



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2022

by K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/W/21/3285668

Central College Nottingham, High Road, Chilwell NG9 4AH

- 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 Arran Bailey (High Road Developments Ltd) against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00891/FUL, dated 19 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing college building to student accommodation comprising 162 bedrooms including external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of existing college building to student accommodation comprising 162 bedrooms including external alterations, at Central College Nottingham, Chilwell, NG9 4AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00891/FUL, dated 19 December 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Application for costs

2. An application for an award of costs has been made by Mr Arran Bailey (High Road Developments Ltd) against Broxtowe Borough Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matter

3. I have used the description of development given on the Council's decision notice and the appeal form, as this more fully describes the proposal than that given on the application form. It is also the description used in publicising the application.

Background and Main Issues

4. The appeal relates to a former educational establishment vacant since autumn of 2020. The appeal relates only to the main building to the southern end of the former campus, though land to the north is within the appellant's control, and it is indicated that the appeal scheme is the first of three intended phases of development across the wider site. The appeal building has been stripped out internally and it has been subject to partial demolition on its northern side.
5. The proposal seeks the change of use of the building to student accommodation of up to 162 bedrooms, along with replacement and alteration of windows, infilling of a balcony and replacement external panelling. 25 car parking spaces, cycle and bin storage, service bay and hard landscaping would be provided to the external parts of the site.

6. The proposal was recommended for approval by planning officers, but refused following a meeting of the Council's planning committee in September 2021, a decision having been deferred at an earlier meeting in July 2021.
7. Based on the reason for refusal and the other evidence before me, the main issues are the effects of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, with respect to i) noise, disturbance and overlooking and ii) parking pressure in the surrounding area.

Reasons

Noise, Disturbance and Overlooking

8. The appeal site is located on High Road in the Chilwell area of Nottingham. There is residential development to the east and north of the site on Grove Avenue, Dale Lane and Richmond Drive. The High Road Central College tram stop is immediately in front of the site. The tram line curves around the western side of the site, beyond which is residential development on Lime Grove Avenue. High Road itself contains a number of shops and other businesses and facilities.
9. The Council's position is that the use of the building for student accommodation would lead to increased and sustained levels of noise and disturbance for neighbouring residents. It argues that the previous college use, though itself a generator of some noise from its everyday activity, would have been quiet in the evenings and weekends when classes had finished. In contrast, the proposed use would see the building occupied around the clock and at high density, which would lead to high levels of noise and disturbance. I have also had regard to the numerous representations from interested parties raising similar concerns with noise and disturbance, alongside other concerns including overlooking, anti-social behaviour and the general conflict between student lifestyles and those of a mainly older population within surrounding streets.
10. The appellant points to the noise assessment undertaken for the application, which indicated high background noise levels already exist in the area, and to the nearest dwelling being some 30 metres away on Grove Avenue, with dwellings to other sides of the site further away at between 55 and 100 metres. The appellant further refers to the previous use of the building as a college for up to 3,000 students and 250 staff, and to the lack of objection from the Council's environmental health officer. A Student Living Management Plan has also been proposed which the appellant indicates would be secured through a Section 106 Agreement.
11. The proposed accommodation is residential in nature, and there is no policy, so far as I am aware, that precludes student housing within residential areas. The development would be occupied on a 24-hour basis, and so would differ from the previous college use in this respect. Given that students would generally leave the site to attend classes during the day, the times of greatest activity are likely to be in the evenings and weekends, although student housing can see notable reductions in numbers at weekends as students return to family homes. For the most part, the activity would be related to normal residential use of the building, and there is no reason to consider that this would be particularly loud, continuous or invasive, such that it would significantly affect the living conditions of neighbouring occupants.

