitate natural flood management through the creation of scrape/ wetland areas, enhancing habitat available and aesthetics of the area.
- 2.4 The site is located within Flood Zone 3. A flood risk assessment (FRA) has been completed in support of the proposed restoration scheme, assessing any flood risk concerns raised by the proposed scheme in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Flood Risk and Coastal Change.
- 2.5 The proposed development lies within the functional floodplain. However, as the design consists of introducing swales and scrapes on the floodplain along with large wood in the Channel within the Framework of the NPPF sequential test, the works cannot be relocated to an area of lower flood risk. The main flood risk comes from fluvial sources. Hydraulic modelling has demonstrated the development will have minimal impact on flood risk beyond the design areas and no properties are put at higher risk of flooding within the design area itself. No other significant sources of flood risk have been identified.
- 2.6 The Environment Agency were consulted as part of the proposal and have assessed and examined the detailed hydraulic modelling that has been submitted as part of the application.
- 2.7 The Environment Agency have concluded the following:
 - The hydraulic model conclusions outlined in section 6 of the Design and Build Report demonstrate that there is no unacceptable increase in flood risk.

- The figures demonstrate a slight increase in flood maximum depth at multiple return periods including the 1 in 100 year flood event, however these are the locations of the design scrapes and therefore will not affect any properties.
 - The report demonstrates no increase in flood risk to surrounding properties, and no significant change to inundation extents for the 1 in 100 year plus climate change flood event. The evidence shows that the design scrapes, swales and embankment will all function as intended.
- 2.8 The flood risk assessment also notes that even though the proposed development is within the functional floodplain, as the scheme is designed to restore a more natural system and flood risk is not increased upstream or downstream of the restoration site, no mitigation measures are required.
- 2.9 Notwithstanding the above, the applicant has submitted a 5 year wetland monitoring strategy. The strategy will be implemented to monitor the River Rom floodplain restoration and will be secured by condition. The strategy includes regular checks by park rangers, ecological surveys and a survey to assess the function of the wetland by Salix, an environmental consultancy who specialise in wetland creation.
- 2.10 The applicant has confirmed that the monitoring strategy is only required for 5 years as the wetland will fully establish within this period. After 5 years the vegetation and water flow within the wetland will become a self-maintained system, which is fully vegetated. No further changes should occur to the flow of water through the wetland or vegetation structure after this period.
- 2.11 After this 5-year period the LBBD rangers service will continue to monitor (as they already do currently) the channels and ponds on their site patrols going forward to any prevent any blockages to the system.
- 2.12 It is therefore considered that the development reduces the risk of potential flooding in the area and creates new biodiversity and ecological habitats to the area. Officers consider that the scheme is positive and is welcomed for the reasons noted above and in doing also strengthens the current designations of the area as forming the green belt, would increase its attractiveness as a public open space.

3.0 Biodiversity and Ecological Enhancement

- 3.1 London Plan Policy G1 states London's network of green and open spaces, and green features in the built environment, should be protected and enhanced. Green infrastructure should be planned, designed and managed in an integrated way to achieve multiple benefits.
- 3.2 Policy G6 of the London Plan require new developments to make a positive contribution to the protection, enhancement, creation and management of biodiversity wherever possible. Policies CR2 and BR3 of the Core Strategy and Borough Wide policies echo the London Plan in its strategic approach to protect and enhance biodiversity and to provide a net gain in the quality and quantity of the Borough's natural environment. This approach is also set out in Policy SP6 of the emerging local plan (Reg 19 stage).
- 3.3 London Plan Policy S1 14 recognises The River Rom as a strategic waterway. The policy states Joint Thames Strategies and other area-based joint waterways strategies should consider opportunities for environmental/ecological and urban design improvements and sites of ecological, historic, or archaeological importance. London Plan Policy S1 16 states "Development proposals should protect and enhance, where possible, water-related cultural, educational and community facilities and events, and new facilities should be supported and promoted, but should take into consideration the protection and other uses of the waterways". Emerging Local plan policy DMNE 4 Rivers, Waterways and watercourses states "development proposals within and adjacent to rivers and waterways will be required to protect and enhance biodiversity and geomorphology in and along watercourses, banks and waterways, adjacent terrestrial habitats, the foreshore and the floodplain".
- 3.4 Officers consider that there is a clear directive from regional and local level that seeks to maximise opportunities to improve the ecological and environmental areas of strategic waterways such as The River Rom.

