

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 4 July 2023

by G Sylvester BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2024

Appeal A Ref: APP/L5240/W/23/3315790

19 Ashburton Road, Croydon CR0 6AP

- 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 Abbas Datoos against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 22/00530/FUL, dated 3 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is alterations to the building at the rear of the site and associated alterations as part of the proposed change of use from storage and leisure into a self-contained dwelling.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/L5240/W/23/3315535

19 Ashburton Road, Croydon CR0 6AP

- 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 Abbas Datoos (ATF Construction Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 22/03215/FUL, dated 2 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is alterations to the building at the rear of the site and associated alterations as part of the proposed change of use from storage and leisure into a self-contained dwelling.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to the building at the rear of the site and associated alterations as part of the proposed change of use from storage and leisure into a self-contained dwelling, at 19 Ashburton Road, Croydon CR0 6AP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00530/FUL, dated 3 May 2022, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Applications for costs

3. Applications for costs were made by Mr Abbas Datoos against the decisions of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon in respect of Appeals A and B. These applications are the subject of separate decisions.

Procedural Matters

4. As set out above there are two appeals on this site. The appeal proposals differ in respect of the scale, layout and appearances of the proposed dwellings. Although I have considered each proposal on its individual merits, to avoid

duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.

5. The description of development on the application form for Appeal A is particularly detailed and therefore I have used the shorter description from the Council's decision notice for the banner heading above, which satisfactorily describes the development. The appellant used the same description on the appeal form. However, in determining Appeal A, I have had regard to the longer description in the appellant's application form. I have taken the postcode for the site address in Appeal A from the appeal form as the appellant has confirmed this to be the correct postcode.
6. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised on 19 December 2023 and is a material consideration in planning decisions. All references to the Framework in these decisions relate to the revised document. Having regard to the matters that are most relevant to these appeals, there are no material changes to the Framework of relevance to the substance of these appeals. Therefore, I am satisfied that no one would be prejudiced by the changes to the national policy context.
7. A third appeal¹ at the same site and relating to the same building is the subject of a separate decision.

Background and Main Issues

8. The Council has not submitted a Statement of Case for either appeal. However, in light of its refusal reasons and the representations of interested parties, I consider that the main issues in these appeals are:
 - The effects of the proposed developments on the character and appearance of the area, including whether they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the East India Estate Conservation Area (the CA).
 - The effects of the proposed developments on the living conditions of the occupiers of the flats at Number 19 Ashburton Road (No 19), with particular regard to the occupiers' outlook and privacy.
 - Whether the proposed developments would provide appropriate living conditions for future occupiers of the proposed dwellings, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance, including the CA.

9. The appeal site lies within the CA, and I have had regard to my statutory duty under s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance.
10. I have had regard to the Croydon Council - East India Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan – Supplementary Planning Document (2014) (CAA), and find that the character, appearance and significance of the CA is derived from the relationship between the area's distinctive linear street pattern and the rows of generally traditional residential buildings that front

¹ APP/L5240/W/22/3305726

onto them. Set on mostly consistent building lines, with generally long and narrow gardens to the rear, the rows of buildings give the CA an attractively formal and well-ordered character and appearance, with a relatively spacious rear garden scene.

11. The existing outbuilding, whilst not readily visible from vantage points accessible to the public at large, is visible from nearby properties, including the gardens and the upper floor windows in No 19, and the nearby flats. The scale and appearance of the outbuilding, whether lawful or not, detracts from the character, appearance and significance of the CA, that I have described above. I note that the respective Inspectors reached broadly similar conclusions in their determination of appeals submitted in 2019² (the 2019 appeal) and 2021³ (the 2021 appeal).
12. I acknowledge that a residential dwelling in this back garden location would not be consistent with the pattern of development in the area and that the CAA states that development in back gardens will generally not be permitted due to the potential disruption to the area's character and loss of green spaces. However, a large outbuilding already exists on the site and would likely be retained if this appeal fails. It is within this context that I have assessed the proposals.

