



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 1 April 2021

by Mrs H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 May 2021

Appeal A Ref: APP/W1715/W/20/3248893

Chalcot, York Road, Netley Abbey SO31 5DD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Wilkinson against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref F/19/86252, dated 12 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing one-bedroomed dwelling and garage, and replacement with new, two bedroomed dwelling.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W1715/W/20/3265379

Chalcot, York Road, Netley Abbey SO31 5DD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs J Wilkinson against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref F/20/88114, dated 29 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing one-bedroomed dwelling and garage and replacement with new one-bedroomed dwelling.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing one-bedroomed dwelling and garage and replacement with new one-bedroomed dwelling at Chalcot, York Road, Netley Abbey, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref F/20/88114, dated 29 June 2020, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Applications for costs

3. Applications for costs were made in respect of both appeals by Mr & Mrs Wilkinson against Eastleigh Borough Council. These applications are the subject of separate Decisions.

Procedural Matters

4. As part of the appeals, two unilateral undertakings made as deeds under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 were submitted. I return to this matter below.

Main Issues

5. The main issue common to both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Netley Abbey Conservation Area.
6. An additional main issue in respect of Appeal B is whether satisfactory living conditions would be created for future occupiers in respect of the adequacy of the garden space.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is occupied by a collection of dilapidated wooden buildings which collectively form a dwelling with a garage and outbuildings. The buildings are all set within a well treed and vegetated site on the clifftop fronting Southampton Waters. The site has a ramshackle appearance that is an oddity within the streetscene when compared with the well-maintained cliffside gardens on either side and more conventional buildings to the rear. The site is also within the Netley Abbey Conservation Area (CA). Under Section 72(1) of the Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act 1990, I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
8. From my findings and from details in the SPD¹, the special qualities and significance of the CA derive from its origins as a village that evolved around the former Royal Victorian Hospital, which was purportedly established in 1856. Significant buildings within the CA include the 13th century Cistercian Abbey of St Mary's and 16th century Netley Castle. Houses in the village are Victorian or post-Victorian. The form of the CA is largely linear, extending from the treed area of Abbey Hill in the north overlooking Southampton Water; in the north-west, the Abbey, including its associated ponds and earthworks; to the south-eastern end where there is a preponderance of Victorian terraced houses on Victoria Road close to the entrance of the Royal Victoria Country Park.
9. The area more closely surrounding the appeal site, including York Road and Manchester Road, comprises substantial Victorian brick built villas with slate roofs set in generous gardens, many with mature trees. The roads serving them – Manchester Road and York Road – are unadopted, and consequently retain a rough surface which lends to a perception that the area is not publicly accessible. The SPD indicates that in order to maintain the character of this part of the CA, sub-division or extension of houses needs to be avoided.
10. The current collection of buildings on site has evolved without regard to the CA designation or to the traditional form of residential buildings that otherwise contribute to the area's special character. It appears that they have been positioned to enjoy a more intimate relationship with Southampton Waters and to be closed off from interaction with York Road. The lack of maintenance of trees has enabled them to grow to maturity, but those same trees and other vegetation now appear to overcrowd the site. The buildings have an unconventional relationship with the trees insofar as they are nestled around them and their respective root systems, and this greenness is the sum of the site's contribution to the CA's appearance. Otherwise, the only real positive attribute about the site is that it is low in profile and maintains a recessive

¹ Netley Abbey Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals Supplementary Planning Document (2010)

appearance in the streetscene. In my view, due to its state of deterioration, the site is beginning to detract from the character and appearance of the CA.

Appeal A – Character and appearance

11. The appeal proposal under Appeal A comprises the removal of the collection of existing buildings and their replacement with a two storey dwelling of greater proportions than the existing buildings, considered as a whole.
12. Owing to the scale, siting, mass and design, the proposal under Appeal A would appear cramped and out of scale with the constrained site. Whilst there would be some benefit to the surroundings through the removal of the existing buildings and clearance of some unmanaged vegetation, the construction of such a sizeable, 'blocky' building of such stark contemporary design would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA. It would appear an incongruous addition within the streetscene and would be far more prominent in views from York and Manchester Roads, Southampton Waters and from the beach.
13. In view of this main issue, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and detract from the appearance of the CA. It would therefore conflict with, in particular, Policies 59.BE and 169.LB of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001 – 2011 (adopted 2006) (LPR). These Policies, amongst other things, seek to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas and require that proposals take full and proper account of the context of the locality and are appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting and trees worthy of retention.
14. For similar reasons, the proposal would also conflict with emerging Policies DM1 and DM12 of the emerging Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016 – 2036 (eLP), which given its stage of production and the general consistency of aforesaid policies with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is capable of attracting modest weight. These Policies require development to take account of the context of the locality, including the character, appearance and land uses, and in respect of heritage assets, seeks to ensure that development does not harm or detract from significance or special interest.
15. Insofar as the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the CA, it would detract from its significance. Under the terms of the Framework, this would amount to 'less than substantial harm'. I attribute great weight to such harm to a designated heritage asset, but am also required by paragraph 196 of the Framework to weigh this against the public benefits of the proposal. I return to this matter later in my decision.

