



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 1 August 2023

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2023

APPEAL A

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/23/3317236

55 Broseley Grove, Lewisham, London SE26 5LD

- 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 James Winston of Sydenham Mews Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/22/127818, dated 28 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of 21 x existing garages on-site and erection of 5 x two-storey plus roofspace, 3-bedroom mews houses with associated landscaping, refuse and cycle storage.
-

APPEAL B

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/23/3317237

55 Broseley Grove, Lewisham, London SE26 5LD

- 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 James Winston of Sydenham Mews Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/22/129149, dated 8 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of 21 x existing garages on-site and erection of 5 x two-storey plus roofspace, 3-bedroom mews houses with associated landscaping, refuse and cycle storage.
-

Decision – Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of 21 x existing garages on-site and erection of 5 x two-storey plus roofspace, 3-bedroom mews houses with associated landscaping, refuse and cycle storage at 55 Broseley Grove, London, SE26 5LD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/22/127818, dated 28 July 2022, subject to the conditions in the attached Schedule.

Decision – Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary and Procedural Matters

3. I have been appointed to determine two appeals on the same site, the details of which are set out in the banner heading above. In both cases, the proposed development is the demolition of a group of existing garages on the appeal site, and the erection of five dwellings. The two schemes are broadly similar, although not identical, and there is therefore some crossover between the reasons for which the Council refused planning permission. While I have

considered each proposal on its own merits, in order to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together except where otherwise indicated.

4. The appellant provided further information during the appeal relating to the storage purposes for which the garages on the site are currently used, and an updated Daylight and Sunlight Impact Assessment. On the basis of this, the Council considered that it no longer felt it necessary to maintain the first and third reasons for refusal (relating to a potential increase in parking stress, and a harmful loss of privacy or daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents) in respect of Appeal A. None of the evidence before me indicates that I should take a different stance to the Council on this matter, and the main issues identified below reflect this.
5. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") on 5 September 2023, replacing the previous version dating from July 2021. The amendments made did not have any bearing on the issues in this appeal, and it was therefore not necessary to seek comments from the main parties on the updated Framework. Where I have referred to specific paragraphs of the Framework, the numbering used is that of the September 2023 version.

Main Issues

6. The main issue in both appeals is whether the proposed development would make appropriate provision for waste collections and other servicing and deliveries.
7. There are also two additional main issues for Appeal B only:
 - Whether the proposed layout would provide safe shared access to the development for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians; and
 - Whether the development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to outlook and sunlight.

Reasons

8. The appeal site is located behind (and to the east of) No 55 Broseley Grove; it is entered by an access road between Nos 53 and 55. It contains 21 single garages arranged in two blocks – 10 on the west side and 11 on the east – and aligned approximately north-south on either side of a hard-surfaced court. Broseley Grove is a cul-de-sac; there is a rather limited turning head in front of Nos 55, 57, 59 and 61, which also gives access to a shared private driveway serving Nos 63, 65 and 67. The surrounding area is predominantly residential. On the eastern side, the site adjoins the back gardens of Nos 74 and 76 Kent House Road, and a garage block at the rear of flats at Orchard Court; it is bounded by the gardens of houses on Broseley Grove itself to the north and west, and by the rear gardens of houses on Woodbastwick Street to the south.
9. The proposed development in both appeals is the demolition of the existing garages, and their replacement with a short terrace of five three-bedroom houses; the block would be set towards the eastern side of the site. The dwellings would have an open plan kitchen/dining/living room on the ground floor, two bedrooms (one with ensuite bath or shower room¹) and a family

¹ With the exception of Unit 01 in the Appeal A scheme.

bathroom on the first floor. The front elevations on the western side would be angled to be staggered or set back from its neighbour. Each dwelling would have private amenity space at its rear, and there would be shared cycle and refuse storage units in the front courtyard.