12. I also note that the appellant's noise assessment indicates a need for windows to be fitted with appropriate glazing and acoustic trickle vents to provide acceptable noise levels internally. This would conversely have some attenuating effect on noise emanating from within the building, which together with the separation distances, would reduce the degree to which noise is heard at neighbouring properties.
13. In addition, the design of the building is such that its external communal areas are within an enclosed, central courtyard which would contain noise from its use by residents. The outer parts of the site closest to neighbouring dwellings would be put to more functional use and would not be areas where residents would be likely to congregate, particularly as the main entrance would be to the front elevation facing High Road. This is also where public transport connections are available, meaning students would not need to routinely travel along any of the surrounding residential streets to access local services or travel options.
14. In terms of overlooking, there would be no significant change to the location of windows facing neighbouring dwellings, which would be separated by at least 27 metres. Daytime activity is likely to be lower than was the case when in use as a college, which would reduce the potential for overlooking in daylight hours. Moreover, the windows closest to dwellings on Grove Avenue would serve single occupancy bedrooms, not communal areas where students would gather for extended periods. There is no reason to think that students occupying their own bedrooms would be any more likely to engage in prolonged overlooking of neighbouring properties than a permanent resident of a flat. Though use of the development would increase in the evenings, this would coincide with occupants and neighbours drawing curtains and blinds for privacy. Combined with the separation distances in this case, I am satisfied that the proposal would not lead to harmful levels of overlooking of neighbouring properties.
15. I have noted the other concerns raised regarding the potential for anti-social behaviour and increased risk of crime. Much of this concern is based on assumptions about student behaviour, and I note reference by some objectors to local news articles about incidents elsewhere in Nottingham. However, it is not clear from the evidence before me that these incidents are representative of the behaviour of the wider student populace, rather than isolated incidents by a small minority.
16. Given the nature of student lifestyles and the number of proposed residents, I accept that there would be an increased propensity for late night activity at certain times of the week as students socialise and return home. In this case, the appeal site would be a self-contained and managed facility, rather than ad hoc, shared use of existing dwellings where students may live next door to permanent residents and where their activity would not be regularly monitored. Within a large facility with multi-occupancy units, it can be also expected that an element of self-policing would occur in respect of noise and disturbance, particularly at unsociable hours.
17. The appellant has proposed a Student Management Plan which sets out a series of measures, including an Anti-Social Behaviour Policy (ASBP). Other measures include use of coded access doors and CCTV to provide security. The Student Management Plan would be secured through the Section 106 Agreement. There

would be a further undertaking by the appellant to maintain a manned a 24-hour management phone line for students and neighbours, and a commitment not to access the site from Dale Lane. I am satisfied that the measures set out by the appellant would be effective in managing the behaviour of student residents of the development and limiting noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupants to a level that would not materially harm their living conditions.

18. Overall, for the reasons set out, I conclude that the proposal would not lead to harmful levels of noise, disturbance or overlooking that would undermine the living conditions of neighbouring occupants. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy (2014) (the ACS) or Policy 17 of the Part 2 Local Plan (2019) (the P2LP) which together require developments to create an attractive, safe, inclusive and healthy environment, by having regard to, amongst other things, features to reduce anti-social behaviour and to ensure satisfactory degree of amenity for occupiers of the new development and neighbouring properties. The proposal would also align with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Parking Pressure

19. The Council's concern, echoed by interested parties, is that insufficient parking would be provided on site. It states that the level of parking proposed is unrealistic for the number of expected occupants, as a result of which residents of the student accommodation would generate increased demand for parking in surrounding streets, adding to parking stress and inconvenience for residents.
20. The appellant has submitted a Transport Assessment (TA) which calculates that the previous use as a college generated 1,179 daily two ways trips, a figure the Council accepts. By comparison, the proposed use is predicted to generate just 35 two way trips. This would represent a significant reduction in vehicular traffic, even compared to the most recent operation of the college at less than full capacity, where two-way trips were still calculated at 275 per day. I note that Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) as the Local Highway Authority accepts this evidence, given it was derived from the industry standard TRICS database.
21. The TA further predicts a modal split for students within the proposed development of 60% public transport (bus, tram), 32% active travel (walking, cycling) and just 7.4% by car. Given that bus and tram stops are located immediate outside of the site, and several amenities including shops and cafes are close by on High Road, I am satisfied that the figures presented in the TA are realistic. The convenience of public transport and active travel options is therefore likely to significantly reduce demand for car use by occupants of the development. This would align with the aims of the Framework to promote opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport. On this basis, I am satisfied that the worst case fears of the Council and local residents that most or all occupants of the development would own a car are unfounded.
22. With a potential occupancy of up to 162 students, I accept that some car ownership and demand for parking may still occur. The proposal provides for 25 on-site parking spaces, increased from 15 proposed initially. I note that NCC was satisfied with the original allocation of parking, noting that it was in line with the Council's own adopted parking standards for student accommodation.

The appellant has increased the amount of parking on site to address some of the concerns raised.