Appeal B – Character and appearance

16. The appeal proposal under Appeal B comprises the clearance of the site and the construction of a single storey dwelling, with a unique form and roof design, expanding across the width of the site but to more clearly nestle between and below trees to be retained and without seeming like a built intervention dropped onto the site as in Appeal A.
17. The more sensitive scale and mass of the proposal under Appeal B would be more apparent from the side and roadside elevations, and would be more reflective of that of the collective mass of the existing buildings on site, which, given the constraints of the plot, already fail to reflect the spacious plot quality

- evident elsewhere in the surroundings. This containment of the buildings form and mass to a single storey structure would be positive, and would help to minimise any dominance of the building, particularly in closer views from York and Manchester Roads. The reintroduction of a building with a pitched roof form would not appear to be as starkly modern or 'blocky' as in Appeal A, would appear more contextually appropriate in relation to the nearby villa-style properties and other more modern buildings, though with its wrap-around form and zinc finish, would create a building with its own distinct character.
18. There would only really be two elevations that would make any contribution to the character of the area given the existing side boundary features and trees that would be retained. The principal elevation has been designed to face towards Southampton Waters and would be largely glazed with a picture window. This would be a logical intervention for the building in such views from Southampton Waters and would set the building apart from other more traditional buildings to the rear. The elevation facing York Road would be deliberately recessive, to minimise the interaction of the building within the streetscene as is presently the case. Combined with its mass, the design and appearance of this elevation would be sufficiently discreet so as to maintain the area's character and appearance.
19. Whilst the SPD indicates that the use of non-traditional materials is not considered appropriate within the CA, it is highly unlikely that any buildings on the site could be reflective of the CA's more traditional buildings. The zinc and darkened timber proposed would, however, be of a high quality and would create a more mature building which would appear lightweight and recessive.
20. Overall, the existing buildings and condition of the site are read as largely distinct from its setting and bear little resemblance to buildings that more appropriately contribute to the significance of the CA. The site needs to be adapted in order to avoid further detracting from the CA's character and appearance. Given the scale, mass, form, design and ability to knit with the trees that are the site's key features, the proposal in Appeal B would represent a bespoke and positive intervention that would modernise the site, yet preserve the CA's character and appearance.
21. In view of this main issue, the proposal would maintain the character and appearance of the area and that of the CA. It would therefore comply with aforementioned Policies 59.BE and 169.LB of the LPR and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the eLP.

Appeal B – Living conditions for future occupiers

22. The garden serving the existing dwelling is relatively constrained in size and limited to a largely flat, grassed area which has an open aspect towards Southampton Waters. Due to the close proximity of trees, there is a degree of overshadowing by tree canopies.
23. The proposal would increase the coverage of the site by buildings and push the front building line towards the cliff edge, thus reducing the garden area.
24. There is no prescription in any current policy of the development plan as to the minimum garden sizes that should be provided for dwellings, although general policy themes in the plans, both current (LPR) and emerging (eLP), are to ensure development avoids harm to the living conditions of future occupiers.

Other relevant material considerations in this regard include the Framework (Section 12), which requires that a high standard of amenity is created for existing and future users, and the Council's Quality Places SPD², which requires that the absolute minimum amount of private amenity space required per dwelling is an area equivalent to at least 60% of its internal floor space. Further guidance in the Quality Places SPD points towards lower proportions being acceptable in urban areas where the site is within 100m of a public open space, but higher proportions where such is dictated by the character of the area or where features such as mature trees will limit the garden's useability.