10. In the Appeal A scheme, the access way from Broseley Grove and front courtyard within the site would effectively be for pedestrian and cyclist access only, and each dwelling would have a front garden. In the Appeal B scheme, the front courtyard would be larger and used for car parking, with space for three vehicles – the dwellings would not have individual front gardens. The angled windows at the north-west corners of the first-floor front bedrooms would have obscure glazing on their (approximately) west-facing sides, oriented towards the rear of Nos 55 and 57 Broseley Grove.

Servicing

11. Refuse collections for the dwellings at the southern end of Broseley Grove are made from the turning head area. The appellant has provided information showing that this is done by a refuse collection vehicle reversing into the head from the street's junction with Elvino Road. For both appeals, the proposed waste storage area would be situated in the forecourt in front of the dwellings. Originally, the Appeal A scheme proposed that refuse vehicles would reverse into the site to collect waste. This was amended for the submission of Appeal B scheme, in which two options were put forward; either that the waste collection operatives could move large shared "Eurobins" from within the site to the part of Broseley Grove where vehicles collect waste from other properties at that end of the street, or that each household would have its own bins, which residents would move to the street on collection days.
12. The Council's 2014 *Small Sites* Supplementary Planning Document ("the SPD") advises that "where refuse vehicle access and turning cannot be provided, refuse should be stored no further than 10m from the adopted highway"; neither appeal proposal would comply with this. The SPD goes on to say that "in some cases it may be possible for refuse vehicles to reverse a maximum of 20m into a development on the basis that turning access can be provided from the highway", though it also states that "this approach will only be accepted where there are a sufficient number of homes within the development to justify it"². However, the Council noted that there was insufficient information (such as a swept path analysis) to show that a refuse collection vehicle would be able to safely enter and leave the site. The appellant subsequently proposed that the two options suggested for the Appeal B scheme could be used in the Appeal A scheme.
13. I note the appellant's reference to the "drag distance" from the proposed refuse store being around 37 metres, and this being "less than the distance [the occupier of] number 67 [Broseley Grove] pulls their wheelie bins to the holding area (45 metres distance)". In my view though, the fact that No 67 has less-than-satisfactory arrangements is not a justification for allowing them in other cases. The two Appeal B options, subsequently also suggested for Appeal A, would place an unacceptable onus either on residents or on refuse operatives (on behalf of the Council) to move bins over relatively large distances.

² The Council's officer report for the Appeal B proposal described this as being a development of 10 or more units, although that number did not appear in the SPD extract with which I was provided.

14. The SPD advises that, where the maximum distances are not achievable, "it may be possible to implement a management strategy where waste and recycling is moved from outside the entrance to dwellings to a collection point", although it notes also that such arrangements would result in additional service charges for occupiers and would be reliant on ongoing management and so would only be allowed in exceptional circumstances. Nevertheless, the appellant suggested that such a condition could be applied here.
15. I note that, notwithstanding its specific concerns about elements of the appeal proposals, the Council did not have any "in principle" objections to the redevelopment of the site for housing. Given the layout and arrangement of the site, and in particular its entrance road, it seems very likely that any proposed redevelopment would fall foul of the SPD's guidance in respect of the distances over which refuse would need to be moved (for example, while the SPD includes an example of a backland garage site, its version has an area conveniently close to the site entrance for bin storage and collection, while the appeal site does not). I therefore consider that the appeal schemes would represent an "exceptional circumstance" in the SPD's terms, and the use of a "waste management strategy" condition would be appropriate.
16. Other servicing and deliveries would also be dependent on drivers being able to park their vehicles in or near the cul-de-sac end of Broseley Grove, and then walk goods up the site access to make the delivery. The Council expressed concern that no measures were proposed to prevent delivery vehicles accessing the site. The appellant suggested that a condition requiring signage to be erected could be imposed; had the Appeal B scheme been acceptable in all other regards, this would have addressed this matter. For Appeal A, where no vehicular access to the site is proposed, this would be more satisfactorily addressed by the "delivery and servicing plan" condition suggested by the Council.
17. The suggested "hard landscaping" and "boundary treatment" conditions would, between them, deal with the details of any gate, bollard or similar proposed for the entrance passageway. This would need to allow access to the site for emergency vehicles. However, at 18m, the access passageway would be shorter than the 20m maximum length above which the London Fire Brigade ("LFB") would seek the provision of turning facilities for a fire appliance, and I note that the LFB did not object to the scheme.
18. Subject to the use of such conditions, I conclude that the proposed development would make appropriate provision for waste collections and other servicing and deliveries. It would therefore comply with Policy 14 of the 2011 Lewisham Core Strategy ("the LCS"), Policy 33 of the 2014 Lewisham Development Management Local Plan ("the DMLP"), and Policy T6 of the London Plan 2021. Together, and among other things, these policies seek to ensure that new development makes adequate provision for convenient service, efficient deliveries, and emergency access. The development would also comply with the provisions of paragraphs 111 and 112 of the Framework, which require development to allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles, and which state that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Safe access – Appeal B only

