



## Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 4 - 7 May 2021

Site Visits made on 19 April 2021 & 12 May 2021

**by Mrs J Wilson BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI DMS**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 18 June 2021**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/W/20/3265649**

#### **Homestead Farm, Main Street, Bothenhampton, Bridport DT6 4BJ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land carried out without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
  - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Kim & Debra Hughes against the decision of Dorset Council.
  - The application Ref WD/D/19/003186, dated 23 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2020.
  - The application sought planning permission for the demolition of original farmhouse in Conservation Area. Erection of 1.no. new 4 bed low carbon house (with variation of condition 1 of planning approval WD/D/17/002888 to amend approved plans) without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref WD/D/17/002888, dated 23 April 2018.
  - The condition in dispute is No 1 which states that: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
    - Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan - Drawing Number 1702L002 received on 04/12/2017
    - Proposed First Floor Plan - Drawing Number 1702L003 received on 04/12/2017
    - Proposed Elevations 2 of 2 - Drawing Number 1702L004 received on 04/12/2017
    - Proposed Elevations 2 of 2 - Drawing Number 1702L005 received on 04/12/2017
    - Proposed Landscaping scheme- Drawing Number 1702L007 received on 04/12/2017
    - Construction Phasing Plan - Drawing Number 1702L010 received on 04/12/2017
    - Proposed Elevations 1 of 2 - Drawing Number 1702L004 Rev A received on 19/03/2018
    - Amended highways access - Drawing Number 1702L015 Rev A received on 19/03/2018
    - Location Plan and Site Plan - Drawing Number 1702L001 Rev B received on 19/03/2018
  - The reason given for the condition is: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the original farmhouse in Conservation Area. Erection of 1.no. new 4 bed low carbon house (with variation of condition 1 of planning approval WD/D/17/002888 to amend approved plans) at Homestead Farm, Main Street, Bothenhampton, Bridport DT6 4BJ in accordance with the application Ref WD/D/19/003186 made on the 23 December 2019 without complying with condition No 1 set out in planning permission Ref WD/D/17/002888 granted on 23 April 2018 by West Dorset Council, but otherwise subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

### **Application for costs**

2. An application for both a full and partial award of costs has been made by Mr and Mrs Hughes against Dorset Council. This will be the subject of a separate Decision.

### **Preliminary Matters**

3. The application was refused by the Council's Planning Committee for two reasons; firstly the effect of the development would neither preserve nor enhance the Conservation Area or its wider setting and secondly the effect of the development on the occupiers of neighbouring properties with regard to their outlook. The Council, subsequent to their decision, clarified that references to character within reason for refusal 2 were included in error; consequently, references to policies ENV10 and D8 are not relevant to the issue of outlook.
4. A further application concerning the same development proposal has been submitted to Dorset Council; at the time of the inquiry it remained undetermined. The consideration of that application is separate and has no bearing on the outcome of this appeal.
5. I outlined at the inquiry that as the development had already taken place the application was to be dealt with under section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act), the effect of which is to consider whether to retain the development without compliance with a condition (Condition 1 of WD/D/17/002888). The effect of Section 73 of the Act is to leave the original planning permission intact. The 2018 permission represents the baseline against which to assess the changes.
6. Representations have been made regarding inaccuracies contained in the submitted plans. Prior to the Inquiry agreement was reached between the appellants and the Council as to the differences in height between the approved 2018 permission and the heights of the 'as built' scheme. These agreed measurements are set out in the Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) and include the approved elevations overlaid with 'as built' elevations.
7. That same SOCG confirmed that the Council and the appellants agreed that the development has no adverse effect on the setting of any listed buildings or other non-designated heritage assets.
8. The Development Plan in force is the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) (WDWPLP) which was adopted in 2015. Since the original planning permission was granted in 2018 the Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan (BANP) has been made (2020) and this now also forms part of the Development Plan for the area.

### **Background and Main Issues**

9. Changes have been made to the 2018 permission including altering the footprint of different elements of the building. A series of applications to the Council for non-material amendments and for alterations to the schedule of materials have been approved by the Council to deal with these issues. However, the development has also been constructed with each element higher than originally specified in the plans referred to in condition 1 of that permission.

10. Taking into account the above matters the main issues are the effect of the development on:

- The character and appearance of the area including whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Bothenhampton Conservation Area (CA).
- the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties on Main Street and Duck Street with regard to outlook.

