
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2021

by D Hartley BA (Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/20/3265480
39A Camlet Way, Enfield EN4 0LJ

- 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 Camlet Villa Developments LLP against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/02112, dated 7 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing house and the erection of 4 houses.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing house and the erection of 4 houses at 39A Camlet Way, Enfield EN4 0LJ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/02112, dated 7 July 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Camlet Villa Developments LLP against the London Borough of Enfield. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. Planning permission has already been granted for the demolition of the existing dwelling on this site and the erection of four new dwellings¹. This planning permission is still capable of being implemented and consequently I afford its existence very significant weight as a material planning consideration as part of the determination of this appeal. I acknowledge comments made about the planning permission being approved on the basis of the Planning Committee Chairman's casting vote, but this does not obviate the fact the planning permission exists and could still be implemented if desired by the appellant.
4. In summary, the main differences between the appeal development and the aforementioned planning permission relate to an increase in the scale of buildings for plots 1 and 2 at ground and first floor levels and the omission of basements; the removal of pitched gables and the provision of solely flat roofs; an increased use of green roofs; fenestration changes; the use of brick built car ports rather than open car parking areas, and an increase in the number of replacement trees.

¹ Planning permission ref 19/02830/FUL

5. Since planning permission was refused the London Plan 2021 (LP) has been published. This post-dates the Council's refusal notice and now forms part of the development plan for the area. It replaces the London Plan 2016 as referred to in the Council's refusal notice. I have taken into account the LP in respect of the determination of this appeal.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are the effect of the development on (i) the character and appearance of the area and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of surrounding residential properties in respect of outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The proposed dwellings would have a very angular or block like appearance and would include the use of flat roofs. While there would be no pitched gables, as per the consented residential scheme, the appeal development overall would not represent a marked change in design terms when compared to the existing planning permission for the site. In other words, the existing planning permission for the site would, if implemented, result in the erection of four contemporary dwellings and the proposal would seek to do the same.
8. While there are some exceptions, most of the properties fronting Camlet Way have pitched roofs. However, I do not consider that the development's absence of pitched roofs is in itself fatal. The appeal site is located in a back land location where public views are largely obscured owing to the position of existing dwellings and mature boundary landscaping. In this context, and taking into account the extant planning permission for the site, I do not consider that the four dwellings would look out of place in terms of the use of flat roofs, or in respect of the proposed materials, the latter of which include the use of white/grey brick walls with recessed mortar which would suitably reflect the appearance of the cottages in the vicinity of the site.
9. In addition to the above, the use of black powder coated aluminium for the window frames and the edges of the roof would have the effect of creating a contemporary and uniform appearance across the four properties. I note the Council's views about many of the dwellings in the area being more 'traditional' in appearance (e.g. in terms of roof form and materials) when compared to the appeal development, but the evidence before me indicates that this is not the case for all buildings. There are some other examples in the area of more contemporary forms of residential development away from road frontages and where public views are limited. In any event, and while I accept that some of the other interested parties would prefer to see dwellings which incorporate pitched roofs, the provision of flat roofs as part of the unifying design concept across the site would not, in this case, mean that the proposal represents poor design given the highway set back and back land position of the site.
10. I acknowledge that some of the dwellings would be larger than already approved, particularly in respect of those shown for plot Nos 1 and 2. However, by opting for flat roofs at first floor level it has kept the dwellings relatively low in this back land context. Furthermore, in overall development footprint terms there would not be a material difference between what has been approved already and the appeal development. Consequently, I do not

consider that the four houses would appear cramped or out of place on this site.