19. For Appeal B, the proposed site layout shows three parking spaces within the front forecourt. The development would overall be likely to lead to a relatively low level of trip generation and vehicle movements. However, even though the access way is not long at around 18m, its narrow width would be likely to lead to some conflict between users as there would be very limited room for (say) a wheelchair user or someone with a pushchair to safely pass a vehicle entering or leaving the site. I also saw on my site visit that, because of the appeal site layout and the parking of vehicles on Broseley Grove, there is unlikely to be clear intervisibility between drivers wishing to enter the site and those wishing to leave. I accept that the accessway may have served the existing garages satisfactorily for a number of years, but would suggest that residents of the proposed dwellings would have higher expectations about the quality of access than people using a garage (whether for car parking or for other storage purposes).
20. The small number of parking spaces proposed within the site would also be likely, at times, to lead to some drivers entering the site, then having to leave immediately due to a lack of space. It is not clear from the evidence before me that vehicles would be able to turn around safely and conveniently within the site if the “official” spaces were occupied. This would also be likely to exacerbate the potential for conflict between the different users of the shared space.
21. I therefore conclude that proposed layout in Appeal B would not provide safe shared access to the development for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. The development would therefore conflict with Policy 14 of the LCS, Policy 33 of the DMLP, and Policy T6 of the London Plan 2021. Together, and among other things, these policies seek to promote and prioritise the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, and provide access which is convenient and safe both for drivers and pedestrians. There would also be conflict with the provisions of paragraph 112 of the Framework, which seek to minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

Living conditions for future occupiers – Appeal B only

22. As I have described above, the front first-floor bedrooms in Appeal B would have obscured glazing on the (approximately) west-facing windows, with only the north-facing panes glazed with clear glass. While this arrangement would be unlikely to have any significant adverse effect on daylight within those rooms, it would reduce the direct sunlight, or at least the effectiveness of direct sunlight, within those rooms. The north facing panes would also be narrow, and they would therefore offer a very limited outlook from the affected bedrooms.
23. The combination of these factors would result in the proposed Appeal B development not providing acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to outlook and sunlight. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy 32 of the DMLP, which requires new residential development to meet the functional requirements of future residents, including by providing a satisfactory outlook, and Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 which sets out standards for high quality housing.

Other Matters

24. I have had regard to the comments made by interested parties. To the extent that they are material, I have addressed the matters raised in my consideration of the main issues above.
25. I note the objections to the proposal from neighbours on Woodbastwick Road, who considered that the change in levels between the appeal site and their dwellings would result in the appeal schemes being dominant or overbearing. No substantive evidence was provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would cause significant harm in this respect; the information before me suggests that the separation distances are appropriate to ensure that significant harm would not arise. Concerns raised about potential impacts on trees outside the appeal site, and the potential for there to be some contamination in fill used to raise the ground levels on the site, can be addressed by appropriate conditions. None of the other matters raised has altered my overall decisions.