## **Reasons**

### *Conservation Area*

11. There is no dispute that the different elements of the building have been constructed with each element higher than indicated in the 2018 permission. These variations range from around 0.15m to 0.81m with the smaller variations applying to the replacement buildings closest to Main Street. Larger variations in height apply to the 'Winter Garden', 'Bedroom Cottage' and 'Old Dairy Barn'. These three elements are set around 26 metres from the front elevation of the adjacent buildings on Main Street and on lower ground. In the context of the view from Main Street, due to the 'Y' shaped form of the building these latter two elements off the building are not generally read together when approaching from either direction along Main Street.
12. There is a noteworthy height difference between existing buildings on the high pavement opposite the appeal site and the appeal building. In absolute terms the height of the development at its tallest point is roughly equal to the eaves level of the terrace of properties opposite, though individually these do vary in height. Significantly the ground level of the cottages on the raised pavement are in excess of 1.5 metres higher than the ground level of the upper part of the appeal site principally due to the raised pavement. The modern wings of the development are around the same height as the top of the ground floor windows of the properties on Main Street. This sets the context of the relationship between the new and existing properties.
13. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that I pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a CA. In this respect national policy on heritage assets is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
14. The Framework defines the setting of a heritage asset as the surroundings in which such an asset is experienced. 'Significance' in heritage policy terms is defined as the value of the asset because of its heritage interest which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. The Framework glossary confirms that significance can be derived from a setting as well as from a physical presence.
15. The appeal site occupies a central position in the Bothenhampton CA on a sloping south facing site. Buildings along Main Street are elevated above it due to the high pavement from where views are gained across the appeal site and out to the wider countryside. The significance of this part of the CA is largely derived from the tightly knit buildings and the predominance of traditional materials with views above and between buildings to the wider hills beyond.

16. The Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) refers to the importance of the group value of the 'long sequence of buildings along the high pavement of Main Street' referring to them as a coherent group of buildings. It notes the elevated pavement as an obvious landmark and refers to 'longer views to the South and East'. The appraisal goes on to say that 'Main Street has a marked change in character created by the fall in levels from north to south. The north side of Main Street is raised above the southside necessitating a high pavement and a sturdy stone retaining wall. The lower buildings to the South, in turn, stand above the continued slope down to a narrow valley. The CAA emphasises that the high pavement provides a good platform for wider views though also comments that the views are over the upper parts of buildings on the south side as well as highlighting an uninterrupted view down Duck Street. These attributes all contribute to the significance of the CA.
17. The CAA particularly highlights detrimental features in the CA including reference to the former Homestead Farmhouse which was cited as an important local building and identified as in a poor state of repair with untidy surroundings. These features were permitted to be replaced as part of the 2018 permission.
18. The Council highlight two aspects from the CAA. Firstly, the impact on views to the high hills, hedges and trees to the East, North East and South East of the CA and described as a key point of the quality analysis. Secondly the coherence of the group of buildings on Main Street which the Council clarified refers to the vernacular scale and form of the buildings. In evidence the Council explained that they do not call into question the design concept of the scheme, as that was accepted in the 2018 permission. The principal concern of the Council is that the additional height of the various elements has a cumulative and unacceptable impact resulting in the development being out of scale. Moreover, they say the building does not read as it previously did and the structure now looms large, standing out in the streetscape and diminishing the key views changing the openness in this part of the village.
19. The 2018 permission accepted the replacement of the demolished structures with a new building tight up against Main Street and further structures running at right angles which replace the original buildings. The increase in height of these particular elements (0.15m, 0.27m and 0.32m) are, in my view, very small and do not materially alter the character or significance of the group of buildings or the streetscape within the CA. Neither do they materially or negatively impact on the ability to appreciate the high hills, hedges and trees which contribute to the wider setting of the CA from the high pavement.
20. The Inquiry heard that the increased height of the modern elements of the buildings identified as the Winter Garden, Bedroom Cottage and Dairy Barn (at 0.68m, 0.76m and 0.81m), 'obstruct' or 'block' more of the view from the high pavement than the 2018 permission and thereby increase the impact of the building on the CA. It was however also accepted by the Council that views were still possible across the site and that the increase in the height of bedroom cottage did not break the view of the horizon.
21. I saw that this section of the raised pavement on Main Street provides a range of different views across the site. The 'as built' development results in varying amounts of increased though modest impact on those views. There is no one point where the building can be seen in its totality given the 'Y' shaped

configuration and this limits the ability to experience all elements of the building at the same time. Indeed, the modern elements are not visible in the streetscape of Main Street until immediately in front of the appeal site.

