

Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 9 and 10 May 2017

Site visit made on 10 May 2017

by Simon Warder MA BSc(Hons) DipUD(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/W/16/3159914

37-39 Oxford Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH8 8EY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Bracken Developments Limited against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2015-13231-T, dated 12 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is to erect a 16 storey block of student accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to erect a 16 storey block of student accommodation at 37-39 Oxford Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH8 8EY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2015-13231-T, dated 12 October 2015, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Bracken Developments Limited against Bournemouth Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. Matters of appearance and landscaping were reserved for further approval. It was agreed at the Inquiry that submitted elevation drawing numbers 8634/101 Rev D, 107 Rev E and 108 Rev E should be treated as illustrative only.
 4. The second reason for refusal in the Council's decision notice refers to the failure of the proposal to contribute towards mitigation measures in respect of pedestrian, cycle and public transport access. These matters have been addressed in the Transport Statement of Common Ground (SofCG) and associated revised site layout drawing (drawing number 8634/100 Rev G), as well as the suggested conditions and Unilateral Planning Obligation (UPO).
 5. The revised site layout drawing shows the pedestrian and cycle route to the south of the proposed building widened to 3.5m and extends it to the rear boundary in order to allow for a future link to the adjoining site. Minor changes have been made to the ground floor plan to accommodate the wider route which pulls this part of the building further from the southern site boundary. There are no changes to the upper floors of the building and the changes do not materially
-

affect the overall site layout, vehicular access or the scale of the proposed development. As such, I am satisfied that taking the revised plan into account would not prejudice the interests of any party concerned with the outcome of the appeal. As with the elevation drawings referred to above, the street scene elevation shown on this drawing should be treated as illustrative. Site layout plan (100 Rev D) and ground floor plan (102 Rev C) originally submitted are replaced.

6. The second reason for refusal also cites Policies CS15 (Green Travel Plan and Transport Assessments) and CS16 (Parking Standards) of the Council's Core Strategy 2012 (CS). These matters have been dealt with in the Transport SoCG and the suggested conditions. The Council is content that the second reason for refusal has been overcome. Nevertheless, I need to be satisfied that the UPO would meet the tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (CIL Regs).
7. Shortly before the Inquiry opened the Council submitted supplementary evidence from Mr Axford on housing land supply matters, Mr Shephard on site sales boards and Mr de Whalley (revised development appraisals). At the Inquiry, the parties agreed not to pursue the matter of the amount of vacant office floor space in Bournemouth. Both parties submitted evidence on the housing land supply position in the Borough and I identified this as a main issue when the Inquiry opened. However, having reflected on the other evidence presented, for the reasons set out below, I have found that the case does not turn on this matter.
8. I have framed the main issue having regard to the above considerations.

Main Issue

9. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the development plan's strategy for the Lansdowne area, having regard to whether there is a reasonable prospect of office or tertiary teaching development at the appeal site.

Reasons

Lansdowne Development Strategy

10. The appeal site is currently used as a surface car park, although planning permission was previously granted for an 11 storey office building¹. It is described by the Council as a key Class B1 site. However, the site is not the subject of a specific development allocation which might support this status. Nevertheless, it is located within the Lansdowne area of Bournemouth which the Council has identified as the town's main business district. Policy CS8 of the CS requires development in the Lansdowne Employment Area to provide principally Class B1 office or tertiary teaching space. The parties agree that, for the purposes of the policy, 'principally' means more than half of the total floorspace in a development.
11. The policy goes on to list in order of preference other uses which would be acceptable in a mixed use scheme provided that the integrity and function of the principal uses are not compromised. Residential or student accommodation comes after other employment and retail and commercial uses in the list and the policy requires it to be demonstrated that such uses are necessary to ensure the

¹ Application refs 7-1989-13231-F, 7-1995-13231-P and 7-2000-13231-Q.

viability of the mixed use scheme and that other employment generating uses have been thoroughly investigated and marketed and shown not to be viable. The Inspector examining the CS² found that the policy preference for employment use in the Lansdowne area contained flexibility and was justified in the circumstances of the local economy. Nevertheless, he considered that it should be monitored to ensure that vacant land in this sustainable location is used effectively.