23. In addition, the appellant states that the development would be promoted from the outset as car-free, including a clause within the submitted Section 106 agreement that would prevent occupants of the development from obtaining resident's parking permits. The appellant has also indicated an intention to provide resident students with free annual tram passes to encourage public transport use. It is argued that these measures, together with the existing parking restrictions in force on surrounding streets, would discourage students from using cars whilst resident within the development.
24. The Council counters that parking restrictions on surrounding streets are only in place between 9am and 5pm Mondays to Saturdays, after which students would be able to park there. It adds that some areas, such as on Richmond Drive, are not restricted.
25. Given the predicted modal travel splits, I am satisfied that the overall level of car ownership among residents of the development would be low. The on-site parking provision would exceed the Council's standards and would be expected to accommodate the residual demand for parking. Loading and delivery bays would also be separately provided within the site. I am satisfied that this provision would prevent indiscriminate parking on surrounding streets.
26. The inclusion of a planning obligation restricting occupants from applying for resident's parking permits would be a further deterrent to parking on surrounding streets. I accept that the restrictions do not apply in the evenings or on Sundays, but the timing of them is such that it would inconvenience car owners without permits who would have to move their vehicles before 9am most mornings, and not park them again before 5pm. The likelihood, as expressed by NCC in its comments, is that non-permit holders would end up looking for parking beyond the limits of the controlled parking zone, by which point the distance from the appeal site and the inability to monitor the vehicle's security would become further deterrents to on-street parking in the area.
27. Despite its general misgivings, the Council has not specifically challenged the appellant's technical evidence, nor has NCC in its comments. I have had regard to other points raised by interested parties, such as the potential cumulative effect of other developments in the area granted without parking provision. I do not have full details of these other developments, but on the evidence before me the appeal proposal would address its own parking requirements and would not have an adverse effect on parking stress in the wider area. I am satisfied, therefore, that the proposal would not add to a harmful cumulative effect with other developments in the area.
28. Similarly, concerns have been raised about the potential cumulative parking demand within the wider appeal site when later phases of development are included. However, no other planning permissions have yet been granted on the wider site, and therefore it is not certain what quantum or type of development may come forward. It would be for the Council to consider the implications of any future proposal in terms of parking, including, as necessary, any cumulative effect with permissions already granted on the site. For the purposes of this appeal, I am satisfied that the proposal would manage its own parking requirements without placing undue demand on surrounding streets.

29. Taking these considerations together, therefore, I find the appellant's technical evidence to be robust in demonstrating that the proposed student accommodation would generate significantly less vehicular traffic than its past use as a college. The provision of on-site parking would exceed the Council's standards and would be sufficient to meet the expected low demand for car parking that would exist, due to the combination of excellent public transport links, facilities within walking distance and the proposed restriction on residents obtaining parking permits.
30. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not lead to harmful increases in on-street parking demand on surrounding streets. Consequently, the appeal scheme would not result in significant disturbance or inconvenience to local residents' living conditions due to increased vehicle movements and/or indiscriminate parking. Therefore, no conflict would arise with Policy 10 of the ACS or Policy 17 of the P2LP which together require developments to be designed to reflect the need to reduce the dominance of motor vehicles and provide sufficient, well integrated parking and safe and convenient access.
31. Nor would there be conflict with the Framework, which states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Other Material Considerations

Principle of Development

32. In terms of the suitability of the site for student accommodation generally, the Council indicates that it does not have a policy restricting student housing in certain locations. I note an interested party's attempt to invoke policies of the Nottingham City Local Plan Part 2; however, these do not form part of the development plan for the area and carry no weight in the assessment of the proposal.
33. I note other comments suggesting that alternative uses should be considered for the building, such as affordable housing, starter homes or housing for older residents. However, the evidence before me does not indicate a policy presumption in favour of developing the site for uses other than that proposed, nor that there is a shortfall in provision of affordable or other forms of specialist housing within the Council's area. In any event, I have no alternative scheme before me and must determine the proposal as submitted.
34. There is additional concern raised at the phased manner in which the wider site is being brought forward for development. A number of the representations frame the perceived impacts on the basis of the expected cumulative quantum of development, particularly in respect of parking, to which I have already referred. However, at the time of this decision, I am not aware of any other permissions in place for the wider site, and estimates of the overall extent or form of development on the site are therefore premature. It is common for larger sites to be developed in stages, and whilst the application includes information on the wider proposals, this is necessarily indicative as they fall outside of the red line of the appeal site, and could take on a different form once an application is made. Therefore, whilst I have taken into account that more development is expected on the wider site, this does not alter my findings on the main issues of the appeal.