Character and appearance, including the CA – Appeal A only

13. In Appeal A, the scale of the existing outbuilding would be reduced, and the design altered from that previously found to be unacceptable by an Inspector when dismissing the 2019 appeal. The reduced scale of the building would restore part of the appeal site to garden and enhance the sense of spaciousness in the garden scene, which is an important characteristic of the CA. The proposal would have a green roof with small roof lights set within it, windows in the east elevation, and an entrance door and narrow window in the south facing elevation. The large, glazed windows and doors serving the main living area would face away from No 19, and the nearby flat block at College Court. These windows and doors would likely be screened in views from the properties to the west by the tall rear boundary treatments.
14. Once established the green roof would assist the building in blending in sufficiently with the surrounding gardens in elevated views from nearby buildings, and its maintenance could be secured by a planning condition. The sparse pattern of relatively small window openings, which would retain a high proportion of blank walling, would be sufficient to avoid the proposed dwelling from appearing overly domestic in its setting, or industrial in character.
15. To address the issue of light spillage, the glazing within the building could be controlled to prevent this during the hours of darkness, such that a separate residential use in this location was not readily apparent. I have no substantive evidence that it would not be practicable to detect a breach in the operation of the 'blackout' glazing technology or that observers would not be able to visually detect whether it was operating or not during hours of darkness.
16. Given the scale of the dwelling, the increase in levels of activity associated with its occupation would be commensurately low and compatible with this residential area. The accumulation of domestic paraphernalia would likely be

² APP/L5240/W/19/3242553

³ APP/L5240/W/21/3266452

split between the two garden areas serving the proposed dwelling and limited in extent given the level of occupancy. The combination of the building itself and the boundary treatments would have a partial screening effect on views of paraphernalia from nearby properties, which would not be inconsistent with the surrounding garden scene within this residential area.

17. For these reasons, I conclude on this issue that the proposal in Appeal A would enhance the spaciousness of the appeal site and the contribution it makes to the character and appearance of the area. Taking the CA as a whole the proposal would have a neutral effect thereby preserving the character and appearance of the CA. The proposal would be consistent with Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021 (TLP) and Policy DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (the CLP), which amongst other requirements, seek to ensure that development is of a high quality that respects the pattern of development and preserves or enhances the character, appearance and significance of heritage assets.

Character and appearance, including the CA – Appeal B only

18. The scale of the existing outbuilding would be reduced along with changes in fenestration and the introduction of a green roof with fewer roof lights in a scattered pattern. The proposal would restore part of the appeal site to garden and enhance the sense of spaciousness in the garden scene, which is an important characteristic of the CA. However, the number, pattern and relatively large windows in the south elevation of the proposed dwelling would give it an overly domestic appearance that would clearly identify it as residential dwelling.
19. The proposed dwelling in this appeal would be materially different to the dwelling previously found unacceptable by the Inspector in the 2019 appeal. It would be smaller and would not have a covered porch or glass panel balustrade. Nonetheless, I have found that it would cause harm arising from the number and pattern of several large windows, and its consequential overly domestic appearance. As such, it would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA.
20. The wide floor to ceiling glass window serving the open plan kitchen/living/dining area would face away from No 19, and the nearby flat block at College Court, and therefore would not be particularly noticeable in the garden scene. This window would likely be screened in views from the properties to the west by the tall rear boundary treatments. Fitting the windows with the same type of glazing technology as proposed in Appeal A, would limit the likely spillage of artificial light out from the windows during hours of darkness, and would not cause harm. The visibility of the garden area of the dwelling would be restricted by the screening effect of the tall boundary treatments and the building itself, and therefore the appearance of paraphernalia would not be inconsistent with the surrounding garden scene. However, an absence of harm in these respects would not outweigh the harm identified in the paragraphs above.
21. I have had regard to the proposals in the dismissed 2021 appeal and a dismissed appeal in 2022⁴ (the 2022 appeal), which were not found to be harmful to the character or appearance of the CA. However, those dismissed appeal proposals, unlike the proposal before me in Appeal B, had fewer and

⁴ APP/L5240/W/22/3293516

smaller window openings, and therefore would not have appeared domesticated to the same degree. As such, the dismissed appeals are materially different to the proposal before me in Appeal B, and they carry limited weight in its favour.