11. I would also add that the dwellings would be juxtaposed with three existing detached dwellings off Alderwood Mews, which are multi-storey in height and set significantly well back from frontage properties facing Crescent East. In this context, and even accounting for level differences between the sites, I do not consider that the appeal dwellings would look incongruous in the locality from a positioning, scale, height or massing point of view. Furthermore, and for the above reasons, I do not agree with the Council that the proposal would fail to respect the pattern of development that characterises the immediate area.
12. I would emphasise, however, that in order to ensure that there remains a suitable amount of space around properties and that a uniform and well-designed appearance to the dwellings remains, as well as to address some living conditions matters as detailed below, there is clear justification in this instance to remove specified permitted development rights from the dwellings. This can be controlled by imposing a planning condition.
13. While some trees would be lost to facilitate the development proposal, it is proposed that a suitable number of new trees would be planted. In this case, I am satisfied that given the retention of a number of trees, coupled with some new planting, the site would suitably retain a verdant character.
14. Notwithstanding the above view, I do nonetheless acknowledge that the development would be visible from some surrounding residential properties and in that sense there would be some change to the overall appearance of the site from one that is characterised by a relatively spacious and undeveloped garden setting to one which includes more built form. However, and notwithstanding the views expressed by the Council, the existing planning permission for the site cannot be ignored. It is a material consideration of significant weight and in such a context the proposal would not cause material harm to the spacious and green character of the site or the area or be unacceptable from a density point of view. Furthermore, I would add that landscaping and tree protection measures are matters that could be suitably controlled by means of the imposition of planning conditions.
15. For the collective reasons outlined above, I find that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with the design, character and appearance requirements of policies D3 and D5 of the LP; policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010 (CS); policies DMD6, DMD 7, DMD 8, DMD 37, DMD 80 and DMD 81 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014 (DMD) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Living conditions

16. I have taken into account the position, height and window positions of the four dwellings and their relationship with each other as well as with surrounding residential properties. In addition, I have had regard to the live planning permission for the site and the position and relationship of the consented dwellings with each other and surrounding dwellings.

17. There would not be a very significant change in respect of the position and scale of the dwellings for plot Nos 3 and 4 relative to dwellings already approved on this part of the site other than it is proposed to have flat roofs instead of pitched roofs. While the dwellings for plot Nos 1 and 2 would be of an increased scale compared to the approved dwellings on the site, these properties would be positioned at sufficient distances from Nos 39, 41 and 43 Camlet Way so as to not have a dominating effect or cause harm from an outlook point of view.
18. While the rear elevation of 10 Alderwood Mews would be at a distance of about 11.7 metres from the dwelling on plot No 2, this would be at an oblique angle and there would be some intervening trees and an existing 3 metre high boundary wall. Even accounting for the differences in levels, taking into account the position and height of the development, I do not consider that it would appear dominant or overbearing when seen from this property including its garden. In reaching this view, I have taken into account the fact that the existing dwelling on the site is already closely aligned with No 10 Alderwood Mews.
19. I acknowledge the comment made by the occupier of No 10 Alderwood Mews about the proposed garage for plot No 2 being close to the common boundary with their property and that this would be a more substantial brick structure than what one might ordinarily consider to be a 'car port'. This flat roof development is shown on the submitted plans and would be suitably screened as a result of the existing boundary wall.
20. I acknowledge that there is a level difference between the appeal site and No 10 Alderwood Mews, but taking into account the existing boundary treatment, and the setback position of the two storey element of the development, I do not consider that the dwelling would appear dominant or intrusive. Hence, it would not cause any material harm to the outlook for the occupiers of this neighbouring property including from its garden.
21. As part of my site visit, I was also able to consider the relationship of the dwelling for plot No 4 with No 9 Alderwood Mews. Planning permission has already been approved for a dwelling in this area and while what is proposed is not entirely the same, the overall effect when viewed from this neighbouring property would not be too dissimilar. In this context, and while the dwelling to plot No 4 would be visible from the garden area of this neighbouring property, and at an oblique angle from rear windows, the overall effect would not be dominant or enclosing.
22. There is a boundary level difference between the appeal site and the garden area of No 9 Alderwood Mews. It is likely that there would be greater level of use of the adjacent land by residents than is the case now. Indeed, the rear garden area for plot No 4, while acceptable in size, would nevertheless be positioned in close proximity to the boundary with No 9 Alderwood Mews. In this context, I consider that it is necessary to impose a condition which controls the position and extent of boundary treatment details (e.g. a boundary wall topper arrangement) so that there is a reasonable level of privacy for the occupiers of No 9 Alderwood Mews when using the rear garden and some rear rooms. Both the Council and the appellant agree that such a condition is necessary and I have made minor changes to the suggested wording of such a condition so that it is precise and enforceable.