25. From the evidence, the footprint of the dwelling would be in the region of 110 sqm as part of a total site area of approximately 219 sqm. The garden area indicated would be in the region of 95 sqm which would exceed the suggested 60% threshold, which in quantitative terms is acceptable. Even if true to the area shown on the plans, areas of this space would need to be devoted to a wildlife corridor in accordance with the recommended ecological mitigation measures and other parts would be shaded and subject to leaf fall. There would also be the potential that the site extent would diminish through erosion processes, particularly prior to any cliff stabilisation works being undertaken.
26. The proposal would not fall short of the suggested 60% floor area requirement specified in the Quality Places SPD. Though it may be more constrained and liable to recession than other gardens, its qualitative factors, such as its level nature and the open aspect to Southampton Waters, with privacy afforded by trees and other boundary features, would make the modest garden an attractive and useable one. Furthermore, despite being modestly beyond the 100m suggested distance, the proximity to the beach and nearby area of public open space, both accessible by a safe, convenient walk, would offset the need for a larger dedicated garden.
27. In view of this main issue, the proposal would create satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers in respect of the adequacy of its garden space. It therefore accords with the objectives of LPR Policy 59.BE and the Framework. It would also adhere to guidance in the Quality Places SPD.

Other Matters

28. The principle of development has been questioned by some interested parties. The general principle of new dwellings is acceptable given the location of the site. However, the Council indicate that the site has a residential use despite that there does not appear to be a Certificate of Lawfulness³ confirming the same. From the evidence and in my view, the site has acquired and retained a residential use and does not appear to have acquired an alternative use in the period since it was last used as such. The proposal is therefore one for a replacement dwelling, as described.
29. The matter of cliff erosion is significant given that the south-west boundary of the site is formed by the cliff edge, and unlike many neighbouring sites, there are no sea defences at the base or extending up the face of the cliff to protect the appeal site. This aspect needs a considered response and at a point in time that can influence the development and manner in which it is undertaken. This is particularly necessary given that the existing buildings have an unusually

² Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2011)

³ of an Existing Use under Section 191 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended

lightweight affixation to the site and that a permanent replacement will require foundations of some specification.

30. Sea defences are a clear requirement in this case, and the implementation of such should also consider the interrelated aspects of foundation design, tree root systems and drainage requirements; all aspects which are required to be conditioned as part of this proposal. The Council has suggested a negatively worded condition that prevents any development, including any removal of existing buildings, until such time as a separate application for cliff stabilisation works has been submitted, approved and implemented. Such conditions should not be used where there are no prospects at all of the action in question being performed within the time-limit imposed by the permission. However, as the submission of a scheme for such works is in the control of the appellant, I am satisfied that there is a likelihood of such being secured to enable the proposal to proceed within the statutory time limit for commencement.
31. The issue of the effects of the construction phase on the private roads serving the site and inconvenience to neighbouring residents has been raised. I accept that disruption should be minimised where possible. The imposition of conditions to manage the construction phase would assist with this aim.
32. The loss of views and effects on property values are not material planning considerations. The suggestion that the proposal would result in the creation of a precedent for a development creep towards the cliff edge is not substantiated by the evidence. The appeal site is unique and there does not appear to be any basis for assuming that similar proposals would come forward in the future.
33. I note that the site has a biodiversity value, indicated by its adjacency to a Site of Importance to Nature Conservation, and that the proposal has the potential to affect that. There are a number of mitigation and enhancement measures that are recommended in the site-specific ecology reports which would form the requirement of planning conditions.
34. I note the concerns of neighbours in respect of the parking of vehicles, given that the proposal would provide a garage and a car port instead of a driveway. A condition would prevent the use of the garage and car port for anything other than the parking of vehicles, and given the absence of other areas on which to park, future occupiers would be directed towards using said structures for their intended purpose. In the absence of any highway objections in this regard, I do not find this to constitute a justifiable reason for refusal.

Protected Sites

35. The site lies within close proximity of the Solent & Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA) & Ramsar sites (hereafter referred to as the Protected Sites). The integrity of the Protected Sites can be affected by additional residential development through increased recreational disturbance and additional wastewater being directed to wastewater treatment works.
36. The proposal comprises the replacement of a dwelling with one of a modern construction. On the basis that the proposal represents a replacement, rather than a net increase in dwellings, significant effects on the integrity of the Protected Sites would not be likely. The consultation response from the Statutory Nature Conservation Body (SNCB) in this regard, Natural England, also indicates that it has no objections on this basis and that the necessary

mitigation necessary is to seek a construction environment management plan by way of condition, to be endorsed by the Council's ecologist. I have had regard to the SNCB's comments in reaching this decision.