Conditions – Appeal A only

26. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance ("the PPG"). I have made some minor changes to the ordering and proposed wording, in the interests of clarity and effectiveness.
27. In addition to the standard time limit condition (1), in the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans (2).
28. As I have described above, I consider that a condition requiring the submission and approval of a construction management plan (3) is necessary to protect living conditions for neighbouring residents, and to ensure that the development does not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the transport network, and to comply with policies SI1 and T7 of the London Plan 2021. This is a pre-commencement condition, as it must necessarily apply to all phases of development work including demolition and other site preparation.
29. Conditions in respect of contamination (4, 5 and 6) are necessary to ensure that any potential site contamination is identified and remedied, and to comply with Policy 28 of the DMLP; for clarity I have broken the Council's original suggested wording for a single condition into these three parts. A condition to protect trees outside the appeal site (7) is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area, and to comply with Policy 12 of the LCS and Policies 25 and 30 of the DMLP. Conditions 3, 4 and 7 are pre-commencement conditions, as they must necessarily apply to all phases of development work including demolition and other site preparation.
30. A condition in respect of surface water drainage (8) is necessary to prevent an increased risk of flooding and to improve water quality in accordance with Policy SI12 of the London Plan 2021 Policy 10 of the LCS. Conditions relating to materials (9), hard landscaping (10), soft landscaping (11), and boundary treatments (12) are necessary to, among other things, protect the character and appearance of the area.
31. Conditions relating to biodiversity enhancements (13), biodiverse roofs (14), external lighting (15) and ecology surveys (16) are necessary to ensure that

the development protects and enhances biodiversity, and to comply with the provisions of the development plan, including Policy 12 of the LCS.

32. Conditions in respect of waste storage (17) and management (18) are necessary to protect living conditions for occupier of the proposed development, neighbouring occupiers, and to comply with Policy 13 of the LCS and Policy 30 of the DMLP. A delivery and servicing plan (19) is required to ensure that the development does not have an unacceptable effect on nearby roads, and to comply with Policy 14 of the LCS. A condition relating to cycle parking (20) is required to ensure adequate provision, and to comply with Policy 14 of the LCS and Policy T5 of the London Plan 2021, although it does not need to be a pre-commencement condition as originally suggested.
33. A condition relating to air source heat pumps (21) is necessary to help protect air quality, and a condition relating to water usage (22) is required to help limit the use of natural resources. These conditions are also necessary to comply with the provisions of Policy 23 of the DMLP (for condition 21) and Policy SI5 (condition 22) of the London Plan 2021. A condition relating to accessible housing is necessary to ensure that there is an adequate supply of such housing, and to comply with Policy 15 of the LCS, Policy 32 of the DMLP, and Policy D7 of the London Plan 2021. Conditions 21 and 22 also enforce optional standards within the Building Regulations.
34. A condition relating to obscure glazing (23) is necessary to protect neighbours' privacy and to comply with Policies 31, 32 and 33 of the DMLP.
35. Paragraph 53 of the Framework states that planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights unless there is clear justification for doing so, and the Planning Practice Guidance advises that conditions restricting the future use of permitted development rights or changes of use "may not pass the test of reasonableness or necessity". In this case, given the constrained nature of the site and the consistent design of the proposed development, I consider that it is necessary to remove permitted development rights relating to extensions in order to protect the character and appearance of the area, and to comply with Policy 15 of the LCS, though as no justification was provided for the wide-ranging block on alterations put forward by the Council I have worded the condition (24) so that it is less restrictive than originally proposed.
36. I have not imposed the suggested Construction Deliveries and Hours condition, as it would duplicate provisions within Condition 3. The suggested Arboricultural Method Statement condition would, to all intents and purposes, have duplicated the provisions of Condition 7. Neither of those suggested conditions is therefore necessary.