- 3.5 The applicant has submitted the following documents to support the ecological and biodiversity improvements and how existing habitats will be protected:
- Great Crested Newt Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMs) Method Statement
 - Ecological Survey Report
 - Conceptual River Rom/Beam Greenspace Freshwater Ecosystem Restoration Plan
- 3.6 The documents and assessments have provided officers with the methodology behind the principle of the proposed development and the substantial benefits it would bring to this part of the Borough. Whilst the Council supports this conservation driven scheme it is considered that the above reports require further detail to addressing outstanding concerns specifically with regards to mitigation strategies.
- 3.7 The Mitigation Strategies must be sufficiently detailed to ensure individual animals are not harmed or killed, and their resting/breeding/hibernation habitats are sensitively destroyed and re-provisioned at an appropriate time, within the context of an appropriate licensing regime.
- 3.8 In particular further information is required on the following:
- Assessment of the effects of the project on the designation of the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (The Chase Local Nature Reserve, Eastbrookend).
 - Exploration of the potential effects on the habitats of:
 - Great crested newt
 - Water vole
 - Reptile
 - Bats (Roosting)
 - Invasive species
- 3.9 Whilst officers consider that the applicant will aim to mitigate any significant impacts of this highly welcomed scheme, officers will need to ensure that the applicant will follow all the relevant protective guidelines and policies for proposals such as this application. Therefore, conditions are recommended for the submission of the following:
- Ecological Assessment to follow CIEEM guidelines and assess the full impacts of the project.
 - An updated Great Crested Newt -Reasonable Avoidance Measures Report
 - Reptile- Reasonable Avoidance Measures Report
 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment – To assess the status of any trees that may be impacted by the proposal and to protect any roosting bats.
- 3.10 The arboricultural impact assessment shall include, but not limited to, the following:
- impact assessment (identifying quality trees, proposed removals)
 - a map plotting retained trees and showing areas of clearance
 - Protection plan, maintenance and methodologies for retained trees
 - images to show the species and size of removals proposed.
- 3.11 Notwithstanding the above, overall, it is considered that the proposed development will positively contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity, ecological and environmental value of the site and complies with relevant policies. Officers consider that any outstanding information can be addressed through the approval of further information as noted in the conditions.

4.0 Impacts on neighbouring amenity

- 4.1 Paragraph 17 of the NPPF details within its core planning principles that new development should seek to enhance and improve the health and wellbeing of the places in which people live their lives. Paragraph 180 outlines that development proposals should mitigate and further reduce potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development and to avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life.
- 4.2 London Plan Policy D13 seeks the Agent of Change principle places the responsibility for mitigating impacts from existing noise and other nuisance-generating activities or uses on the

proposed new noise-sensitive development. Policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Policies and Policy DMD1 of the emerging Local Plan (Reg 19 stage) specifically relate to ensuring neighbourly development, specifying various potential impacts that development proposals shall take into account and avoid or minimise.

- 4.3 Officers note that of the 263 neighbours consulted that no responses have been received. A press notice was also published and again there have been no representations received.
- 4.4 Notwithstanding the lack of responses, officers consider that the scheme would benefit local residents as the scheme would reduce of the risk of flooding along this part of the Rive Rom and would enhance the public open space and Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.
- 4.5 Insurance that the benefits are delivered would be strengthened in the 5 year monitoring Strategy that is proposed as part of this application. Further narrative is contained within paras 2.9 to 2.12 of this report. The monitoring strategy will be secured by condition.
- 4.6 Officers consider there would unlikely to be any disadvantages resulting from this proposal and the long term benefits to local residents will be materialised once the scheme has been implemented, completed and the resulting habitats have become established.