22. I acknowledge that the Inspector in the 2022 appeal, found that there would be some benefit through the investment in the existing building which is currently in a poor state of repair. However, I am not persuaded that this appeal proposal would be the only means of achieving this objective and it therefore attracts limited weight in favour of it.
23. For these reasons, I conclude on this issue that the proposal in Appeal B would harm the character and appearance of the area, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As such, it would be contrary to TLP Policy D3 and CLP Policy DM10, which amongst other requirements, seek to ensure that development is of a high quality that respects the pattern of development and preserves or enhances the character, appearance and significance of heritage assets.
24. In terms of the Framework, I am required by Paragraph 205 to give great weight to the conservation of the CA as a designated heritage asset. The harm that would be caused by Appeal B to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset would be 'less than substantial'. Nevertheless, this is a matter of considerable weight and importance, and Paragraph 208 of the Framework requires me to weigh this harm against the public benefits of the proposal.
25. The public benefits associated with Appeal B, would include the delivery of a market housing unit that would contribute to housing supply in a sustainable location, readily accessible by public transport. The construction and occupation of the proposed dwelling would provide short term and lasting economic benefits through future resident's contributing to the local economy, using local services and facilities, and employing persons in the construction of the development. However, these public benefits are relatively small given the scale of the proposed development.
26. Given the above, the great weight that I attribute to the proposal's 'less than substantial' harm to the significance of the CA, would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Therefore, the proposal in Appeal B would conflict with the conserving and enhancing the historic environment objectives of the Framework.

Living conditions of No 19

27. The proposed dwellings in both appeals would be relatively low height structures, broadly similar to the height of the existing building, and set no closer to No 19, and with smaller footprints. As such, neither dwelling would have a dominant or overbearing effect on the outlook of the existing occupiers of No 19, which the evidence suggests is occupied as flats, in views from their rooms or communal garden. Furthermore, there would be no material reduction in light to nearby occupiers, given the reduced scale of the existing building.
28. A fence of sufficient height and solidity could be secured by planning conditions to adequately safeguard levels of privacy for the occupiers of No 19, in views from the gardens, access path, and rooms within the proposed dwellings. Set on the alignment shown on the submitted drawings for Appeal A, the distance

of separation between a suitably tall fence and the rear wall of No 19, would be sufficient to avoid a dominant or overbearing effect on the outlook of the occupiers of No 19, in views from their rooms and communal garden.

29. Views out of the high-level windows in the east facing elevation of the proposed dwelling in Appeal B, would generally be towards the sky or the upper parts of nearby buildings, and with satisfactory distances of separation between buildings. As such, their heights would limit the ability of future occupiers to see into the communal garden and the rooms within No 19, thus ensuring satisfactory privacy levels for the occupiers. I note that the proposed dwelling in the 2019 appeal included a proposed a high-level window and outdoor amenity space that would have faced No 19, and this was not considered to harm the existing occupiers' privacy.
30. Based on the evidence before me and my observations on the site visit, I am satisfied that the size of the retained communal garden area for No 19, even with new fencing erected, would be satisfactory for its purpose and would not harm the occupiers' living conditions.
31. Given their scales and likely low occupancy levels, the proposed dwellings in both appeals would generate relatively small increases in the levels of activity on the appeal site. Whilst this would occur close to nearby properties, it would not be dissimilar to existing activities within nearby gardens in this built-up area. Some noise and disturbance would be expected during construction works, particularly demolition works. However, the effects of this on the living conditions of nearby occupiers of residential properties could be appropriately mitigated by measures secured by condition through the agreement of a Construction Management Plan.
32. For these reasons, I conclude on this issue that the proposed dwellings in Appeals A and B would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 19, consistent with TLP Policies D3 and D6, and CLP Policy DM10, which amongst other requirements, seek to ensure that development delivers appropriate privacy and protects the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining buildings.

Living conditions of future occupiers – Appeal A only.