35. The site is a highly accessible location with direct access to the city's two main universities, close to a wide range of services and amenities and would be a productive re-use of a substantial vacant building on a brownfield site, all of which would be public benefits. I note public concern over the number of students in the Chilwell/Beeston area, but I have no firm evidence of an overconcentration in this respect. Moreover, the Council has not pointed to there being a material risk of local services being overwhelmed as a result of the increased population the proposal would provide. Rather, it would be expected that residents of the development would generate additional economic activity in the local area through use of local businesses that would be a further public benefit of the scheme.
36. Reference is also made to the potential for the development to relieve pressure on the existing housing stock to cater for student accommodation through conversions of dwellings to flats or houses in multiple occupation. The evidence before me does not conclusively demonstrate the extent to which this would occur, but it is reasonable to consider there may be some positive benefit in this respect, though I afford this consideration only limited weight.
37. I have had regard to other planning and appeal decisions relating to student accommodation referred to me by the appellant; however, I am not provided with the full particulars of these schemes to ascertain if their circumstances are comparable to the proposal before me. Therefore, whilst noting the approach of the Inspectors in each appeal, I have determined this appeal on its own merits and taking account of the specific site circumstances.

Character and Appearance

38. The external alterations to the building would be modest in scope, mainly aimed at upgrading windows and external panelling to the older part of the building at the rear to match with the striking, contemporary front section facing High Road, which remains in good condition. The scale and form of the building would not change, whilst its overall design and appearance would remain largely the same. The proposal would therefore preserve the character and appearance of the area.
39. Moreover, given the modest extent of external changes proposed, the proposal would not harm the setting of the adjacent Chilwell Cottage Conservation Area, or its overall heritage significance.

Flood Risk

40. The site is located partially with Flood Zones 2 and 3, which is which is land with a high probability of river flooding (1 in 100 or greater). The appellant has conducted a sequential test which concluded that no sequentially preferable sites were reasonably available, suitable or viable. The Council accepts that the site is sequentially preferable given it would reuse an existing building and avoid further development in the Green Belt, which is a major constraint.
41. I also note the appellant's flood risk assessment states that the access to the site lies within Flood Zone 1, at the lowest risk of flooding, and that the ground floor level of the building stands substantially above the levels of surrounding land outside the site boundary, as a result of which floodwaters would be expected to displace to these areas before reaching a level that would infiltrate the existing building.

42. Overall, the evidence before me indicates that the proposal would not be at significant risk from fluvial or other sources of flooding, and subject to conditions to secure surface water drainage mechanisms and other resilience measures, could be made safe from flooding for the life of the development.

Ecology

43. The Council did not find harm in respect of ecology, noting the site was considered to be of low value to wildlife and that only a small range of floral species were present. On the evidence before me, I have no reasons to disagree with the conclusions reached, and the recommended conditions to protect existing biodiversity on site and secure ecological enhancements would be satisfactory in this case.

Construction Impacts

44. Interested parties have raised concern with the potential disturbance from construction impacts. However, whilst the size of the appeal building means there is a strong likelihood of audible construction noise, this is an inevitable consequence of building works and would occur regardless of the form of development permitted. Such effects would be temporary, but it would be possible to mitigate these impacts through planning conditions requiring a demolition and construction method statement that would set out measures to control the impacts of construction, including vehicular movements, security, dust and waste. A separate condition setting out permitted working hours on site would help to limit disruption from construction noise in particular.

Planning Obligations

45. Policy 19 of the ACS sets out that developments will be expected to meet the reasonable costs of new infrastructure required as a consequence of the proposal. Policy 32 of the P2LP lists the types of infrastructure for which contributions will be sought, including a) affordable housing, b) health and g) highways, including sustainable transport measures.
46. The signed Section 106 Agreement would secure financial contributions in respect of the provision of primary health care, namely additional GP facilities in the area, in the amount of £35,113.50, which would accord with the requirements of the aforementioned policies.
47. A separate contribution of £7,500.00 for would be paid to provide for monitoring of the implementation of the proposed travel plan, which would be separately secured by condition. The agreement also includes an undertaking that no residents of the development would be eligible to apply for a residents' parking permit (except for those holding a disabled person's badge). This would secure sustainable transport measures and prevent additional parking pressure in accordance with Policy 10 of the ACS.
48. There would be further obligations on the appellant to submit a student management plan for approval by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the development, to implement it from the first occupation and to provide a single, 24-hour phonenumber for residents to contact in the event of noise, disturbance or nuisance. This is necessary in to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring residents, in accordance with Policy 10 of the ACS and Policy 17 of the P2LP.