Conclusion – Appeal A

37. I conclude that the proposed development would make appropriate provision for refuse collections and other servicing and deliveries, and would comply with the development plan read as a whole.
38. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above I therefore conclude that Appeal A should be allowed and

planning permission granted, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Conclusion – Appeal B

39. I conclude that the proposed development in Appeal B would not provide safe and convenient access for all users, and would not provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers. It would therefore conflict with the development plan read as whole.
40. I have given full consideration to the arguments in support of the scheme which have been put to me, but there are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, Appeal B is therefore dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector

Schedule of Conditions – Appeal A

- 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 and documents:
 - LP – 01002 - Existing Block Plan
 - LP – 01001 – Site Location Plan
 - EL – 04101 – Existing North & South Elevations
 - EL – 04102 – Existing East & West Elevations
 - GA – 02100 – Existing Roof Plan
 - GA – 02000 - Proposed Level 00
 - GA – 02001 - Proposed Level 01 – REVISION A
 - GA – 02002 – Proposed Level 02
 - GA – 02003 – Proposed Roof Plan
 - EL – 04001 – Proposed North & South Elevations
 - EL – 04002 – Proposed East & West Elevations
 - SC – 03001 – Proposed Section A-A & B-B
 - SC – 03002 – Proposed Section C-C
 - Archaeological desk based assessment by RPS;
 - - Daylight and sunlight assessment by GL Hearn;
 - - Design and access statement (DAS) by Downen Farmer Architects;
 - - Bat emergence survey and report by Green Shoots;
 - - Energy and sustainability statement by eb7;
 - - Flood risk assessment and SuDS Strategy Report by eb7;
 - - Planning statement by MJP Planning;
 - - Statement of community involvement by Consult Communications;
 - - Transport statement by RPS; and
 - - Tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment by John Cromar
- 3) No development shall commence on site until such time as a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall cover:
 - (a) Dust mitigation measures.
 - (b) The location and operation of plant and wheel washing facilities
 - (c) Details of best practical measures to be employed to mitigate noise and vibration arising out of the construction process
 - (d) Details of construction traffic movements including cumulative impacts which shall demonstrate the following:
 - i. Rationalise travel and traffic routes to and from the site.

- ii. Provide full details of the number and time of construction vehicle trips to the site with the intention and aim of reducing the impact of construction related activity.
- iii. Measures to deal with safe pedestrian movement.

(e) Security Management (to minimise risks to unauthorised personnel).

(f) Details of the training of site operatives to follow the Construction Management Plan requirements and any Environmental Management Plan requirements (delete reference to Environmental Management Plan requirements if not relevant).

(g) Details of the construction hours and activity

The measures specified in the approved details shall be implemented prior to commencement of development and shall be adhered to during the period of construction.

- 4) No development or phase of development (including demolition of existing buildings and structures, except where enabling works for site investigation has been agreed by the local planning authority) shall commence until:

(a) A desk top study and site assessment to survey and characterise the nature and extent of contamination and its effect (whether on or off-site) and a conceptual site model have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

(b) A site investigation report to characterise and risk assess the site which shall include the gas, hydrological and contamination status, specifying rationale; and recommendations for treatment for contamination encountered (whether by remedial works or not) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council.

(c) The required remediation scheme implemented in full.

- 5) If during any works on the site contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified ("the new contamination"), the Council shall be notified immediately and the terms of Condition 4 shall apply to the new contamination. No further works shall take place on that part of the site or adjacent areas affected, until the requirements of Condition 4 have been complied with in relation to the new contamination.

- 6) The development shall not be occupied until a contamination closure report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council.

This shall include verification of all measures or treatments as required by Condition 4 and relevant correspondence (including other regulating authorities and stakeholders involved with the remediation works) to verify compliance requirements, necessary for the remediation of the site have been implemented in full.

The closure report shall include verification details of both the remediation and post-remediation sampling/works, carried out (including waste materials removed from the site); and before placement of any soil/materials is undertaken on site, all imported or reused soil material must conform to current soil quality requirements as agreed by the authority. Inherent to the above, is the provision of any required

documentation, certification and monitoring, to facilitate condition requirements.