23. Overall, and also taking into account the existing planning permission for the site, I find that subject to the imposition of a number of planning conditions (including the removal of specified permitted development rights), the development would not cause any material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of surrounding residential properties from the point of view of outlook or privacy. In this regard, I conclude that the proposal would suitably accord with the amenity requirements of policies DMD 7, DMD 8 and DMD 10 of the DMD; policy D6 of the LP, and paragraph 127(f) of the Framework.

Other Matters

24. I have taken into account objections made by other interested parties at both planning application and appeal stages. Some of the comments made have already been addressed in my reasoning above.
25. In the context that there is already a planning permission in place for four dwellings on the site, I do not envisage that the proposal, which is for the same number of dwellings on the site, would cause material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties from a noise or disturbance point of view.
26. I have considered the appellant's updated daylight and sunlight assessment dated 23 June 2020 and am satisfied that no significant harm would be caused the occupiers of any surrounding properties (including Nos 9 and 10 Alderwood Mews) from a daylight and sunlight penetration point of view.
27. In respect of the dwellings on plot Nos 3 and 4, the size and position of windows would be very similar to those already approved for the site and the provision of first floor windows to the en-suites would be obscure glazed and serve non-habitable rooms. There would be no loss of privacy to neighbouring land or properties as a result of this part of the development proposal.
28. The first floor elements of the buildings are such that the separation distances between neighbouring properties means that there would be no material harm caused to the occupiers of these properties from an overlooking point of view. No 9 Alderwood has an existing boundary wall of about 1.7 metres and this would suitably screen views of ground floor windows in the northern elevations of Plot 4.
29. In respect of the dwelling on Plot 2, and its relationship with No 10 Alderwood, the first floor window to the landing area would be non-openable and obscure glazed and views out of the 200 mm inset windows would be oblique. Overall, and taking into account retained mature trees (T30, T28 and T27), I am satisfied that there would be no unacceptable overlooking towards No 10 Alderwood.
30. I acknowledge that the distance between the front windows of the dwelling for plot No 2 and those of the semi-detached dwellings of plot Nos 3 and 4 would directly face each other at ground and first floor levels at about 11.2 metres and that such a separation distance does not accord with the requirement of policy DMD10 of the DMD which stipulates 22 metres. However, in this instance there is justification for departing from this standard, taking into account the constraints of the site and the suitable adherence to standards in terms of existing surrounding properties, the latter of which I afford greater importance. Indeed, it is reasonable to take the view that those deciding

whether to purchase one of the dwellings would be able to take a view as to whether they were content to proceed on the basis of window to window separation distances between the aforementioned properties. In any event, it is my judgement that this part of the proposal is nevertheless acceptable and that the technical conflict with policy DMD10 of DMD would not in itself justify refusing planning permission.