22. The increase in the height of the Dairy Barn and the Winter Garden obstruct marginally more of the view towards the horizon than was the case in the 2018 consent. Those changes would be visible from the high pavement, but they are also seen against the backdrop of dwellings on the other side of the valley and their impact on the horizon is minor. That is not to say that the changes would not be visible, the key consideration is whether they would be harmful to the experience of the CA to observers from the high pavement and thereby negatively affecting its character. From the evidence before me and from my observations on site I have concluded that they would not.
23. Taking into account the heights of buildings on Main Street; the topography of the surroundings; and the limited alteration to the vista across the appeal site, I consider the development does not have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area and in this regard preserves the character of the CA in a similar way to the 2018 permission.
24. In reaching this finding I have taken into consideration that the Council contended that the officer report did not fully or appropriately assess the proposal and its impact on the CA. They also argued that there was no previous position to depart from as the effect on the CA had not been properly assessed. The Conservation Officers' comment in the 2020 report was described as 'telegraphic' and whilst it is acknowledged to be brief, the planning officer, in the wider report, made specific reference to the CA, to the former condition of the site and the contribution made by important buildings in the locality. Whilst it could have been more comprehensive, I have not found it to be silent on the matter of the effect on the CA.
25. Overall, I conclude that the development would not lead to harm and that the alterations to the 2018 permission preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a heritage asset, and thereby satisfy the statutory duty of s72(1) of the Act. Consequently, the proposal accords with policies ENV4, ENV10 and ENV12 of the WDWPLP and Policies HT2, D1 and D8 of the BANP. These seek, amongst other things, to conserve and enhance heritage assets, the qualities of the area as a whole and to achieving high quality design and architecture.
26. As I have concluded that there would be no harm to the heritage asset, there is no need to consider the public benefits of the proposal as this is required by paragraph 196 of the Framework in cases where harm is identified.

#### *Amenity*

27. The amenity impact in dispute is concerned with the effect of the development upon the outlook from a number of adjacent properties. There was no dispute between the appellants and the Council regarding any other aspect of amenity including privacy or any concerns relating to impact on light. Based on the evidence provided I find no reasons to disagree.
28. Outlook in its simplest sense is taken to mean the view or prospect from a particular place. The Council has identified seven properties which it considers are sensitive receptors affected by the increased height of the various elements of the development. They also clarified in evidence that outlook from a

principal living room is considered to justify additional protection under the parameters of Policy ENV16 and D1 though neither of these policies is specific on that point.

29. I observed the view from each of the properties listed at paragraph 9.1a of the SOCG. From these observations and taking into account the concerns of the Council, my view is that the changes in height of the replacement buildings (i.e. the Old Barn, and the two parts of the Farmhouse) by reason of the separation distances to existing and elevated properties on the high pavement of Main Street, do not adversely affect the outlook from any of the properties cited along Main Street.
30. Turning to the effect of the increased height of the modern elements named: Winter Garden, 'Bedroom Cottage' and 'Dairy Barn'. The increased height of these three elements varies by 0.68, 0.76 and 0.81 metres respectively (from the approved 2018 permission) and their positions are also marginally closer to Main Street. Nonetheless these elements are set well into the site, on lower ground and are in excess of 26 metres from the front elevation of the properties along the high pavement which are set at a higher level. These factors lead me to conclude that there would be no unacceptable or overbearing effect on the outlook of occupiers of those properties.
31. In respect of the property on Duck Street there is a considerably greater distance between the appeal building and 1 Primrose Cottages (No. 1). The buildings are in excess of 40 metres apart with No.1 set on lower land. Whilst upper windows from the side and rear of the property have an outlook across the site, that view would not be materially different from that which would have resulted from the 2018 permission particularly given the distances and levels involved. I could clearly see on my visit that the contemporary wings of the development and the winter garden are visible, particularly so from the garden of No.1. However, the scheme under the 2018 permission would have been similarly visible. The change in detail given the distances involved does not result in a substantially different relationship than would have resulted from the construction of the 2018 permission and as such would not be harmful to the outlook of occupants of that property.
32. Whilst the precise effect of the development on each of the properties listed was not individually detailed by the Council, a point challenged by the appellants during evidence, Policy ENV16 does not specify any minimum distances by which the relationship should be judged nor is there any mechanism in that policy to quantify harm, as such it relies on a planning judgement. On the basis of the evidence before me I am unconvinced by the Councils' evidence on this matter and find that the planning judgement exercised by them is not well supported by their evidence.
33. The increased height of the building removes marginally more of the view across the appeal site than the original consent but that fact, in itself, does not mean that the structures are 'overbearing' to adjacent properties. Whilst residents of the existing properties have inevitably experienced a change in their outlook and now see a larger structure this does not inherently cause harm to amenity. The loss of a view must not be confused or conflated with harm to outlook.
34. For the above reasons the relationship between buildings identified in the SOCG do not result in an overbearing impact when compared to the dimensions