49. A further contribution of £72,693.00 sought by the local NHS Trust for additional health services to meet increased demand has not been agreed to by the appellant. The Council states that no policy basis exists for this contribution and that its absence is not a reason to resist the proposal.
50. The Trust sets out that it is operating at full capacity in the provision of acute and planned healthcare and that the proposal would result in it operating above capacity. However, the Trust covers several local authority areas and it is unclear from the evidence presented how acute the pressure is on services from within Broxtowe specifically. Moreover, the main parties indicate that, unlike the primary health care contribution, this type of healthcare was not assessed through the local plan process and, as a result, there is no clarity as to what funding may be required or how a contribution is to be calculated. Policy 32 refers to the Council's Planning Obligation Strategy, but this does not deal specifically with health contributions and provides no basis for the contribution sought.
51. The Trust calculates that the population of the development would create some 283 additional admissions per annum across its various departments. By any measure, this is a very modest increase on the total activity recorded in 2019/20 of 198,870 admissions. It is also not clear that the Trust is actually operating above 100% capacity in Broxtowe, as graphs provided indicate rates of occupancy of between 86% and 97% across its whole area. These figures also relate to 2017/18 and so do not show the latest position.
52. Moreover, in planning for population growth to secure funding each year, there must be an acknowledgment by the Trust that growth comes, at least in part, from additional housing being built in the area. In this respect, it is unclear whether the population projections for Broxtowe have already been exceeded, or whether the additional population would fall within the anticipated growth.
53. Therefore, I find that the evidence does not clearly demonstrate that all of the predicted admissions would put the Trust over capacity and generate a funding deficit, or what percentage of them would do so. Given this, I am not satisfied that the proposed contribution of £72,693.00 sought by the NHS Trust meets the tests for planning obligations set out in the Framework, specifically that it is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, or fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to development. Therefore, the absence of a contribution in this respect is not a factor weighing against the development in the planning balance.
54. I am satisfied that the other sought obligations meet the three tests set out in Paragraph 57 of the Framework for planning obligations. As a result, I have taken the completed planning obligation into account.

Planning Balance

55. On the main issues of the appeal, I have found that the proposal would not lead to demonstrable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants though noise and disturbance or increased parking pressure in the area. Therefore, no conflict would arise with the development plan in these respects.
56. I have found that other material considerations in this case do not raise significant adverse impacts, with any concerns being minor in nature and capable of being addressed by condition. Rather, the development would

deliver a number of public benefits in line with the aims of the Framework, including the effective re-use of a major brownfield site, additional purpose built student housing in a highly accessible location, economic benefits from construction and subsequent use of local services by residents of the development, and modest but nonetheless positive ecological enhancements.

57. Overall, the proposal accords with the development plan for the area and the Framework, and material considerations do not indicate that permission should nevertheless be withheld. Therefore, the appeal should succeed.

Conditions

58. I have had regard to the list of suggested conditions provided by the Council. Where necessary, I have amended their wording to ensure they meet the relevant test for conditions set out in the Framework. The appellant has also confirmed their agreement to those conditions which would be pre-commencement.
59. In addition to the statutory time limit for implementation, a condition setting out the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty.
60. A condition requiring a demolition and construction method statement (DCMS) is necessary to ensure construction works minimise disruption to neighbouring occupants. It is also necessary to secure details of access and egress of construction vehicles over the adjacent tram line, but this can form part of the DCMS rather than forming a separate condition as suggested by the Council. To protect and enhance biodiversity, it is necessary to secure details and implementation of a Reasonable Avoidance Measures Statement and Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.
61. These conditions are pre-commencement as they relate specifically to the construction phase or matters that would be affected by construction works and would be ineffective or lead to harm or loss were they required to be addressed at a later stage.
62. Further conditions are required in respect of external materials and landscaping, to ensure a satisfactory appearance. It is necessary to secure the installation of windows to meet the required level of acoustic performance so as to ensure adequate internal living conditions for residents. Conditions are further required to secure details of external lighting, and to limit hours of construction, both in the interests of protecting neighbours' living conditions.
63. A condition requiring implementation of proposed surface water drainage and resilience measures is necessary to address flood risk. Finally, a condition to secure a Travel Plan is required to ensure the promotion of sustainable transport within the development.