31. Comments have been made about inadequate access arrangements. This is a matter that was considered as part of the existing planning permission for four dwellings on the site and this application does not represent a material change to that approved position. In any event, I am satisfied that the access, which already serves some development, would be suitable and safe for four dwellings. It is of note that the Highway Authority do not object to the proposal given the likely low volume and traffic speeds along the access. In this case, there is no objective evidence before me to indicate that a net three additional dwellings on the site would have a severe effect on the free flow of traffic on the surrounding highway network or that the development would lead to unacceptable highway safety impacts.
32. Car parking provision on the site would suitably accord with the Council's standards. Given the provision of green roofs the proposal would not, in relative terms, lead to any significantly greater impact on the area from a surface water run off point of view. A drainage strategy for the site could be controlled by way of the imposition of a condition.
33. There is no evidence to indicate that the proposal would cause any harm to protected species or to matters of bio-diversity importance. Conditions could be imposed to deliver some bio-diversity enhancement.
34. Other interested parties have drawn my attention to the refusal of planning permission for other residential development in the area. However, I have determined this appeal on its individual planning merits and in the context that there is already a planning permission for four dwellings on the site.
35. I accept that views of the site from surrounding residential development, including from No 35 Camlet Way, would change as a result of the development. However, the Courts have held that the loss of a view is not a material planning consideration. Outlook is of course a different matter, but I have found that overall the proposal would not cause any significant harm to the occupiers of surrounding residential properties in this regard.
36. I have considered the position of the Handley Wood Conservation Area (CA) as depicted in the CA plan provided by the Council. Given the separation distance from the edge of the CA, as well as intervening trees and development at Alderwood Mews, I am satisfied that the proposal would not interfere with any important views into or out of the CA. The proposal would therefore preserve the setting of the CA. In this respect, I therefore find no conflict with the heritage requirements of policy 31 of the CS or the Framework.
37. Concerns have been raised by other interested parties about the width of the access road and hence that the fire service would not be able to access the site. However, this is acknowledged by the appellant in their design and access statement where they say *'a fire engine will not be able to access the site. We have confirmed with building control that a dry riser can be installed or a*

sprinkler systems can be installed to each house. This was accepted with the previous application'.

38. The proposed arrangements for dealing with a fire emergency are not disputed by the local planning authority, or the Council's Building Control service, as part of this appeal. This takes into account comments made by Thames Building Control (TBC) who stated that such arrangements would be acceptable based on the determination of the previous planning application for the site. Indeed, TBC specifically commented that *'we have dealt with an almost identical situation recently at the planning stage and our design report allowed for:- (i) A dry rising main box at the site entrance (adjacent public highway); (ii) A horizontal above ground 100 mm diam and dry main pipe running to the refuse store unit; (iii) A dry main cabinet with twin outlet breach adjacent the refuse store (main system must be drainable) and (iv) All locations in all houses to be within 45 metres of dry main outlet otherwise house or houses beyond same to be fitted with sprinklers to BS 9251 throughout'.*
39. While I do not have a formal consultation response from the Fire Service, there is no reasonable evidence before me to indicate that it would not be possible to have in place measures to ensure that the occupiers of the dwellings were safe in the event of a fire. This is a matter that would need to be separately addressed as part of the submission of a Building Regulations consent application for the site. In this respect, it is not necessary to impose a planning condition relating to this issue.
40. None of the other matters raised alter or outweigh my conclusions on the main issues.

Conditions

41. The conditions set out in the accompanying schedule are based on those suggested by the Council. Where necessary I have amended the wording of the suggested conditions, in the interests of precision and clarity, and in order to comply with advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
42. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit condition. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect.
43. In the interests of the living conditions of the occupiers of surrounding residential properties, including those that would live on the appeal site, there is clear justification for imposing conditions that remove specified permitted development rights as well as attaching conditions relating to specified windows being obscure glazed; no means of enclosure on or use of flat roofs; an undertaking relating to implementing the Considerate Constructors Scheme; the adherence to an approved construction management plan, and the submission and control of boundary treatment details.
44. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, conditions are necessary relating to landscaping, materials, the protection of trees, means of enclosure and the removal of specified permitted development rights.
45. In the interests of bio-diversity enhancement and the protection of wildlife, it is necessary to include conditions relating to when vegetation clearance takes place, the provision of new bat habitat and green roofs. In the interests of

environmental sustainability, conditions are necessary relating the provision of a sustainable drainage system, bicycle storage facilities, green roofs, waste storage and recycling facilities, a site waste management plan and energy/water efficiency measures.

46. In order to ensure that there remains adequate on-site car parking provision in accordance with the Council's standards, it is necessary to include a condition which stipulates that the parking areas forming part of the development are only used for the parking of private motor vehicles.