consented under the 2018 permission and as a result cause no overbearing impact on outlook. Therefore, I find no adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupants of the properties identified on Main Street and Duck Street in respect of the outlook.

35. Consequently, I find no conflict with policies ENV12 and ENV16 of the WDWPLP or to Policy D1 of the BANP in so far as they relate to amenity. These policies require that developments do not have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties nor any adverse effect on the amenity of adjacent occupiers.

### **Other Matters**

36. The site, the village of Bothenhampton and the surrounding area is washed over by the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) designation. It is, however, no part either main parties case that the development has any adverse effect on the AONB and I have no evidence before me which would lead me to disagree.
37. Whether or not the development fulfils the low carbon brief for the site, it is clear that the previous planning permission, whilst described as a low carbon development, did not specify any level in the code for sustainable homes which must be achieved. There is no requirement in the 2018 permission to achieve Level 5 - Code for Sustainable Homes. In this regard I am satisfied that it has been the personal choice of the appellants rather than any prerequisite which has resulted in the height increase by placing service runs and insulation above the steel frames and thereby necessitating an increase in the heights. From what I saw I am not persuaded that there was insufficient space to run services below the steel frames and still retain useable space. However, this is a separate issue to the effect of the external height changes on the character or appearance of the CA which I have dealt with on their own merits. As such this matter has not been determinative to the outcome of this appeal.
38. It has been argued in written representations that to allow the appeal would set an undesirable precedent for individuals to depart from approved development proposals. Also, that there should be a public expectation that all applicants should adhere to approved plans and not see them as a starting point to evolve a scheme. The frustration of local residents in this regard is acknowledged, however, the legislation allows scope to accommodate variations to agreed schemes and for these to be considered retrospectively. The route is available to any applicant in possession of a permission. Even so I have determined the application on its own merits and whilst the concerns of representors are noted, they do not alter my findings on the main issues.
39. Reference has been made to paragraph 11d of the Framework. It was accepted in evidence that there was no dispute that the authorised use of the site is residential, albeit the original building was in a poor condition and had been deemed uninhabitable. Therefore, there is no argument to be made regarding any net gain of residential units as one dwelling replaced another. In this regard the Framework provisions in paragraph 11d are not relevant to the consideration of this appeal.
40. It was put to me that weight should be given to the issue of intentional unauthorised development with reference to the 2015 Written Ministerial Statement on Intentional Unauthorised Development (WMS) and the

frustrations of representors concerned by the implementation of works on the appeal site without first obtaining the necessary planning permissions. The appellants in pursuing a variation, stopped construction once the anomalies were identified and cooperated with the Council and the planning process in submitting a revised scheme. In any event the WMS referred to provides for situations where no planning permission is in place which is not the case here. In this regard the fact that the development departs from the approved plan does not demonstrate intentional unauthorised development.

41. Written representations suggest that the two modern wings of the building are significantly larger than the modest agricultural structures which they replaced. That may be so however, the type, contemporary nature of the design and amount of development have already been approved and the scheme has been implemented so there is no latitude to revisit these matters.
42. A proof of evidence was provided on the ecological benefits of the scheme by the appellants. As this was uncontested by the Council the evidence was taken as read. I have not needed to consider this matter further given my findings on heritage matters.
43. Written representations have been made as to the definitive ownership of the site which questions whether the sale of the former Homestead Farm site was legitimate. Any dispute regarding the ownership of the site is a civil matter and not within the remit of this appeal.
44. The appellants highlighted the extent of the costs involved to retrofit the construction to within the parameters of the 2018 permission. The Council argued that this is not a relevant factor. I agree with the Council on this matter and have focused on the areas of dispute. As such any reinstatement costs have not been determinative to my findings.