5.0 Archaeology

- 5.1 NPPF Section 16 and the Draft London Plan (2017 Policy HC1) recognise the positive contribution of heritage assets of all kinds and make the conservation of archaeological interest a material planning consideration. NPPF paragraph 189 says applicants should provide an archaeological assessment if their development could affect a heritage asset of archaeological interest. NPPF paragraphs 185 and 192 and Draft London Plan Policy HC1 emphasise the positive contributions heritage assets can make to sustainable communities and places. Where appropriate, applicants should therefore also expect to identify enhancement opportunities. Paragraph 199 of the NPPF says that applicants should record the significance of any heritage assets that the development harms. Applicants should also improve knowledge of assets and make this public.
- 5.2 London Plan policy HC1 recognise that heritage assets including archaeological remains and memorials should be identified, so that the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and of utilising their positive role in place shaping can be taken into account.
- 5.3 Adopted Local Plan policies CP2 and BP3 and emerging local plan policy DMD 4 seek to conserve or enhance archaeological remains and their settings will be secured by requiring an appropriate assessment and evaluation to be submitted as part of the planning application for any developments in areas of known or potential archaeological interest.
- 5.4 The application site does not lie in an area of archaeological interest and does not require the application to submit an archaeology assessment to support the proposal. However, the applicant has submitted a Historic Environment Assessment.
- 5.5 The Assessment clarifies that the “There are no designated heritage assets such as Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings or Registered Parks and Gardens within the site. Part of the site lies within an Archaeological Priority Area as designated by the local authority”. The submitted document concludes that the “no likely buried heritage assets of very high or high significance, which would require permanent preservation in situ, have been identified within the site”.
- 5.6 Officers therefore consider that no further investigation is required for the limited development proposed by this application in terms of preserving the potential of any significant archaeological findings.

Conclusions:

The river restoration of the River Rom will return stretches of the river to its original state, making it more visually pleasing but also will improve the health of the river, and the quality of the green space around it. In the past unnatural high banks were engineered onto the River Rom, which limits biodiversity and increases the risk of flooding. These man-made banks will be removed in three locations. It is then the intention to create 3 ponds beside the river which will connect from the river breaches. These will soak up

water during high flows and also increase habitats for a number of species, including Great Crested Newts and improve the experience of visitors to the park.

It is considered that the proposal will:

- strengthen the role of the Green Belt at this location
- Improve the enjoyment of the public open space
- Enhance the Site of Importance of Nature conservation
- Create new and enhance existing ecological and biodiversity habitats along strategic waterways
- Reduce the risk of flooding in this location

It is therefore considered that the proposal is highly supported by planning policies detailed within this report and therefore the application is recommended for approval subject to the noted conditions.

Appendix 1:

Development Plan Context:	
<p>The Council has carefully considered the relevant provisions of the Council's adopted development plan and of all other relevant policies and guidance. Of particular relevance to this decision were the following Framework and Development Plan policies and guidance:</p>	
<i>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (MHCLG, Feb 2019)</i>	
<i>The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for London (March 2021)</i>	Policy G1 Green infrastructure Policy G2-London's Green Belt Policy G4-Open Space Policy G6 - Biodiversity and access to nature Policy SI 12 -Flood risk management Policy SI 13 -Sustainable drainage Policy SI 14 Waterways – strategic role Policy SI 16 Waterways – use and enjoyment Policy D13 Agent of Change Policy HC1 archaeology
<i>Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy (July 2010)</i>	Policy CM1 - General Principles for Development Policy CP2 Policy CR4
<i>Local Development Framework (LDF) Borough Wide Development Plan Document (DPD) (March 2011)</i>	Policy BR4 - Water Resource Management Policy BP3
<p><i>The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan: (Regulation 19 Consultation Version, October 2020) is at a "mid" stage of preparation. Having regard to NPPF paragraph 216 the emerging document is now a material consideration and considerable weight will be given to the emerging document in decision-making, unless other material considerations indicate that it would not be reasonable to do so.</i></p>	
<i>The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan: (Regulation 19 Consultation Version, October 2020).</i>	Policy DMNE3- Nature Conservation and Biodiversity Policy DMSI6 – Flood Risk and Defences Policy DMNE 4 – Water Environment Policy DMSI7- Water management Policy DMD1 Policy DMD 4
<i>Supplementary guidance</i>	LBB Council Green Belt Review dated 2015