Conclusion

47. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

D Hartley,

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: 479318-10 479318-11; 479318-12 Rev A; 479318-13 Rev A; 479318-14 Rev B; 479318-15 Rev A; 479318-16 Rev A; 479318-17 Planning / Design and Access/ Sustainability Statement dated 07/20; Daylight and sunlight assessment (P115035-1001 Issue:1 dated 23 June 2020); Energy Statement dated 14/07/2019; Bat Emergence and Re-entry Surveys dated 07/08/19; Sustainable Drainage Strategy (REF:19064/SUDs_R01/RS REV P2 2020.07.08); Tree survey schedule Phase II Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Ref: 101 131 Updated 17/09/2019 and received on 10/12/2020); Tree Protection Plan dated 10/12/2020; Tree Constraints Plan dated 7/3/2018 GUA-Dr-L-001 Revision P03; Supplementary information – Mock-up view from first floor window of Plot 2 Indicative details of bricks.
3. The glazing to be installed in the first-floor eastern, southern and western elevations (except the recessed window to master bedroom in the western elevation) of the new building of Plot 1, the first-floor northern elevation of new building of Plot 2, and first-floor eastern elevations of new buildings of Plots 3 and 4 shall be obscured to level 3 or above of the Pilkington Obscuration Scale and fixed shut to a height of 1.7m above the floor level of the room to which they relate. The glazing shall not be altered without the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.
4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, or any amending Order, no external windows or doors other than those indicated on the approved drawings shall be installed in the development hereby approved without the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.
5. Prior to the commencement of development, details of all materials to be used on all external finishes, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, or any amending Order, no balustrades or other means of enclosure shall be erected on the roofs of the dwellings. No roof of any part of the dwellings shall be used for any recreational purpose and access shall only be for the purposes of the maintenance of the property or means of emergency escape.
7. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Tree Protection Plan dated 10/12/2020 and method statement contained within the submitted Phase II Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Ref: 101 131 Updated 17/09/2019 and received on 10/12/2020).
8. The site shall be landscaped in accordance with the approved landscaping drawing (ref: GUA-Dr-L-001 Revision P03) including the provision of at least 5 new trees on site in the first planting season after completion or occupation of the development whichever is the sooner. The landscaping and tree planting shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved Phase II Arboricultural

Impact Assessment (Ref: 101 131 Updated 17/09/2019 and received on 10/12/2020). Any trees or shrubs which die, becomes severely damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced with new planting in accordance with the approved details.

9. a) Details of the proposed green roofs shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing demonstrating the feasibility or otherwise of providing a biodiverse green roof. The submitted detail shall include location, design, substrate (extensive substrate base with a minimum depth 80- 150mm), vegetation mix and density, and a cross-section of all the proposed roofs. The green roofs shall not be used for any recreational purpose and access shall only be for the purposes of the maintenance and repair or means of emergency escape. b) The biodiverse green roofs shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation and maintained as such thereafter. Photographic evidence of installation is to be submitted to the Council.

10. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, details of all means of enclosure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The means of enclosure shall be erected in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied and shall be retained thereafter.

11. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, details of the siting and design of refuse storage facilities including facilities for the recycling of waste to be provided within the development, in accordance with the London Borough of Enfield - Waste and Recycling Planning Storage Guidance ENV 08/162, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied. The refuse facilities shall thereafter be retained within the approved areas except on collection day.

12. No above ground works shall commence until the details and design of secure and fully enclosed cycle parking has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before it is occupied, and the facility retained for the life of the buildings.

13. The development shall not commence until a Revised Sustainable Drainage Strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be based on the disposal of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles as set out in the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework and should be in line with the Council's DMD Policy SuDS Requirements: a) Shall be designed to a 1 in 1 and 1 in 100 year storm event with the allowance for climate change; b) follow the SuDS management train and London Plan Drainage Hierarchy by providing a number of treatment phases corresponding to their pollution potential; c) should maximise opportunities for sustainable development, improve water quality, biodiversity, local amenity and recreation value; d) the system must be designed to allow for flows that exceed the design capacity to be stored on site or conveyed off-site with minimum impact; e) clear ownership, management and maintenance arrangements must be established; f) the details submitted shall include levels, sizing, cross sections and specifications for all drainage features. The development shall accord with the approved sustainable development strategy and sustainable drainage system.