### **Conditions**

45. As the suggested conditions discussed at the Inquiry were largely a repeat of those attached to the 2018 planning permission there was little dispute between the parties as to their general wording. However, parties were alerted to inconsistencies between the agreed schedule of plans and the conditions agreed between the appellants and the Council such that during the inquiry revisions were produced.
46. Suggested wordings have been amended to provided clarity and avoid duplication and to remove tailpiece wording, where essential I have made reference to tie the approval of details agreed under earlier minor material amendments for the sake of clarity and completeness and have amalgamated plans conditions to avoid duplication.
47. As the scheme is already substantially built there is no need for a time limit condition. A plans condition will aid with both clarity and later compliance as the scheme is not yet fully complete.
48. A condition to ensure compliance with drainage details is required to address flood risks and a requirement for the completion of parking spaces is both reasonable and necessary given the nature and position of the access and the width of Main Street.



49. Even though the scheme is substantially complete there is a need for a condition relating to compliance with agreed materials as some elements are yet to be finished. Similarly, as landscaping is not yet complete a condition to secure the agreed scheme and to ensure compliance with longer term maintenance/management is necessary and reasonable.
50. The need for a condition relating to the maximum height of soft landscaping behind the boundary wall along Main Street is necessary so as prevent views being obstructed from the raised pavement.
51. A hours of construction limitation was included on the original permission and is both reasonable and necessary to protect the living conditions of residents living in close proximity to the site.
52. A condition to secure the effective implementation of the Biodiversity Action Plan will secure the biodiversity benefits, and a condition requiring the formation of the access of Duck Street will secure the provision of a safe access.

### **Conclusion**

53. In conclusion, I have found that the proposal would accord with the Development Plan and the objectives of the Framework. I have not found any other harm arising from the changes made from the 2018 planning permission. Consequently, for the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed without compliance with the original condition No.1 related to plans approved under WD/D/17/002888, subject to conditions as set out in my formal decision and attached as a schedule.

*Mrs J Wilson*

INSPECTOR

## **Appearances**

### **For the Local Planning Authority**

Mr Charles Merrett of Counsel instructed by Mr Philip Crowther.

He called:

Dr James Weir – Senior Conservation Officer – Heritage matters

Mr James Lytton Travers – Planning and amenity matters

### **For the Appellants**

Ms Anne Williams of Counsel assisted by Mr William McBarnet instructed by Mr T Pinto

She called:

Mr Kim Hughes

Mr Terry Pinto BA (Hons), PG Dip, Profession Practice in Architecture PG Certificate, ARB, RIBA

Dr Chris Miele MRTPI, IHBC, FRHS, FSA Heritage Specialist

Mr Andy Partridge BSc (Hons), DIP UP, MRTPI – Planning Consultant

### **Third Parties**

Mr M Best – local resident speaking in support

Ms L Lake – local resident speaking in support

Mr M M Coulthard – speaking in support

### **Inquiry Documents presented - check list re conditions plans and additional documents**

- LI Doc 1 – Opening Statement by Mr Charles Merrett on behalf of Dorset Council
- LI Doc 2 – Opening Statement by Ms A Williams for the Appellants
- LI Doc 3A – Statement to the Inquiry by Mr M Best
- LI Doc 3B – Photograph and summary statement submitted by Ms Lake
- LI Doc 4 – Updated Draft Conditions and plan 1702L-650 indicating extent of conditioned hedgerow
- LI Doc 5 – Updated proof of evidence from Mr K Hughes
- LI Doc 6 – Further revised conditions list
- LI Doc 7 – email clarifying which submitted plan details the dimensions between the as built scheme and existing properties - 1710 Appeal 01 and 1702 L007
- LI Doc 8 – Expanded summary from Mr T Pinto
- LI Doc 9 – Errata and corrections to Mr C Meile proof
- LI Doc 10 – CD2 – 1702 L007 B – Landscape Plan
- LI Doc 11 – L 654 – Site construction access
- LI Doc 12 – Further list of Plans for conditions received 7 May 2021
- LI Doc 13 – Suggested unaccompanied Site Visit itinerary – L-652
- LI Doc 14 – Closing submissions by Mr Charles Merrett on behalf of Dorset Council
- LI Doc 15 – Closing Submissions by Ms Anne Williams on behalf of the Appellants
- LI Doc 16 – Revised costs application
- LI Doc 17 – L-650 Extent of frontage hedgerow with conditioned heights
- LI Doc 18 – L-651 Rev B hedgerow Height Implications
- LI Doc 19 – Revised Condition wording also dated 7 May 2021