12. Policies S1 (Spatial strategy), U1 (Mixed uses) and U3 (Student accommodation) of the Bournemouth Town Centre Area Action Plan 2013 (AP) support CS Policy CS8. The non-statutory Lansdowne Delivery Plan 2015 (LDP) seeks to promote the area as a key location for business and education and identifies a number of physical projects, including public realm and pedestrian and cycle access improvements in the vicinity of the appeal site. The Council has secured a grant of £8.5m from the Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership towards infrastructure and public realm works in the Lansdowne area.
13. The appeal proposal is for student accommodation only. As such, the parties agree that it conflicts with CS Policy CS8 and AP Policies S1, U1 and U3. The parties also agree that a scheme at the appeal site providing principally office or tertiary teaching space would not be viable. However, the Council considers that a scheme providing an element of office space would be viable. Although such a scheme is not before me, the Council has produced viability appraisals for notional schemes including one and two floors of office space in the appeal building.
14. The appellant disputes the findings of these appraisals and considers that the inclusion of any office or teaching space would render a scheme at the appeal site unviable. Neither party has put forward substantive evidence to demonstrate that tertiary teaching space nor the other employment or retail and commercial uses listed before student accommodation in Policy CS8 would contribute more to the viability of a scheme than office space.
15. The appellant, therefore, considers that Policy CS8 is incapable of being complied with and is inconsistent with National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) paragraph 22. This requires policies to avoid the long term protection of employment uses where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. In those circumstances, applications for alternative uses should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities. The paragraph also advises that land allocations should be regularly reviewed. I have already noted that a similar point was made by the CS examining Inspector in relation to Policy CS8.
16. The Council has begun a review of the CS and, with neighbouring authorities, has produced the Dorset, Bournemouth and Poole Workspace Strategy October 2016 as well as an updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment and retail land reviews. Whilst the updated Workspace Strategy identifies a shortage of small scale office floorspace in the study area and continues to support office development in Bournemouth town centre, I have not been made aware of a review the effectiveness of Policy CS8 specifically. Nevertheless, I recognise that the appeal proposal would result in the loss of a small scale (in terms of site size) employment site at a highly sustainable location.

² Report on the Examination into the Bournemouth Plan Core Strategy dated August 2012

17. The Council has not undertaken the initial consultation required to update the CS and the Local Plan Development Scheme³ anticipates that the updated Plan will not be adopted until July 2019. This will be some three years after the CS examining Inspector recommended that a review should take place. The recommendation is carried forward to CS Policy CS21, albeit that the primary reason for the review concerns housing matters.
18. To establish the continued effectiveness of Policy CS8, as required by Framework paragraph 22, it is necessary to consider the viability and marketing of the appeal site in order to ascertain whether there is a reasonable prospect of it being used for offices.

Viability and Marketing

19. Various iterations of the viability assessments were produced and this resulted in a common methodology and a considerable measure of agreement between the parties over most of the inputs used. It was also agreed that the value of any office space in a scheme would not cover its construction costs, even without taking into account funding and purchaser's costs and the like. The value generated by the student accommodation is, therefore, required to make any scheme viable.
20. There was also general agreement on the level profit necessary to prompt a developer to proceed with the scheme. A range of 10-15% profit on costs would be necessary where the scheme is 'pre-let' to a student housing operator or pre-sold to an investor. Where there is no pre-let or pre-sale, the developer's risk is greater and, therefore, a profit level of 15-20% would be required.
21. Whilst there was a difference of opinion over some other inputs, the most important factor in dispute was the yield to be used in calculating the value of the student accommodation. Although it was acknowledged by both viability witnesses⁴ that arriving at a yield figure involves an element of professional judgement, it was also agreed that important considerations include the location of the accommodation and the terms of the disposal, or income received, from the completed scheme. With regard to location, Mr de Whalley considered that Bournemouth would rank lower than places such as Newcastle, Reading and Birmingham which are regarded as 'Prime Regional' locations, but should be classified as better than 'Secondary Regional' in the terms used by valuers of student accommodation. Mr Newman was of a similar view.
22. There is no deal in place to dispose of the proposed student accommodation to a student housing operator or investor. Moreover, there is no firm evidence to suggest that any of the tertiary education institutions in Bournemouth would enter into a pre-let agreement with an operator in this case. As such, any operator would need to arrange direct lets with students. Although this would be likely to enable higher rental levels to be achieved, it would increase the financial risk to the operator, and therefore, require a higher yield. Mr de Whalley confirmed in cross examination that the rental level in his final appraisals assume direct letting of the student accommodation. He also recognised that, whilst student accommodation has been provided in isolation of tertiary education providers in other south coast towns, there is no track record of it occurring in Bournemouth.

³ Inquiry Document 3

⁴ Mr de Whalley for the Council, Mr Newman for the appellant

23. Mr Newman's considered that a yield of 6.5% would be appropriate in this case. The appraisals appended to Mr de Whalley's proof use a yield of 6.25%. His final appraisal, dated 8 May 2017, adopts a yield figure of 6%. This is based on a report on the sale of a portfolio of Unite student accommodation⁵ and student housing reviews by GVA and Savills⁶. The yield given for the Unite portfolio is 5.6%. Whilst the portfolio covers 68 properties in 23 locations, the report does not detail their locations or letting terms. Therefore, I am not persuaded that, of itself, it provides a sufficiently precise comparison to justify the use of a yield of 6% in this case. The GVA report refers to direct let yields of 6% to 6.25% and gives examples of properties in Newcastle (6%), Manchester (5.5%) and Reading (6%). However, since it is accepted that Bournemouth would rank lower than the likes of Newcastle and Reading as a university location, the evidence suggest a yield greater than 6% would be appropriate. Similarly the Savills report gives direct let yields of 6% for 'Prime Regional' and 6.75% of 'Secondary Regional' locations.
24. Therefore, the balance of evidence suggests that a yield figure of 6% would be too low in this case. Appraisal Version 1A at Inquiry Document 6 adopts a yield of 6.25% for a scheme with a single floor of office accommodation. It shows a profit on costs of 12.7%. This is below the range which was agreed to be necessary where there is no deal in place for pre-let or pre-sale of the student accommodation. There is currently no such deal in place in this case. The Council points to other schemes in the Lansdown area where such deals have been agreed at a later stage in the development process. However, there is no firm evidence to suggest that one will be forthcoming in this case and my decision must be based on the evidence before me.
25. I recognise that a number of the factors involved in assessing the viability of the project require the exercise of professional judgement. The evidence in this case, however, indicates that the inclusion of a single floor of office space would be likely to undermine the viability of the appeal proposal.
26. The Council considers that insufficient effort has gone into the marketing of the site for office use and, until very recently, no attempt has been made to market the site for the other employment generating uses which appear above student accommodation in the list of preferred uses in Policy CS8.
27. There is evidence to show that the site has been marketed for office use since around the time that planning permission was granted first for the office building in 1989. Local and national agents have been instructed over that period, brochures circulated and the site was entered onto a number of property databases. However, there appear to have been extended periods when there was no sale board on the site, there is little to suggest that targeted promotion of the site has taken place or that new and social media have been used systematically. Whilst, latterly, some consideration has been given to other uses, including healthcare and hotel schemes, there is limited evidence of a sustained effort to market the site for other employment generating uses.
28. Notwithstanding these shortcomings, the site has been made available to potential developers over a period of almost 30 years and no firm interest has emerged. Taken together with the agreed findings that neither office or other employment generating uses would be viable of themselves, I am not convinced

⁵ Appendix 5 of Mr de Whalley's proof

⁶ Appendices G and H respectively of Mr Newman's proof

that a further marketing effort, even adopting the approaches outlined in Mr Shephard's proof, would bring about a different result.

29. The absence of office, tertiary teaching or other employment generating uses in the appeal scheme would conflict with CS Policy CS8 and AP Policies S1, U1 and U3. However, the Council accepts that a policy compliant mix of uses at the appeal site would not be viable. Moreover, based on my findings on the viability and market of the appeal site, there appears to be no reasonable prospect of the inclusion of even a single floor of office space. In any event, the provision of this amount of office floorspace, within a building where student accommodation would be the predominant use, would make only a limited contribution to the Council's objectives for the Lansdowne area. Nor would it make a significant contribution to the supply of small employment sites in the Borough. Therefore, having regard to the advice at Framework paragraph 22, I consider that the proposal would result in only limited conflict with the cited development plan policies and similarly limited harm to the strategy for the Lansdowne area. In accordance paragraph 22, I consider the merits of the proposed alternative student accommodation use in the Planning Balance below.

Other Matters

30. The occupier of the office building to the south of the appeal site has expressed concern regard the effect of the proposal on the daylight reaching that building and the overbearing nature of the relationship between the two buildings. Reference has been made to AP Policies D4 and D5 which require, amongst other things, tall buildings to respect the amenity of surrounding uses.
31. I have not been made aware of any formal analysis of effect of the proposal on the sunlight or daylight reaching the adjoining office building. Nevertheless, the proposed building would be located to the north of the existing office which would limit direct overshadowing.
32. The two buildings would be separated by a distance of more than 10m at their closest points. Moreover, the element of the existing office building closest to the common boundary is circulation, rather than office, space. To the rear of this circulation space, the office space of the existing building is set back from the boundary by some 10.5m (according to the objection letter) and the bulk of the rear wing of the proposed building is set back from the common boundary by a similar distance. Therefore, even having regard to the height and scale of the proposed building, I consider there would be sufficient separation from the adjoining office building to prevent its occupiers from experiencing an overbearing effect on their outlook or an undue loss of daylight. As such, the proposal would not conflict with AP Policies D4 or D5.
33. Reference has been made to an appeal decision for student accommodation on a site at 4-6 Christchurch Road, Bournemouth⁷. The appeal was allowed despite a finding of conflict with CS Policy CS8. The Inspector in that case was clear that the decision was based on the unique circumstances of the case and should not set a precedent for other proposals. My decision is also based on the particular circumstances and evidence presented in this case.

⁷ Joint Appendix 8, Appeal reference APP/G1250/A/13/2209991

Planning Obligation

34. Regulation 122 of the CIL Regs states that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission if it is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
35. The appellant has submitted a signed and dated UPO and the Council has indicated that it is content with the terms of the document. The UPO would secure a financial contribution of £225,000 towards pedestrian, cyclist and public transport improvements in the vicinity of the appeal site. The Transport SoCG sets out the need for such improvements in accordance with CS Policies CS13 (Key Transport Routes), CS14 (Delivering Transport Infrastructure), CS18 (Increasing Opportunities for Walking and Cycling) and CS41 (Quality Design, including site layout) and AP Policies T4 (Public Transport), T5 (Bournemouth rail and coach station) and T6 (Highway improvement schemes) as well as the proposals of the LDP. I was assured by the Council that the contribution would not be caught by the pooling restrictions set out in Regulation 123.
36. The UPO also requires the approval of a scheme for the provision of a pedestrian/cycle route through the site together with details of its implementation and maintenance once the third party land to the rear of the appeal site becomes available to complete the route. The provision of such a route is included in the LDS proposals and would improve access to the site and the wider area.
37. Consequently, I consider that both requirements of the UPO are necessary, relevant and fairly related to the proposal as required by Regulation 122. I have, therefore taken them into account and am content that, together with the Transport SoCG, they overcome the second reason for refusal.

Conditions

38. At the Inquiry the Council produced a list of suggested 20 conditions⁸ which superseded those set out in its Statement and the Transport SoCG. Following discussion, it was agreed that additional conditions setting out the time limits for submission of reserved matters and implementation of the development should be imposed.
39. It was also agreed that suggest condition 1 should be amended to delete reference to drawing numbers 8634/107 Rev E and 108 Rev E since they are illustrative only and that suggested conditions 3 (external materials), 4 (hard landscaping), 5 (soft landscaping) and 6 (landscape maintenance) were not necessary since their requirements would be covered by the reserved matters condition. Further, that suggest condition 8 (hard surfacing) is unnecessary since it is replicated by condition 7 (sustainable urban drainage). It was also agreed that suggested condition 20 was not necessary as its requirements are covered in the UPO. With minor amendments for clarity, I find that the remaining conditions meet the tests set out in the PPG.
40. A condition specifying the approved plans is required in the interests of certainty. Conditions requiring the approval and implementation of a construction method statement and a student management plan are necessary to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and highway safety. Conditions controlling

⁸ Inquiry Document 10

car parking provision and management, visibility splays at the access and the width of cycle routes are required to ensure highway safety. Conditions dealing with underground, ground level and visitor cycle parking are also required for that reason and in the interests of sustainable travel objectives. A condition to secure the approval and implementation of a Travel Plan is also necessary in the interests of sustainable travel objectives.

41. A condition to secure the approval and implementation of a sustainable urban drainage scheme is necessary to ensure the sustainable disposal of surface water. Conditions dealing the provision of a bin store and a refuse management plan are necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

42. Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Framework require the economic, social and environmental roles of sustainable development to be considered together.
43. I have already concluded that the proposal would result in limited harm to the Council's strategy for the Lansdowne area and the supply of small employment sites. There is nothing to suggest that the existing car parking use of the site makes a significant contribution to the local economy. Notwithstanding the absence of a specific employment use within the proposal, the appellant's evidence indicates that around 26 jobs would be provided at the completed development⁹. This is not disputed by the Council. The construction of the building on a site which has remained vacant for a long period could be expected to show confidence in the Lansdowne area and assist in its regeneration. Moreover, the proposal would offer short-term economic benefits through the creation of construction jobs and expenditure. In the longer term, the students could also be expected to contribute to the vitality of the area through expenditure at local facilities and services.
44. The proposal would generate a Community Infrastructure Levy payment of £550,602 and a financial contribution of £225,000 towards pedestrian, cyclist and public transport improvements which would help to support the regeneration of the Lansdowne area. These economic benefits would help to offset the limited harm the proposal would cause to the strategy for the Lansdowne area and the supply of small employment sites in the Borough. Overall therefore, I find that the proposal would have a very minor negative impact on the economic role of sustainability.
45. The proposal would provide accommodation for 426 students. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that encouraging dedicated student accommodation may provide low cost housing that takes pressure off the private rented sector and increases the overall housing stock. I recognise that there is a significant amount of existing student accommodation in the Borough, and in Lansdowne in particular, and that a number of planning permissions have been granted for further provision. However, there is no firm evidence to indicate that the proposed accommodation would not be taken up and contribute to the range and choice of housing in the Borough.
46. The Council and the appellant disagree over whether or not the proposed studio units should be treated as equivalent to a single dwelling. However, even taking

⁹ Section 9 of Mr Sturt's proof

the appellant's preferred approach of considering 4 studios units as equivalent to a single dwelling¹⁰, the proposal would result in the equivalent of some 280 new dwellings.

47. The Council and the appellant dispute whether there is a five year supply of housing land in the Borough. Whilst I consider that it is not necessary to reach a finding on this matter, I have already noted that the CS examining Inspector found that an early review of housing needs and potential provision was essential to make the Plan sound. The review expected in 2016 has yet to be completed and adoption of the updated Plan is not due until 2019. Moreover, irrespective of the exact housing land supply position, Framework paragraph 47 seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing and paragraph 50 seeks a wide choice of high quality homes. Therefore, I consider that the housing benefits of the proposal would make a considerable contribution towards the social role of sustainability.
48. The appeal site is enclosed on its Oxford Road frontage by close boarded fencing and advertising boards. Above this enclosure the absence of built development appears as an unwelcome gap in a street scene where the prevailing form comprises substantial buildings laid out at fairly regular intervals along the road. In its current and long-standing condition therefore, the site detracts from the character and appearance of the area.
49. Policy D5 of the AP supports tall buildings in the vicinity of the appeal site. The proposed 16 storey building would have a considerable presence in the street scene and continue the regular pattern of large buildings. Whilst appearance and landscaping are reserved for further approval, the illustrative drawings show a contemporary architectural approach with opportunities for planting on the Oxford Road frontage. As such, I consider that the proposal has the potential to considerably enhance the character and appearance of the area compared with the existing situation and, therefore, contribute positively to the environmental role of sustainability.
50. Whilst the appeal site is highly sustainably located, the sustainable travel advantages of this location would accrue to other potential land uses and would not, therefore, be a particular benefit of the appeal proposal.
51. Taking the three roles together, I consider that the proposal would amount to sustainable development and would help to support the local community. As such, it benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out at Framework paragraph 14 and derives from paragraph 22. These considerations are sufficient to overcome the proposal's limited conflict with CS Policy CS8 and AP Policies S1, U1 and U3 and the harm to the strategy for the Lansdowne area.
52. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be allowed.

Simon Warder

INSPECTOR

¹⁰ Section 6 of Mr Parke's proof

Appearances

FOR THE COUNCIL

Scott Stemp	of Counsel, instructed by the Council's Head of Legal Services
-------------	--

He called

Mark Axford BA(Hons) Dip UP Dip EAM MRTPI	Planning Policy and Research Manager, Bournemouth Borough Council
--	--

Chris Shephard BA(Hons)	Head of Economic Development and Sustainability, Bournemouth Borough Council
-------------------------	---

Simon de Whalley MRICS	Head of Development Viability and Disposals, Valuation Office Agency
------------------------	---

FOR THE APPELLANT

Christopher Boyle	of Queen's Counsel, instructed by Ken Parke Planning Consultants
-------------------	---

He called

James Newman BSc(Hons) PGDip MBEng MRICS	Director, Tangent Surveyors
---	-----------------------------

Richard Sturt MRICS FRGS MSc BSc(Hons)	Sturt and Company
---	-------------------

Ken Parke BSc(Hons) TP PGDip MRTPI	Managing Director, Ken Parke Planning Consultants
---------------------------------------	---

Documents Submitted at the Inquiry

- 1 Ken Parke Supplemental Statement
- 2 Richard Sturt Rebuttal Statement
- 3 Extract from the Local Development Scheme for Bournemouth, Update October 2016
- 4 Bournemouth Borough Council Parking Supplementary Planning Document
- 5 Email from Simon de Whalley dated 8 May 2017 and attachments
- 6 Email from John Newman dated 8 May 2017 12:40 and attachments
- 7 Email from John Newman dated 8 May 2017 15:18 and attachments
- 8 Signed, undated Unilateral Planning Obligation
- 9 Supreme Court Judgement dated 10 May 2017 in the 'Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes' case.
- 10 Composite list of suggested conditions

Documents Submitted after the Inquiry

- 11 Closing submissions on behalf of the appellants
- 12 Closing submissions on behalf of the Council
- 13 Signed Unilateral Planning Obligation dated 16 May 2017

**Schedule of conditions attached to
Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/W/16/3159914
37-39 Oxford Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH8 8EY**

1. Details of the appearance and landscaping (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
2. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
3. The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 8634/100 Rev. G, 8634/101 Rev. D, 8634/102 Rev. C, 8634/103 Rev. A, 8634/104 Rev. A, 8634/105 Rev. B and 8634/106 Rev. B.
5. No site clearance or development work shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a Construction Method Statement that includes the following measures:
 - a) parking arrangements for operatives and construction vehicles working on-site;
 - b) noise reduction measures (including times of piling operations);
 - c) details and siting of equipment, machinery and surplus materials on the site.

The Construction Method Statement shall include safe access to the site for deliveries, loading and unloading of plant and materials and wheel cleansing of vehicles prior to egress from the site onto the public highway. The approved Construction Method Statement shall be implemented and adhered to throughout the construction phase of the development.