33. The proposed dwelling would be a dual aspect unit with principal windows in the east and west facing elevations serving bedrooms and the open plan kitchen, dining and living room. Views out of the bedrooms would be across the garden and towards the opposing proposed boundary fence, beyond which would be the open communal garden to No 19. Given the distances of separation between the fence and these bedroom windows, future occupiers would not be provided with an unacceptably oppressive or enclosed outlook. This fence would also restrict views from No 19 and into the east facing rooms and garden serving the proposed dwelling, thus safeguarding the privacy of future occupiers.
34. The glazing in the west elevation of the dwelling would provide views out of the open plan kitchen/dining/living room towards the opposing tall boundary treatment. The distance between the glazing and the boundary would be relatively short. However, the wide expansive of glazing, combined with the width of the garden, would ensure that the outlook for future occupiers of this room would not be dominated by the boundary treatments or oppressive. As such, future occupiers would not experience an unacceptable sense of

enclosure. Views from the upper floor windows of nearby properties and towards the proposed dwelling would not, given the distances involved, and the presence of boundary treatments, lead to unacceptable standards of privacy for future occupiers.

Living conditions of future occupiers – Appeal B only

35. There would be windows and glazed doors in the south, east and west facing elevations of the proposed dwelling. Views out of the bathroom and bedroom windows would face the opposing tall boundary wall across short distances. However, given the nature of the accommodation within these rooms, I am satisfied that this would not cause harm to the living conditions of the future occupiers.
36. The number of windows and extent of glazing to the open plan kitchen/dining/living area, would give the room a multi aspect. The principal outlook from this room would be out through the extensive glazing in the west facing elevation of the proposed dwelling. Due to the size of this room, views out from it would take in the garden and the opposing boundary walls. The walls of the building itself would also be visible. However, given the size and shape of the garden, and the wide expanse of glazing to the west facing elevation, the outlook for future occupiers would not be dominated by the boundary walls or the dwelling's wall. Therefore, future occupiers would not experience an unacceptable sense of enclosure or oppressive outlook.
37. Views out of the south facing windows of this room would be towards the opposing boundary wall at a short distance. Views out of the high-level windows in the east facing elevation would be somewhat restricted to views of the upper parts of nearby buildings and sky. Nonetheless, they would contribute to providing future occupiers with a sense of the outdoors and the building's surroundings, and access to light.
38. The height above ground level of the high-level windows along with their narrow shape, would limit the ability of the users of the communal garden at No 19, to see into the living areas of the proposed dwelling. Views from the upper floor windows of nearby properties and towards the proposed dwelling would not, given the distances involved, lead to unacceptable standards of privacy for future occupiers.

Living conditions of future occupiers – conclusion

39. The appeal proposals before me do not include an internal courtyard and are therefore materially different to the proposals found unacceptable by the previous Inspectors in the 2021 and 2022 appeals.
40. For the reasons given above, I conclude on this issue that the proposed dwellings in Appeals A and B, would provide appropriate living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to outlook. As such, the proposals would be consistent with TLP Policies D3 and D6 of TLP, and CLP Policy DM10, which seek to ensure that housing developments provide future occupiers with comfortable and functional layouts and deliver appropriate outlook taking account of the optimisation of site capacity and density.

Other Matters

41. The site for these appeals lies within an area where on-street parking is controlled and where services and facilities are readily accessible by modes of transport other than the car. To my mind a car would not be likely to be essential for future occupiers to meet most of their day-to-day travel needs. Based on the small scale of the development and my observations of the road conditions in the area, I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on parking in the area leading to inconvenience to residents, traffic congestion or harm to the safety of road users. Suitable facilities for cycle storage could be secured by condition to encourage cycling. Although a dedicated off-road car parking space is proposed, the appeal proposal is described as a standard market dwelling. For the above reasons, the car parking space would not be necessary to make the development acceptable.
42. The proposed dwellings are low-rise structures with smaller footprints than the existing building. Therefore, neither proposal would result in harm to the living conditions of nearby occupiers through a loss of outlook or light. Views out of the windows and doors in the proposed dwellings would generally, with the exception of No 19 described above, face opposing tall boundary treatments and would not cause a harmful loss of privacy for the occupiers of nearby properties. It is noteworthy that the Council found similar in this regard.
43. There are locally listed buildings to the west of the appeal site and fronting onto Outram Road, which the CAA⁵ identifies as Numbers 30-32. Based on the CAA, and my observations the significance of these buildings is derived primarily from their architecture, where they contribute to a group of villas which display a consistent scale, massing, height, fenestration and doorways, front garden and boundary arrangements. The existing building on the appeal site is a low-rise structure set some distance away from these locally listed buildings, and separated from them by tall boundary treatments, and long rear gardens. There is relatively limited intervisibility between the appeal building and the locally listed buildings, particularly in the most important views of those buildings from Outram Road. Furthermore, the appeal proposals would reduce the scale of the existing building. For these reasons, I find that the appeal proposals would not harm the significance of the locally listed buildings.
44. The distance over which future occupiers of either proposed dwelling would be required to either wheel a loaded bin or carry waste and/or recycling to the bin storage area would not be excessively inconvenient. Based on the evidence submitted and my observations, the route between the proposed dwellings and the bin store would be along a hard surfaced path on generally level ground. I note the Council had no objection in this regard subject to the imposition of conditions. Details of refuse storage arrangements to achieve good refuse management would be secured by condition.
45. The footprint of the existing building would be reduced and with no incursion beyond the existing footprint. Therefore, based on my observations and the evidence available, I find that the trees and planting growing close to the boundaries would not be harmed by the appeal proposals.
46. The accuracy of the drawings of the appeal proposals is not in dispute between the main parties. The Council's Committee reports refer to the submission of