Additional Reference:
<p><i>Human Rights Act</i></p> <p>The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report.</p> <p><i>Equalities</i></p> <p>In determining this planning application, the BeFirst on behalf of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham has regard to its equalities obligations including its obligations under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (as amended).</p> <p>For the purposes of this application there are no adverse equalities issues.</p>

Appendix 2:

Relevant Planning History:			
<i>Application Number:</i>	N/A	<i>Status:</i>	
<i>Description:</i>			
<i>Enforcement Case:</i>	N/A	<i>Status:</i>	
<i>Alleged breach:</i>			

Appendix 3:

The following consultations have been undertaken:

Summary of Consultation responses:		
Consultee and date received	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments
Environment Agency dated 3 rd February 2021	No objection but informative setting out the criteria for when an environmental permit is required in accordance with The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016.	Noted
Drainage Dated 24 th February 2021	No objection	Noted
LBBB Environmental Health Dated 16/02/21	No objection	Noted
Ecology dated 1 st February 2021	No objection subject to conditions relating to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of an Ecological Assessment Report • Submission and approval of updated Reasonable Avoidance Measures Report. • Submission of Reptile Reasonable Avoidance Measures Report. • Submission of water vole survey work to determine if Water Voles will be harmed. In the event water voles could be harmed then a Water Vole Reasonable Avoidance Measures Report shall be updated and submitted for approval. • Submission and approval of a Ground Level assessment of the trees and mature shrubs will be undertaken following BCT 2016 guidelines. 	The relevant conditions have been included
Trees dated 3 rd March 2021	A condition for the submission of an arboricultural impact assessment to be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of works.	The relevant condition has been included.

Appendix 4:

Neighbour Notification:	
Letters sent:	15 th January 2021
Date of Press Advertisement:	20th January 2021
Number of neighbouring properties consulted:	263
Number of responses:	0

Appendix 5:

Conditions

Conditions:

1.Statutory Time Limit

The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of THREE YEARS from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. Development in Accordance with Approved Plans

The development hereby approved shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below:

- River Rom Restoration Summary dated 14 12 2020
- River Rom Wetland Restoration Project 5 year monitoring strategy dated 03/09/2020 by Thames 21
- River Rom 5 year monitoring strategy cover letter by Thames 21 dated 03/09/2020
- River Rom Restoration Modelling Review dated Oct 2020 by EdenValeYoung
- Response to EA Hydrological Queries dated 9th December 2020
- River Rom Site Investigation Factual and Interpretative Report by CBEC Eco Engineering Project PY190330 dated December 2019
- Great Crested Newt Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMs) Method Statement for River Rom Restoration at Grenfell Park and Eastbrook End Country Park by Environment Agency Biodiversity Tech Spec dated August 2019
- Ecological Survey Report on Grenfell Park and the River Rom Corridor 2019 by Peter West dated December 2019
- Conceptual River Rom/Beam Greenspace Freshwater Ecosystem Restoration Plan ref: RB04-140818 dated August 2018
- Flood Risk Assessment by CBEC Eco Engineering dated 19/12/2019
- Ponds Detail- Drawing No. 13 dated 17/12/2019
- Plan View 5 -Drawing No. 11 dated 17/12/2019
- Cross Sections -Drawing No. 12 dated 17/12/2019
- Cut Fill- Drawing No. 17 dated 17/12/2019
- Pond Detail- Drawing No. 14 dated 17/12/2019
- Ponds Sections- Drawing No. 15 dated 17/12/2019
- Pond Sections- Drawing 16 dated 17/12/2019.

- Plan View 4 -Drawing No. 10 dated 17/12/2019
- Ponds Sections -Drawing No 9 dated 17/12/2019
- Ponds Details -Drawing No. 8 dated 17/12/2019
- Plan View 3- Drawing No. 7 dated 17/12/2019
- LSW Section 3- Drawing No. 6 dated 17/12/2019
- LWS Section 1- Drawing No 4. Dated 17/12/2019
- Plan View 2- Drawing No. 3 dated 17/12/2019
- LWS Section 2 -Drawing No. 5 dated 17/12/2019
- Plan View 1- Drawing No. 2 dated 17/12/2019
- Plan Overview- Drawing No. 1 dated 17/12/2019
- Design and Access Statement dated December 2019 by CBEC Eco Engineering

No other drawings or documents apply.

Reason: To ensure that the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved drawing(s) and document(s) to ensure that the finished appearance of the development will enhance the character and visual amenities of the area and to satisfactorily protect the residential amenities of nearby occupiers.

3. Ecological Assessment

Prior to the commencement of works, an Ecological Assessment report should be submitted to and approved by the council. The report should follow CIEEM guidelines and assess the full impacts of the project.

Reason: In the interests of protecting and enhancing biodiversity

4. Great Crested Newt -Reasonable Avoidance Measures Report

Prior to the commencement of works, the Great Crested Newt Reasonable Avoidance Measures Report shall be updated and submitted to and approved by the council. This should include a proposed timetable of works based from the point of approval to project completion. The report should clearly outline the GCN interest of the site, which features are to be removed, appropriate working methods, safeguards and any associated timings. The report shall also include a monitoring and maintenance strategy during construction to ensure habitat does not improve. Once the monitoring and maintenance strategy is approved it shall be implemented throughout the construction of the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of protecting and enhancing biodiversity

5.Reptile- Reasonable Avoidance Measures Report

Prior to the commencement of works, a Reptile Reasonable Avoidance Measures Report shall be submitted to and approved by the council. This should include a proposed timetable of works based from the point of approval to project completion. The report should clearly outline the reptile interest of the site, which features are to be removed, appropriate working methods, safeguards and any associated timings. The report shall also include a monitoring and maintenance strategy during construction to ensure habitat does not improve. Once the monitoring and maintenance strategy is approved it shall be implemented throughout the construction of the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of protecting and enhancing biodiversity

6.Arborcultural Impact Assessment

Prior to the commencement of works an arboricultural impact assessment shall be submitted to and approved by the Council. The arboricultural impact assessment shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- impact assessment (identifying quality trees, proposed removals)
- a map plotting retained trees and showing areas of clearance
- Protection plan, maintenance and methodologies for retained trees
- images to show the species and size of removals proposed
- Impact on roosting bats

Any plans or strategies for the protection and maintenance of impacted trees to be approved by the Council shall be implemented thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of protecting and enhancing biodiversity

7. Monitoring

Within one month of the completion of the works, written confirmation shall be submitted to the Council confirming the date of completion of the works and the start of the implementation of the monitoring strategy.

The monitoring strategy for the proposal as contained within the following approved documents:

- River Rom Wetland Restoration Project 5 year monitoring strategy dated 03/09/2020 by Thames 21
- River Rom 5 year monitoring strategy cover letter by Thames 21 dated 03/09/2020

shall be implemented upon the completion of the approved works for a period of 5 years.

Reason: In the interests of protecting and enhancing biodiversity