- 7) No development shall commence on site until a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) has been submitted to and approved by the Council. The TPP should follow the recommendations set out in BS 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations). The TPP should clearly indicate on a dimensioned plan superimposed on the building layout plan and in a written schedule details of the location and form of protective barriers to form a construction exclusion zone, the extent and type of ground protection measures, and any additional measures needed to protect vulnerable sections of trees and their root protection areas where construction activity cannot be fully or permanently excluded.
- 8) No development above slab level shall commence on site until a scheme for surface water management, including specifications of the surface treatments and sustainable urban drainage solutions, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and thereafter the approved scheme is to be retained in accordance with the details approved therein.
- 9) No development above slab level shall commence on site until a detailed schedule and specification/samples of all external materials and finishes/windows and external doors/roof coverings/other site-specific features to be used on the buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 10) Prior to above ground works drawings showing hard landscaping of any part of the site not occupied by buildings (including details of the permeability of hard surfaces) shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include details of the access way and an associated scheme of external lighting for the access way. All hard landscaping works which form part of the approved scheme shall be completed prior to occupation of the development.
- 11) A scheme of soft landscaping (including details of any trees or hedges to be retained and proposed plant numbers, species, location and size of trees and tree pits) and details of the management and maintenance of the landscaping for a period of five years shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to construction of the above ground works.

All planting, seeding or turfing shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the completion of the development, in accordance with the approved scheme. Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
- 12) Details of the proposed boundary treatments including any gates, walls or fences shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to construction of the above ground works. The approved

boundary treatments shall be implemented prior to occupation of the buildings and retained in perpetuity.

- 13) Details of the location of 2 bat boxes or bricks and 5 bird boxes, and details of the number and location of the bee/bug hotels and hedgehog holes to be provided as part of the development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of above ground works and shall be installed before occupation of the building and maintained in perpetuity.

- 14) The development shall be constructed with a biodiversity living roof laid out in accordance with plan nos. GA-02003-Rev A hereby approved and maintained thereafter.

The living roofs shall not be used as an amenity or sitting out space of any kind whatsoever and shall only be used in the case of essential maintenance or repair, or escape in case of emergency.

Evidence that the roof has been installed in accordance with the approved plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.

- 15) Prior to occupation, a "lighting design strategy for biodiversity" shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall: show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the bat species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places; and not uplighting trees.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.

- 16) If works of the development hereby approved do not commence within 18 months of the survey that has been undertaken for the report, the ecology of the site should be re-assessed as the ecological situation may have changed in the intervening time.

All reports shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority including any recommended mitigation measures.

- 17) No development above slab level shall commence until details of proposals for the storage of refuse and recycling facilities for each residential unit hereby approved, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The facilities approved shall be provided in full prior to occupation of the development and shall thereafter be permanently retained and maintained.

- 18) No development above slab level shall commence until a waste management plan has been submitted for the residential accommodation and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The waste management plan shall be provided and implemented prior to the occupation of the development and shall thereafter be maintained.

- 19) The development shall not be occupied until a Delivery and Servicing Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall demonstrate the expected number and time of delivery and servicing trips to the site, with the aim of reducing the impact of servicing activity.

The approved Delivery and Servicing Plan shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details from the first occupation of the development and shall be adhered to in perpetuity.

- 20) No development above slab level shall commence until the full details of the cycle parking facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

All cycle parking spaces shall be provided and made available for use prior to occupation of the development and maintained thereafter.

- 21) No development above slab level shall take place until a scheme including the details of the location, type and specification and enclosure of the proposed Air source heat pump shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved plant shall be implemented in its entirety in accordance with details approved under this condition before any of the development is first occupied or the use commences and shall be retained as such thereafter.

- 22) Each dwelling shall be limited a maximum mains water consumption of 105 litres per person per day.

- 23) Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the new windows to be installed in the first-floor western elevation serving bathrooms of the building hereby approved shall be fitted as obscure and retained as such in perpetuity.

- 24) Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1, Class A of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions to the dwellings hereby permitted shall be carried out without the grant of further specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.