⁵ Paragraph 6.5.6

amended drawings resolving previous inconsistencies. I am satisfied that the drawings are sufficiently accurate to allow a thorough assessment of the appeal proposals' impacts to be made. Demolition of the boundary wall to College Court, or the insertion of a gate into this wall, are not shown on the drawings for either appeal, nor described as being part of either appeal proposal. As such, they form no part of my consideration in this appeal.

47. I am advised that parts of the appeal building and access to it are located on land not within the ownership or control of the appellant. However, no detailed or definitive evidence has been presented to demonstrate this to be the case. In any case, for the purposes of my determination of these appeals, matters related to the ownership of the land are separate to my assessment of the proposals planning merits and have not influenced me.
48. The appeal proposals are described as for the alteration of the existing building and not its complete replacement. I have determined the appeals on that basis. I note that these appeals follow several previous planning applications and related appeals for development on the site. All citizens have a right to submit planning applications and appeals for determination by the relevant authorities. The financial motivations of the appellant have not influenced my consideration of these appeals. I have limited details of the appellant's other developments and do not find them of relevance to my considerations in these appeals, which are based on their individual merits.
49. I have no substantive evidence that emergency services would be unable to access the proposed dwellings in either appeal. A condition requiring adherence to the submitted fire safety details would be necessary in the interests of safety.
50. I have no substantive evidence that the extent of glazing in either appeal proposal would lead to unacceptable heat loss.
51. There are some broad similarities between the appeal proposals before me and the previous appeals on this site. However, appeals are evidence and fact specific, and must be determined on their individual merits. I have determined these appeals on their own merits with careful regard to those previous appeals. Given the fact specific nature of the appeals before me, I see no reasons why they would set a precedent for other back garden developments in the area.

Conditions – Appeal A only

52. The Council has not provided a Statement of Case setting out a detailed list of planning conditions. However, the Council's Committee Report lists the headings of several conditions, which I have considered in accordance with the tests set out in the Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework, including seeking the main parties views on them. The appellant has given written approval to the pre-commencement condition. In the interests of certainty of the planning permission granted, the approved drawings are specified in a condition.
53. The location of the development site is in close proximity to nearby residential properties and gardens. To protect the living conditions of nearby occupiers a condition requiring adherence to a Construction Management Plan is necessary.