Conclusion

64. For the reasons set out, therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

K. Savage

INSPECTOR

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:
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-XX-DR-A-1000-S4-P02 (Site Location Plan)
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-00-DR-A-3010-S4-P01 (Existing Ground Floor Plan)
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-01-DR-A-3110-S4-P01 (Existing First Floor Plan)
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-M1-DR-A-3115-S4-P01 (Existing First Floor Mezz Plan)
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-02-DR-A-3210-S4-P01 (Existing Second Floor Plan)
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-03-DR-A-3310-S4-P01 (Existing Third Floor Plan)
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-XX-DR-A-4010-S4-P01 (Existing Elevations 1 of 2)
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-XX-DR-A-4011-S4-P01 (Existing Elevations 1 of 2)
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-XX-DR-A-1010-S4-P07 (Proposed Site Plan)
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-GF-DR-A-3000-S4-P03 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan)
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-01-DR-A-3100-S4-P01 (Proposed First Floor Plan)
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-02-DR-A-3200-S4-P03 (Proposed Second Floor Plan)
 - 19119-CBP Z1-03-DR-A-3300-S4-P01 (Proposed Third Floor Plan)
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-XX-DR-A-4000-S4-P01 (Proposed Elevations 1 of 2)
 - 19119-CBP-Z1-XX-DR-A-4001-S4-P02 (Proposed Elevations 2 of 2)
- 3) No development shall commence until a Demolition and Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Demolition and Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Demolition and Construction Method Statement shall provide for:
 - a) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
 - b) parking provision for site operatives and visitors;
 - c) the loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - d) the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - e) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - f) access and egress arrangements with specific regard to preventing any damage or disruption to the operating procedures of the adjacent Nottingham Express Transit route.
- 4) No development shall commence until a Reasonable Avoidance Measures Statement (RAMS) is produced and subsequently approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the agreed details.
- 5) No development shall commence until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) mapping the ecological enhancements on site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The enhancements shall be constructed only in accordance with the approved details and prior to the first occupation of the building.
- 6) No above ground works shall commence until samples of external facing materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

- 7) No above ground works shall take place until a landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall include the following details:
- a) numbers, types, sizes and positions of existing/proposed trees, shrubs and hedgerows and measure for their protection during construction. No development shall commence until the agreed protection measures are in place
 - b) details of boundary treatments;
 - c) proposed bin and cycle stores;
 - d) proposed hard surfacing treatment;
 - e) planting, seeding/turfing of other soft landscape areas; and
 - f) timetable for implementation of the scheme.

The approved scheme shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details and shall be carried out not later than the first planting season following the substantial completion of the development and any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years, die, are removed or have become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with ones of similar size and species to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, unless written consent has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority for a variation.

- 8) Prior to the first occupation of the building following the change of use hereby approved, the fenestration shall be installed in accordance with the details as outlined in section 6.0, page 18 of report titled Spire Environmental ref: R20.1435-1N-AG dated 18th December 2020.
- 9) Prior to the first occupation of the building following the change of use hereby approved, a detailed lighting strategy shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed only in accordance with the approved details and maintained for the lifetime of the development.
- 10) Prior to the first occupation of the building following the change of use hereby approved, the development shall be constructed in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment by HSP Consulting Engineers Ltd ref: HSP2020-C3450-C&S-FRAS1-38 dated 15 December 2020 and subsequent technical memorandum by HSP Consulting Engineers Ltd ref: C3450/TM001 dated 30 April 2021.
- 11) Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall be in broad accordance with the Framework Travel Plan HSP2020-C3450-T&T-TP-49 Rev B. The Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timescales set out within that document.
- 12) No construction or site preparation work in association with this permission shall be undertaken outside of the hours of 08:00-18.00 Monday to Friday, 08:00-13:00 on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

END OF SCHEDULE