Planning obligations

37. Unilateral undertakings (UUs) have been submitted in respect of both appeals to restrict either proposal to a self-build dwelling under the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended). The obligations would ensure that the initial occupant/s have had primary input into the design and layout of the dwelling; are on the Council's register and that the occupation of the dwelling is first occupied as a self- or custom build dwelling. The UUs include blue pencil clauses which nullify the appellant's obligations to comply therewith in the event that I find them incompatible with the tests for planning obligations set out at Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations (2010, as amended) or the Framework.
38. As Appeal A is failing for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to further consider the UU submitted in respect thereof. In respect of Appeal B, I have considered the obligations in the context of the relevant considerations. As the principle of development is not in question and the design aspects of the development are detailed in the plans, with no anticipated harm, there is no specific justification for an obligation of the nature provided. Whilst the third party comments suggest a preference for the scheme to be a self-build, this has little material difference in terms of the use or principle of development.
39. Whilst the self-build nature of the scheme could count towards the provision of a self-build dwellings and may enable the appellants to claim CIL exemption, the obligation would not be necessary or directly related to the proposal or make an otherwise unacceptable development acceptable. As such, the UU is not compatible with the CIL Regulations.

Conditions

40. I have considered the suggested conditions provided by the Council in light of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. Where necessary, I have undertaken minor editing in the interests of precision and conciseness. Due to the site constraints and the need for further detail on a number of aspects prior to works starting, a number of conditions are pre-commencement conditions for which I have sought agreement.
41. In addition to the statutory time limit, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty.
42. As above, a condition is necessary to ensure that cliff stabilisation works are approved and undertaken prior to commencement of the development.
43. Given the stipulation by the SNCB and the need to safeguard the environment and living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, a condition seeking a Construction Environment Management Plan is necessary.
44. The need to manage any potential invasive species results in a need for a condition to ensure the implementation of any necessary control measures.
45. Given the importance of the trees to the site, the specific measures to avoid harm to trees, there is a need for arboricultural supervision during construction

works and a condition seeking such. Other measures to include subsequent tree planting also form the requirements of separate conditions.

46. In the interests of the quality of the environment, a condition is required seeking details of the surface and foul water drainage scheme/s. In the interests of cliff stability, a condition is required seeking details of the piling or other site-specific foundation design.
47. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, conditions are required seeking details of proposed landscaping. For similar reasons, details of external materials and site boundaries are required by condition. To ensure a satisfactory form of development, details of bin, and cycle storage are required by condition. Further conditions are also required in connection with the provision and retention of car parking spaces.
48. A condition dictating the construction working hours is necessary in the interests of the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
49. In the interests of the area's biodiversity value, a condition is required to secure a wildlife corridor. In accordance with the Council's adopted approach, measures to secure an energy and water-efficient building are required.
50. The Council suggested a condition requiring the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), though I note that one was submitted with the appeal application. The FRA concludes that the site is in Flood Zone 1 (at least risk of flooding) and all mitigation measures proposed in relation to drainage are to be addressed by way of conditions. Accordingly, such a condition is not necessary.

Planning balance and conclusions

51. In respect of Appeal A, for the reasons outlined above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. The removal of the existing buildings and improvement of the character of the site would be a benefit to the CA, but the development as completed with a dwelling of an inappropriate scale and design would result in overall harm of a less than substantial magnitude to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset.
52. The benefits of Appeal A include the provision of a dwelling to the local housing stock, temporary construction phase economic input and related social benefits through enhanced access to housing opportunities, particularly if considered as a self-build. However, these benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the conflict with the development plan or the less than substantial harm to the CA.
53. Accordingly, Appeal A is dismissed.
54. The proposal in Appeal B would derive the same benefits as those outlined in Appeal A, but would result in the preservation of the character and appearance of the CA, thus protecting its significance.
55. In the absence of any development plan conflict or other reasons to indicate that permission should be withheld, Appeal B is allowed.