54. The appeal site is located in an area where on-street parking is controlled, and traffic movements were observed to be relatively low. Given the scale of the proposed developments, the evidence before me does not justify the necessity to control the parking of vehicles during construction. Furthermore, in the context of the proposal's scale, requiring dedicated facilities for the loading and unloading of plant and materials; precautions to guard against the deposition of mud on the public highway, or details of site hoardings, would be unreasonably excessive and unnecessary.
55. A condition controlling external materials and glazing is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area. I see no basis on the evidence before me to require the agreement of these details before the commencement of development and have amended the wording accordingly.
56. Conditions requiring the provision of bin storage and cycle parking, and the management of storage and collection are necessary to ensure satisfactory servicing of the development and to preserve the character and appearance of the area.
57. A landscaping scheme, including details of the green roof, is necessary to ensure the development responds appropriately to the character and appearance of the area, and to ensure that boundary treatment protecting privacy is provided. I have required an implementation programme to be agreed by the Council to ensure coordinated delivery of the various elements of the scheme.
58. In accordance with TLP Policy D12, a condition requiring adherence to the submitted fire safety details is necessary in the interests of safety.
59. The Council's Committee Report refers to CLP Policy SP6.3 as requiring all new build residential development to achieve the national technical standard for energy efficiency in new homes set at a minimum of 19% CO2 reduction beyond Part L of the Building Regulations and requiring new build development to meet a minimum water efficiency standard of 110 litres/person/day. However, the proposal is for change of use and alterations, not a new build dwelling. On the evidence before me, I cannot be certain that these requirements apply to the appeal proposal, and as such I have not required it to comply with them.

Planning Balance and Conclusions

60. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the proposed development in Appeal A is consistent with the development plan as a whole and it should be allowed.
61. I have found that the proposed development in Appeal B, would harm the character and appearance of the area, and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As such, it would be contrary to the requirements of TLP Policy D3 and CLP Policy DM10, insofar as they seek to ensure that development is of a high quality that respects the pattern of development and preserves or enhances the character, appearance and significance of heritage assets. I give considerable importance and weight to the harm to the CA, which would bring the proposal in Appeal B into conflict with the development plan as a whole. I give significant weight to the appeal proposal's conflict with the development plan in this regard. It would also

conflict with the conserving and enhancing the historic environment objectives of the Framework.

62. I acknowledge that Council Planning Officers recommended the proposal in Appeal B for approval. I have no reason to doubt that it would accord with the objectives in several TLP and CLP policies that seek to make efficient use of land and reuse existing buildings for housing in parts of London that are well connected to public transport⁶, which this site is. As a smaller dwelling it would likely be more affordable than a larger dwelling and would contribute to the Borough's housing targets, including on windfall sites. It would exceed internal space standards and I have no reason to find that it would not be sufficiently accessible. Investment in the existing building, which is in a poor state of repair, would bring some limited benefit to the appearance of the site and area.
63. I acknowledge that the proposal in Appeal B would not result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties and it would provide the intended future occupiers with adequate living conditions. Although there is an absence of harm in these respects, this does not weigh positively in favour of the Appeal B proposal.
64. The benefits of the additional housing unit in Appeal B, would be small and of limited weight in its favour. Taken together with the material considerations referred to above, the benefits of Appeal B do not carry sufficient weight to outweigh the harm I have identified, nor do they indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the decision should be made in accordance with the development plan and Appeal B should be dismissed.

G Sylvester

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions - Appeal A only

- 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: Location Plan; PR.00 Revision A; PR.01 Revision B; PR.02; and PR.03.
- 3) No development, including demolition, shall commence until a Construction Management Plan, to include the following information, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - a) Hours of demolition and construction;
 - b) Hours of deliveries; and
 - c) Dust control methods.

⁶ Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4

The approved Construction Management Plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period of the development.

- 4) No development above floor slab level shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.
- 5) No development above floor slab level shall take place until a scheme for the glazing of the windows and rooflights of the development hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include full details of the glazing, its method of operation and operating hours. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme, and thereafter retained and operated in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 6) No development above floor slab level shall take place until details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - a) cycle parking provision including the type of cycle stands.
 - b) bin storage facility, including the size and number of bins.

The dwelling shall not be occupied until the cycle parking facility and bin storage facility have been provided in accordance with the approved details and thereafter kept available for the parking of cycles and storage of bins and used for no other purpose.

- 7) No development above floor slab level shall take place until details of hard and soft landscape works, together with a programme for their implementation, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Hard landscaping shall include hard surfaces, walls, fences or other means of enclosure. Soft landscaping shall include species, size and density of new planting, including details of the green roof. The hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the approved implementation programme. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 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 unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.
- 8) The dwelling hereby permitted shall not be occupied except in accordance with a Waste Management Plan, specifying how refuse from the site would be managed and collected, that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 9) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Fire Statement dated 24 February 2022.