### **Schedule of Conditions**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
  - Location Plan - Drawing Number 1702 L301 received on 27/12/2019
  - (As built) Lower Ground Floor Plan & Ground Floor Plan - Drawing Number 1702 L401 received on 27/12/2019
  - (As built) First Floor Plan & Roof Plan - Drawing Number 1702 L402 received on 27/12/2019
  - (As built) Elevation 1 of 3 - Drawing Number 1702 L601 (Rev A) 01.12.2020
  - (As built) Elevation 2 of 3 - Drawing Number 1702 L602 (Rev A) 01.12.2020
  - (As built) Elevation 3 of 3 - Drawing Number 1702 L603 (Rev A) 01.12.2020
  - Barbeque Shelter Area - Drawing Number 1702 L501 received on 27/12/2019
  - Open Compost Bins & Wood Shed - Drawing Number 1702 L505 received on 27/12/2019
  - Amended Highways Access Plan 1702 L015 Rev A received on 27/12/2019
  - Greenhouse Drawing Number 1702 L506 received on 27/12/2019
  - Field Shelter Drawing Number 1702 L502 received on 27/12/2019
  - Access from Duck Street Drawing Number 1702 L016 Rev H received on 27/12/2019
  - Chicken Coop - Drawing Number 1702 L507 received on 27/12/2019
  - Tool & Lawnmower Shed - Drawing Number 1702 L503 received on 27/12/2019
  - Open Wood Shed & Trailer Store - Drawing Number 1702 L504 received on 27/12/2019
  - Landscaping Plan - Drawing Number 801 LANDP001 REV 009 received on 27/12/2019
  - Landscaping Plan - Drawing Number 1702 L007 Rev B received on 13/07/2020
  
2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with details and samples of all facing and roofing materials including the glazing installed in the rear lower extensions hereby approved as per the following:
  - Natural Finish Larch Cladding T&G
  - Purbeck Stone
  - Re-Used Dry Stone Wall
  - Lime Render 1:3 NHL mix with washed sand
  - Slate Tile - Del Carmen Ultra Spanish slates 500x250mm by SSL
  - Standing Seam Zinc - ZM Silesia (Pre-Aged Grey)
  - Clay Tile - Phalempin Single Camber Clay Plain Roof Tile
  - Sinusoidal Corten Steel Roof
  - Sedum Roof - Bauder Sedum on Green Felt
  - Doors and Windows - Painted timber (RAL 7016)
  - Lead Black Metal Gutters and RWPs Glass: Low reflectance glass to southern elevations
  - Balcony glass - Guardian Glass with 1 coat of Clarity Low reflectance coating to the outside. Light reflectance of 4%
  - Glass to windows and doors SSG Climate Plus 6. Light Reflectance 12%

3. Before the dwelling hereby approved is first occupied the turning and parking shown on Drawing Number 1702 L 001 Rev B must have been constructed and surfaced in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, these areas, must be permanently maintained, kept free from other obstructions and be available for the purposes specified.
4. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the proposed drainage works (foul and surface water) submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority under ref WD/D/18/002892/CWC. That approved drainage scheme shall be completed before the first occupation of the development hereby approved.
5. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the landscaping details as shown on drawing number Landscape Plan - Drawing Number 1702 L007 Rev B. The scheme shall be carried out no later than the first available planting season following first occupation of the dwelling. If within a period of 5 years from the date of the planting of any tree/plant, that tree/plant or any tree/plant planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies (or becomes in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority seriously damaged or defective) another tree/plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be replanted in the first available planting season.
6. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted biodiversity mitigation report of William Davis, Lindsay Carrington Ecological Consultancy Ltd dated 3rd January 2018.
7. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the Duck Street access proposals (drawing number L 016 REV H). That access shall be completed prior to the first occupation of the dwelling and thereafter retained in accordance with these agreed details.
8. Hours of construction associated with the development hereby permitted shall not take place outside the hours of 8am to 6pm on weekdays; 8am to 1pm on Saturdays; with no work on Sundays and Bank Holidays. Parking for site operatives shall be in accordance with the approved details as per application ref WD/D/18/001167/CWC.
9. The frontage hedgerow shown between points X-X and Y-Y on plan Reference numbers 1702-L-650 and in a position shown on drawing 1702 L-651 Rev B shall be maintained so as not to exceed 2.75m in height as measured from the road level.

---- End of Schedule ----