14. Prior to the commencement of any construction work, details of the groundwater level shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include: a) Photos and a level to the depth of the groundwater table b) Measurement from the invert of proposed basement to the water table.

15. Prior to occupation of the development, a Verification Report demonstrating that the approved drainage / SuDS measures have been fully implemented shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. This report must include: As built drawings of the sustainable drainage systems including level information (if appropriate); photographs of the completed sustainable drainage systems; any relevant certificates from manufacturers/ suppliers of any drainage features; a confirmation statement of the above signed by a chartered engineer (or similar).

16. a) Prior to commencement of above ground works, details of the number, siting and specification of bat bricks/tiles designed into and around each new buildings and trees under the supervision of a suitably qualified ecologist shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. b) Confirmation of installation, prior to first occupation of the dwellings, together with accompanying photographic evidence shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The installations shall be retained for the life of the buildings.

17. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the energy saving and water efficiency measures identified in the submitted Energy Statement dated 14/07/2019. The energy saving and water efficiency measures shall be maintained for the life of the buildings.

18. Following the practical completion of works a final Energy Performance Certificate with associated Building Regulations Compliance Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where applicable, a Display Energy Certificate shall be submitted within 18 months following first occupation of each dwelling.

19. The development shall not commence until an undertaking to meet with best practice under the Considerate Constructors Scheme and achieve formal certification has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

20. The development shall not commence until a construction management plan has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The construction management plan shall be written in accordance with London Best Practice Guidance and contain: a. A photographic condition survey of the public roads, footways and verges leading to the site. b. Details of construction access and associated traffic management. c. Arrangements for the loading, unloading and turning of delivery, construction and service vehicles. d. Arrangements for the parking of contractors' vehicles. e. Arrangements for wheel cleaning. f. Arrangements for the storage of materials. g. Hours of work. h. The storage and removal of excavation material. i. Measures to reduce danger to cyclists. j. Dust mitigation measures. k. Membership of the Considerate Contractors Scheme. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved construction management plan.

21. Notwithstanding the approved documents, the development shall not commence until a revised Site Waste Management Plan has been submitted to and

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan should include as a minimum: a) Target benchmarks for resource efficiency set in accordance with best practice; b) Procedures and commitments to minimize non-hazardous construction waste at design stage and specify waste minimisation actions relating to at least 3 waste groups and support them by appropriate monitoring of waste; c) Procedures for minimising hazardous waste; d) Monitoring, measuring and reporting of hazardous and non-hazardous site waste production according to the defined waste groups (according to the waste streams generated by the scope of the works); e) Procedures and commitments to sort and divert waste from landfill in accordance with the waste hierarchy (reduce; reuse; recycle; recover) according to the defined waste groups. In addition, no less than 85% by weight or by volume of non-hazardous construction, excavation and demolition waste generated by the development has been diverted from landfill.

22. All areas of trees, hedges, scrub or similar vegetation where birds may nest which are to be removed as part of the development, are to be cleared outside the bird-nesting season (March - August inclusive) or if clearance during the bird-nesting season cannot reasonably be avoided, a suitably qualified ecologist will check the areas to be removed immediately prior to clearance and advise whether nesting birds are present. If active nests are recorded, no vegetation clearance or other works that may disturb active nests shall proceed until all young have fledged the nest.

23. The parking areas forming part of the development shall only be used for the parking of private motor vehicles and shall not be used for any other purpose.

24. Notwithstanding the provisions of classes A, B and E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any amending Order), no buildings or extensions to the existing and new buildings hereby approved shall be erected without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

25. Prior to first occupation of any dwelling hereby approved details of all boundary treatments with neighbouring properties shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted details shall include existing and proposed sections of all boundary treatment and, in particular, shall include proposals to improve the existing boundary treatment with No 9 Alderwood Mews and the rear boundary treatment with number 33 Camlet Way. None of the dwellings hereby approved shall be occupied until the approved details of boundary treatment have been fully implemented and thereafter such boundary treatment details shall be retained.

-----End of Conditions-----