6. Prior to the occupation of the building, a Student Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Student Management Plan shall provide details of the management of the student accommodation, including the arrangements for the following:
 - a) how it is proposed to warden the development 24 Hours a day; the warden's role and responsibilities, the times that the warden shall be available on site and mechanisms for dealing with issues at any time of the day;
 - b) how incidents relating to noise complaints will be dealt with;
 - c) procedures for dealing with incidents relating to noise or other complaints (including details of tenancy agreements);
 - d) car parking management/car ownership policy, including the restriction of car ownership;
 - e) provision of CCTV.

The approved Student Management Plan shall be implemented on first occupation of the approved development and thereafter retained for the duration of the use hereby approved.

7. Before the commencement of development, details of the specification (a typical cross section of the surfacing is required) of the accesses and areas for turning and car parking, including the marking out of spaces shown on the

approved plan, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These areas shall be constructed and surfaced in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development and permanently retained and kept available for student drop-off and pick-up, staff and visitors of the development at all times. One of the spaces shall be provided as a disabled parking space and retained as such in perpetuity.

8. Prior to commencement of development a detailed Parking Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Parking Management Plan shall be implemented and complied with in full by the Applicant or its successor upon occupation of the development, and the Parking Management Plan shall be permanently enforced and retained thereafter.

The Parking Management Plan shall include the marking out of spaces, a management proposal for these spaces and appropriate enforcement measures for the parking spaces once the development is occupied. The Parking Management Plan shall also specify arrangements for the start and end of each term with regard to pre-allocated time slots for students to drop-off and pick-up their belongings. The Parking Management Plan shall ensure that drop off and pick up arrangements for the students at the start and end of term time shall be made on weekdays.

The Parking Management Plan shall be reviewed with the Local Planning Authority on an annual basis with regard to potential impact of drop-off and pick-up of other student accommodation provision in the Lansdowne area.

9. Before occupation of the development, pedestrian inter-visibility splays of 2m x 2m shall be provided on each side of both vehicular accesses, as shown on the approved plan, Drawing No 8634/100 Rev G. No fence, wall or other obstruction to visibility over 0.6m in height above ground level shall be erected within the area of the splays at any time.
10. Notwithstanding the submitted plans, all cycle routes through the development shall be a minimum of 1500mm wide.
11. Before the occupation of any part of the development hereby approved, the underground cycle store for 142 cycles, which must include internal lighting, shall be erected as shown on the approved plan and thereafter be retained, maintained and kept available for the occupants of the development at all times. The store shall include the provision of a 1.5m wide staircase to the basement store with cycle 'rails' to ensure that access is maintained at all times.
12. Before the occupation of any part of the development hereby approved, the ground level cycle store for 16 cycles, which must include internal lighting and an access door 1100 mm wide, shall be erected as shown on the approved plan and thereafter be retained, maintained and kept available for the occupants of the development at all times.
13. Before the occupation of any part of the development hereby approved, the visitor cycle parking shall be erected as shown on the approved plan and thereafter be retained, maintained and kept available for visitors of the development at all times.
14. Prior to the occupation of the approved development, a detailed Travel Plan shall be prepared in accordance with current best practice and guidance and

- submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Travel Plan and obligations therein shall be implemented upon occupation of the development and the development shall be operated in accordance with the Travel Plan thereafter.
15. Before the commencement of development a scheme providing for the disposal of surface water run-off and incorporating sustainable urban drainage systems for the whole site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the development or in accordance with a timetable to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the following as appropriate:
- a) a scaled plan indicating the extent, position and type of all proposed hard surfacing (e.g. drives, parking areas, paths, patios) and roofed areas;
 - b) details of the method of disposal for all areas including means of treatment or interception for potentially polluted run-off;
 - c) scaled drawings, including a cross section, to illustrate the construction method and materials to be used for the hard surfacing.
16. The bin stores hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development and shall be retained and maintained for that use thereafter.
17. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a Refuse Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include: details of the management company to be set up; the employment of a private contractor to collect the refuse (if applicable); measures to be taken if no private contractor is available at any time in the future (such as the employment of a person or persons to ensure bins are wheeled to a collection point); and that bins will not be stored in the open or at the collection point apart from on the day of collection. The Refuse Management Plan shall be implemented upon occupation of the development and the development shall be operated in accordance with the Refuse Management Plan thereafter.