Hollie Nicholls
INSPECTOR

APPEAL B – SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Site Location Plan, ref LP01 Rev A, dated July 2019
 - Site Layout, ref SL01 Rev B, dated June 2019
 - Site Layout with Floorplan, SL01 Rev B, dated June 2019
 - Sunlight Penetration Diagram, ref SS01 Rev C, dated July 2019
 - Sunlight Penetration Diagram, ref SS01 Rev D, dated July 2019
 - Frontage Area Comparison, ref Front01 Rev B, dated Dec 2019
 - Floor Plans including decking, ref FP01 Rev C, dated June 2019
 - Elevations, ref ELEV01 Rev B, dated June 2019
 - Street Elevation, ref SE01 Rev B, dated June 2019
 - Site Section – 03, ref SS03 Rev B, dated July 2019
 - Street Elevation – View from Southampton Water, ref SS03 Rev B, dated Aug 2019
 - Site Coverage Plan, ref Cover01 Rev B, dated December 2019
- 3) The development hereby approved shall not commence until the Local Planning Authority has issued a separate grant of planning permission for a full scheme of cliff stabilisation works. These works shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved.
- 4) The development hereby approved shall not commence until a Construction Environment Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Council's Ecologist. Demolition and construction work shall only be undertaken in accordance with the approved Construction Environment Management Plan which shall include:
 - a) phasing of the demolition and all construction work;
 - b) measures to ensure the biodiversity recommendations and enhancements (Ecological Appraisal by Ecosupport (July 2019) and Supplemental Ecological Response by Ecosupport (December 2019)) are implemented during construction;
 - c) location of temporary site buildings, compounds, construction material, and plant storage areas used during demolition and construction;
 - d) arrangements for the routing/ turning of lorries and details for construction traffic access to the site;
 - e) the arrangements for deliveries associated with all construction works, loading/ unloading of plant & materials and restoration of any damage to the highway;
 - f) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - g) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt generated by demolition and construction;
 - h) a scheme for controlling noise and vibration from demolition and construction activities (to include piling);

- i) provision for storage, collection, and disposal of rubbish from the development during the construction period which shall preclude burning of such materials resulting from site clearance or other source;
 - j) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding;
 - k) details of temporary lighting used during demolition and construction;
 - l) safeguards to be used within the construction process to ensure surface water contains no pollutants on leaving the site. This should include safeguards for fuel and chemical storage and use.
- 5) The development hereby approved shall not commence until a detailed method statement for the managing of any invasive species has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved method statement.
- 6) No excavation, demolition or works comprising the development hereby approved shall commence until a final detailed arboricultural supervision proposal, detailing all supervision activity and method of reporting, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved arboricultural supervision proposal.
- 7) No excavation, demolition or works comprising the development hereby approved shall commence until a tree planting plan and planting method statement, as per British Standard 8545:2014, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details. Tree planting must take place as soon as possible after completion of the proposed development and no later than the end of the following planting season. For a period of no less than 10 years after planting, any trees which are removed, die or become seriously damaged, shall be replaced as soon as reasonably practicable with others of the same species, size and number.
- 8) Notwithstanding the details sought by other relevant conditions, the development must accord with the arboricultural report reference J1187.02 produced by Sapling Arboriculture Ltd (2020). No excavation, demolition or works comprising the development hereby approved shall commence until the tree protection fencing and ground protection has been installed as per the tree protection plan contained within the report. Once installed, no access by vehicles or placement of goods, chemicals, fuels, soil or other materials shall take place within the protected area. Tree protection measures shall be retained in their approved form for the duration of the work.
- 9) The development hereby approved shall not commence until details for the sustainable disposal of surface water and the disposal of foul drainage from the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
- 10) The development hereby approved shall not commence until a scheme of work detailing the extent and type of piling, the foundations design including water diversion system, the slab design, the voided subbase design and the garden decking design has been submitted to and

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

- 11) The development hereby approved shall not commence until a landscaping scheme and management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall cover all hard & soft landscaping and shall provide details of timings for all landscaping and any future management, including management of trees to be retained and planted. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 12) Notwithstanding the approved plans, no development above slab level shall commence until full details and all samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 13) No development above slab level shall commence until details for the treatment of site boundaries have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be brought into use until the boundary treatments have been provided as approved and shall be retained thereafter.
- 14) No development above slab level shall commence until details for the onsite provision of bin & cycle storage facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the storage facilities have been constructed as approved and shall thereafter be retained as such.
- 15) The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the proposed two car parking spaces have been provided. The garage and car port shall only be used for the purposes of parking private motor vehicles in connection with the residential use of the dwelling and shall not be used as additional living accommodation or for commercial purposes.
- 16) No construction, demolition or deliveries to the site shall take place except between the hours of 0800 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays or 0900 to 1300 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
- 17) Prior to occupation of the dwelling hereby approved, details of a wildlife corridor shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details and maintained as such thereafter.
- 18) Prior to occupation of the dwelling hereby approved, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - an 'as built' stage SAP data confirming a 19% improvement of dwelling emission rates over target emission rates as set by building regulations;
 - an 'as built' stage water calculator confirming predicted internal mains water consumption to be no more than 105 litres/person/day; and
 - a sustainability report setting out how all of the essential requirements of the adopted 'Environmentally Sustainable Development' Supplementary Planning Document (2009) have been met.

END OF SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS