



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2024

by K Townend BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/W/23/3331195

Land Adjacent 25 Victoria Park Road, Malvern, Worcestershire WR14 2JU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Chris Warner on behalf of Castlethorpe Homes against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
 - The application Ref is M/22/01893/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of 4no. houses and associated landscape and highway works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of 4no. houses and associated landscape and highway works at Land Adjacent 25, Victoria Park Road, Malvern, Worcestershire WR14 2JU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref M/22/01893/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. As part of the appeal, the appellant has submitted a Heritage Rebuttal¹ responding to the Council's reasons for refusal. Annexe M of the Procedural Guide – Planning Appeals – England advises that if an applicant thinks that amending their application proposals would overcome the Council's reasons for refusal, they should normally make a fresh planning application. The appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme. In considering whether to accept the additional information, I have had regard to Holborn Studios Ltd².
3. The Heritage Rebuttal (HR) does not result in a fundamental change to the nature of the proposal over what was considered at the planning application stage. The HR provides additional information to support the appellant's statement of case. Moreover, the Council has had an opportunity to comment on the HR as it was submitted with the appeal. The HR would, also, not alter the effect of the proposal on the neighbouring residents. Consequently, no party would be unfairly prejudiced and, I have, therefore, considered the HR as part of the appellant's evidence in determining this appeal.
4. Both main parties have drawn my attention to a previous decision at the appeal site for the erection of three new dwellings³. That application was for a similar development as the appeal before me as it proposed new residential dwellings. However, the previous scheme was for three dwellings whereas the appeal before me is for four. The previous decision constitutes a valid fallback position

¹ Appendix C of the Appellant's Statement of Case – Land adjacent to 25 Victoria Park Road, Malvern: Heritage Rebuttal

² Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin)

³ Council reference 21/00652/FUL approved 27 October 2021

as there is a significant likelihood that the development, as approved, would take place should the appeal before me fail. I have, therefore, given substantial weight to the fallback scheme in considering this appeal.

5. While the South Worcestershire Development Plan Review has been submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination the Council advises that limited weight should be afforded to the review policies. The main parties do not rely on any Review policies within their submissions. Therefore, I have determined the appeal having regard to the adopted development plan which consists of the South Worcestershire Development Plan, adopted 2016 (SWDP).
6. The Council, in their statement of case, have also drawn my attention to Policy SWDP 6 of the SWDP. This policy relates to the historic environment and reflects the wording in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Policy SWDP 6 adds to the Framework and Policies SWDP 21 and SWDP 24 of the SWDP in that it requires consideration of the effect of a development on undesignated heritage assets. This policy is not referred to in the reason for refusal, however it was referred to in the officer report and the appellant has had an opportunity to comment on this policy as part of the appeal. Consequently, I have, therefore, had regard to Policy SWDP 6 as part of my assessment of the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

7. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Malvern Link Conservation Area.

Reasons

8. The appeal site is a parcel of land to the side of 25 Victoria Park Road, also known as Cannock House. It is situated on a corner of Victoria Park Road. The site was previously part of the garden to Cannock House and includes a single garage. It is enclosed along the roadside with a high stone wall and with fencing and brick walls to the rear and a new close boarded fence boundary with the host dwelling.
9. Victoria Park Road is a residential street. It connects to Worcester Road which is the principal shopping street in Malvern Link. The houses along the northern side of Victoria Park Road are large detached and semi-detached villas. Cannock House is shown on the historic maps as one of the earliest properties built on the road and previously had a larger plot than any of the other properties. The houses on the south side are later development and smaller in height and footprint but still detached and semi-detached properties.
10. The site lies within the Malvern Link Conservation Area (the Conservation Area). The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act) provides, at section 72(1), that with respect to any buildings or other land, in a Conservation Area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character, or appearance of that area.
11. The Malvern Link Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, January 2009 (CAA) details the historic development of the area and the characteristics which are of special architectural or historic interest. The Conservation Area is split into five different character areas. The appeal site lies in the area defined as "Villas fronting Victoria Park Road" which is two small

sections of properties on the northern side of Victoria Park Road, either side of the Co-op. The houses are detached and semi-detached villas of varied character, building types, and materials with high architectural quality that, collectively, create an impressive and varied frontage to Victoria Park Road.

12. I consider that the significance of the Conservation Area is informed, in part, by the linear form, with the main Worcester Road providing the commercial focus and residential streets leading off from Worcester Road. The area is set within the backdrop of the Malvern Hills and the CAA also notes that Victoria Park contributes to the setting of the buildings on Victoria Park Road.
13. The appeal site currently contributes positively to the Conservation Area by reason of being a prominent gap between buildings, the relationship with the stone-built Cannock House, and by reason of the stone boundary wall along the roadside boundary of the site. The gap enables views of Cannock House. The stone wall is a feature of the Conservation Area and such stone walls are noted in the CAA as an important contributor to the appearance and significance of the area.
14. Notwithstanding the appellant's assertions I consider that Cannock House is a non-designated heritage asset due to its prominence in the street scene, its architecture, and historic significance. Cannock House also contributes positively to the Conservation Area.
15. The appeal proposal would result in the development of the current gap between the buildings and within the setting of the non-designated heritage asset. The proposal would, therefore, alter the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
16. The CAA notes that all of the properties on Victoria Park Road are linked by their position, set back from the road with front gardens bound by low walls. The appeal scheme would also be set back from the road and would include front gardens and parking areas bound by the existing stone wall but with gaps created to access the parking spaces.
17. I accept that the proposed development would be set further back from the road than Cannock House and the neighbouring pairs of semi-detached villas. However, the proposed layout would ensure that the properties on plots 2 to 4 would relate to the proposed dwelling on plot 1 and would reflect the junction of the two sections of Victoria Park Road, even though it would not continue the existing building line or reflect the curve of the road.
18. The proposed layout would enable Cannock House to still be the prominent dwelling in the street scene, retaining views of this larger, detached, villa from further along Victoria Park Road. The development, albeit set further back than the existing housing, would respect the character of the Conservation Area and retain the prominence of Cannock House. Moreover, the proposed set back is of a similar distance to the fallback scheme which also included parking to the front of the properties.
19. The orientation of plot 1 is different to the rest of Victoria Park Road but the dwelling on this plot would be read alongside the buildings fronting Worcester Road. Furthermore, the orientation of this plot is similar to the approved fallback scheme. The layout of the proposal would be no more harmful to the character of the area or to Cannock House than that scheme.

20. By reason of proposing four new dwellings, rather than three, the plot widths would be narrower than the approved scheme. However, the appeal site is wider than the fallback scheme and provides more space to accommodate four dwellings. Moreover, from the evidence before me and my own observations of the area, the plot widths as proposed would not be significantly narrower than the semi-detached villas along the same side of Victoria Park Road.
21. The plot for Cannock House would be reduced from its original size and reduced to narrower than the approved scheme. Nevertheless, the plot for Cannock House would remain one of the larger plots on the street and would retain the prominence of this property as a non-designated heritage asset. For these reasons, the reduction in the plot size for Cannock House, beyond what was previously approved in the fallback scheme, would not be significantly harmful to the setting of the non-designated heritage asset or the Conservation Area.
22. There would be a narrower gap between plot 2 and plot 3 than any other gap in the area but there would be comparable sized gaps between plot 1 and plot 2 and between plot 4 and Cannock House. The gaps between buildings in the street scene are not a defining characteristic of the area and are not regular. The proposed development would add to the mix of plot sizes and gaps. Albeit proposing a tighter development layout than the other houses in the street the scheme would not appear cramped or contrived and, therefore, would not constitute overdevelopment of the site.
23. Overall, the layout, orientation and widths of the proposed development would respect the character of the area and the layout and density of the other properties along Victoria Park Road, as required by the CAA. The layout would also retain views of Cannock House as an important non-designated heritage asset on the street scene and would not be any more harmful than the fallback position. Moreover, the layout and orientation would respect the existing built form and the linear form of the Conservation Area.
24. Plot 1 is proposed as a two-storey dwelling to reflect the building on the corner of Worcester Road. Plots 2 to 4 would be three-storey with the third storey provided in the roof space and served by gable end windows and rooflights. The height of the proposed development would reflect the height of the existing houses and would not project above the height of Cannock House. In this regard the proposal complies with the guidance in the CAA.
25. The design detailing, including the gable windows, stone banding, decorative finials, barge boards and door surrounds pick up on architectural detailing from the other houses in this part of the Conservation Area whilst also adding new, yet respectful details, including the two-storey bay windows. Red brick and slate are noted as the predominant building material in the Conservation Area, but the CAA also notes a variety of building materials.
26. I acknowledge that plot 2 would be tall and narrow and that there are no other existing properties in the street scene of a similar form or massing. Nevertheless, plot 2, due to the layout of the other proposed plots, would not be read on its own, even when viewed from Pickersleigh Avenue. The whole development would be read as part of the wider street scene. For that reason, I find that the development, as a whole, would be acceptable. The proposed design and materials would be sympathetic to, and in keeping with, the mix of building materials and would add to the varied character, building types, and

materials along the frontage to Victoria Park Road. For these reasons, I find that the proposed dwellings would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

27. The existing stone boundary wall around the front of the site has signs of damage and some areas where planting is pushing the stone out from the wall. However, the proposal is to repair the sections of wall which are to be retained. As noted above, the existing wall also contributes positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and is a distinctive feature of this part of the Conservation Area, even in its current condition.
28. The CAA seeks to retain original stone boundary walls and seeks to resist the replacement of front gardens with hard standing. While that may be the case, the fallback scheme approved two new openings in the stone wall and the laying of hardstanding to create driveways to dwellings. The principle of the loss of parts of the wall and new driveways has already been accepted.
29. As the proposal creates two new vehicular openings, one which would provide access to two dwellings, the appeal proposal would result in the loss of more of the existing stone wall than the fallback position and, in that regard, the appeal before me would be more harmful than the fallback position. However, although the proposal would be more harmful, the additional loss of the stone wall which would result from widening one of the approved openings, would not result in significantly greater harm to the Conservation Area.
30. The development would retain large sections of the stone wall and would provide for the sensitive repair of the retained sections. The retained sections of the wall would remain prominent, and the repairs would enhance this characteristic feature of the streetscape, albeit with new openings created. The most prominent part of the wall, on the corner of Victoria Park Road, would be kept and could be maintained at its existing height. The creation of two new openings in the wall and the laying of hard surfaced driveways would result in some degree of harm to the significance of the Conservation Area. However, in my judgement, this harm is less than substantial.
31. I have no substantive evidence that the proposal would result in the loss of any of the existing ornate metal railings to the front of Cannock House, which is an important feature to the non-designated heritage asset. The retention of the railings and the finished height and design of the front wall to the appeal site could be controlled by a condition to require the details to be submitted for approval. Such a condition would also ensure that appropriate piers are provided at the new accesses.
32. For the reasons given above, and taking into account the fallback position, I find that the proposal would not result in harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, Cannock House.
33. The loss of sections of the wall would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Malvern Link Conservation Area. Despite this, the dwellings proposed would conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would enhance the character and appearance of the Malvern Link Conservation Area and find no conflict with Policies SWD 6, SWDP 21 and SWDP 24 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan, adopted 2016 (SWDP). These policies taken together, seek to ensure development is of a high design quality, integrates

with its surroundings, conserves, and enhances heritage assets and their settings, including undesignated heritage assets, and complement the character of the area.

34. In accordance with the Framework, the harm to the Conservation Area should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The development would provide four additional dwellings with the associated social and economic benefits both during and post construction. It would also accord with the Framework aim to boost the supply of housing. The site would be located so that occupants of the appeal dwellings would have access to the services and facilities of the settlement by foot or bicycle and therefore there would not be a dependence on the private vehicle for all journeys. Furthermore, the development would make efficient use of the site.
35. The Framework advises that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification and that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of the level of potential harm. For the above reasons, I find that the public benefits of the proposal have substantial weight and, therefore, would outweigh the harm to the CA and its significance, which in accordance with the Framework, is required to be attributed great weight. In coming to this view, I have also had regard to the fallback position.

Other Matters

36. In addition to the matters addressed above, concerns have been raised regarding a number of other matters including, but not limited to, the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring properties. The houses on Worcester Road have rear elevations with windows facing towards the appeal development. From the evidence before me there is sufficient separation distance between the existing properties and the proposed dwellings so as not to cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the properties on Worcester Road. The proposed dwelling on plot 1 would be close to the building on the corner of Worcester Road and Victoria Park Road, however the windows proposed in the first floor of plot 1 would not directly face the existing property.
37. The houses on the opposite sides of Victoria Park Road would all be separated by the road and also sufficient separation distances to restrict overlooking. The layout of the proposal would also ensure that the living conditions of the future occupants of Cannock House are not significantly affected. The windows in the side elevation of the existing dwelling, albeit retrofitted with film to obscure the glazing, would be forward of the proposed new dwellings.
38. The living conditions of the future occupants of the proposed development would also be acceptable given the separation distances to the neighbouring properties. Although the proposed dwellings are close to each other the buildings have been designed to ensure that there would not be unacceptable levels of overlooking and that the levels of light would be appropriate. Each plot would be provided with a garden of an appropriate size for the size of the dwelling.
39. Notwithstanding the concerns of the local representations, I have no substantive evidence that the development would result in harm to the trees within and around the site and the submitted Arboricultural Report sets out

tree protection measures which can be conditioned. The Biodiversity Report has also been accepted by the Council and I have no reason to disagree with their findings, notwithstanding the assertions made by interested parties regarding the use of the site by badgers.

40. With regard to the concerns on access, parking, highway safety and pedestrian safety matters, the proposal includes vehicular access and parking for each property, albeit in tandem form. Furthermore, the reduction in the area of land for Cannock House has reduced the ability for this property to provide any additional off-street parking and the appeal proposal results in the loss of the existing garage.
41. I saw at my visit that the existing house has space to the front for one vehicle. The proposal would provide two spaces for each of the new dwellings. I have no reason to find that the future occupants would not use the driveways to their full capacity. The Council raised no objections in regard to this matter and the scheme would not be significantly more harmful than the fallback position, even with the additional dwelling.
42. Moreover, there are no restrictions preventing on-street parking outside the site and although parking in this area is busy the comments received from third parties accept that this is influenced by the commercial businesses on Worcester Road. This corresponds with my observations on site where parking was only busy outside the appeal site and did not affect the availability of existing driveway accesses. Whilst the majority of on-street parking spaces were occupied at the time of my visit, there was sufficient room for vehicles to travel safely along the road. I saw no evidence of illegal or dangerous parking. The proximity of the site to services and facilities, including public transport, would also encourage alternative means of travel.
43. My attention has been drawn to an approved development noted as the Victoria Park Council Hub. I do not have the full details of that scheme or what considerations were given to parking provision for that development. Notwithstanding that consent, I have no substantive evidence that there is not sufficient space within the site and on the road outside the site to provide parking for the proposed development, including for Cannock House.
44. Construction vehicle movements and parking would be short term. The submitted Construction, Environment & Traffic Management Plan (CETMP) details the spaces that would be provided on site for parking, deliveries, and storage of materials. Any construction noise or other general disruption would also be short term and the CETMP also restricts hours of construction and deliveries to ensure that these are within reasonable daytime hours only. Any damage caused by the development would be a private matter between the parties and is not determinative in the appeal.
45. The development would provide environmental benefits through the proposed air source heat pumps and photovoltaic cells. The details of these features would need to be agreed with the Council to ensure that there is no harm to the character or appearance of the area or the living conditions of occupants of neighbouring properties. Electric vehicle charging facilities are also proposed and would need to be secured by condition. The green roofs to the flat roof sections at the rear of plots 2 to 4 would also provide environmental and biodiversity enhancements.

46. Interested parties, and the Council Conservation Officer, have suggested an alternative layout with access to all the properties serviced off the existing access or an alternative of two pairs of semi-detached houses. However, neither of those are the scheme before me, and I have to assess what has been proposed in the appeal.
47. I have also been made aware of a more recent planning application submitted to the Council under planning reference M/23/01632/FUL. This later application has not been determined and is not before me for consideration.

Planning Balance

48. Policies SWDP 2, SWDP 6, SWDP 21 and SWDP 24 of the SWDP are the most relevant policies in considering the proposal. None of these policies seek to restrict new housing within the development boundary and they are all consistent with the Framework. As I have found no conflict with any of the above policies, I find the development would not conflict with the development plans as a whole.
49. The main parties agree that the Council is not able to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. As the Council's emerging Local Plan is now at Regulation 19 Stage, the latest revisions to the Framework require a four-year housing land supply. Although the published figure is not a significant shortfall it is still a shortfall. Paragraph 11d) of the Framework therefore applies.
50. The proposal would accord with the Framework aim to significantly boost the supply of housing. I also acknowledge there would be general social and economic benefits and energy efficiencies and carbon savings as supported by the Framework. However, given the fallback scheme the proposal would only add one new dwelling over and above the approved scheme. The benefits are, therefore, limited.
51. For the reasons detailed earlier in this decision, I have found less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area and that this harm is outweighed by the public benefits. There is, therefore, no policies within the Framework, including those conserving and enhancing the historic environment, which would provide a clear reason for refusing the development. Furthermore, albeit that the benefits are limited, the adverse impacts of the development would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits I have identified when assessed against the Framework, taken as a whole. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies.

Conditions

52. The Council has provided a list of suggested planning conditions, which I have considered against the Framework and advice contained in the Planning Practice Guidance. I have undertaken some minor editing and rationalisation of the conditions proposed by the Council in the interests of precision and clarity.
53. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt. I have not specified the existing plans or the comparative overlay plan as these are not necessary given the other plans detail the approved scheme. In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the Conservation Area, I have included a

condition requiring the materials to be as listed in the Council's suggested condition.

54. I have combined the conditions requiring the provision of the parking areas and the requirement for the first five metres to be of a bound surface into one as both of these works relate to the same part of the development. This condition is necessary in the interests of highway safety and to ensure the provision of off-street parking for the development.
55. I have, however, not included the pedestrian visibility splay requirement as this would cause further loss of the stone boundary wall and greater harm to the Conservation Area. I have included conditions to secure electric vehicle charging points and cycle parking to encourage sustainability, the use of electric vehicles and alternative means of travel other than the car in accordance with Policy SWDP 21 of the SWDP and Policy MT3 of the Malvern Town Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2030, made 2019 (NP).
56. Given the residential nature of the immediate area and the local concerns regarding on-street parking I have included the condition to require the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted Construction, Environment and Traffic Management Plan and to restrict the hours of construction work.
57. In the interests of protecting and enhancing ecology and biodiversity, in accordance with Policy SWDP 30 of the SWDP and the Framework, I have included conditions requiring the details of mitigation measures to protect and enhance species and habitats. I also consider it is necessary, in the interests of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the Tree Protection Method Statement to ensure that all trees that are to be retained are protected during the construction works.
58. Additionally, in the interests of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area I have included conditions to require the submission of further details of the rooflights, joinery and renewable energy/low carbon energy generating measures. For the same reason, and to ensure that the existing stone wall is retained and repaired appropriately, I have included a condition to require the details of the height and finish of the wall and any proposed gate piers to be submitted to the Council for approval.
59. Conditions to require the properties to be connected to super-fast broadband and to ensure non-recycled water consumption levels are necessary to comply with Policies SWDP 26 and SWDP 27 of the SWDP, to provide the economic, and social benefits associated with broadband and to ensure that the development contributes towards reducing water consumption. To ensure that the surface water drainage scheme is provided and maintained, so as not to increase the risk of flooding, I have also included a condition to this effect.

Conclusion

60. The proposed development is in accordance with the development plan when considered as a whole. Having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

K Townsend

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans, all of which are prefixed with 5017862/RDG/XX: ST/PL/A/104B, ST/PL/A/103E, ST/PL/A/106C, XX/PL/A/100I, XX/PL/A/106D, XX/PL/A/107C, XX/DR/C/0502/P01, ST/PL/A/108 and XX/EL/A/110B.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the vehicle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with drawing no ST/PL/A/106C. The first five metres of each of the approved driveways, as measured from the edge of the carriageway, shall be surfaced in a bound material. Thereafter those spaces shall be retained for the parking of vehicles only and the first five metres shall be retained as a bound surface.
- 4) The development shall not be occupied until electric vehicle charging points have been provided in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The electric vehicle charging points shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be maintained for the lifetime of the development.
- 5) No dwelling shall be occupied until space has been laid out within the site for bicycles to be stored in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be kept available for the lifetime of the development.
- 6) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details provided in the Castlethorpe Homes Construction, Environment and Traffic Management Plan dated May 2023.
- 7) No development shall take place until a detailed Ecological Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement Strategy, based on the Pro Vision Preliminary Ecological Appraisal report dated December 2022, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Strategy shall include:
 - Mitigation measures to protect species and habitats during clearance and construction;
 - Details of the species mix and location of new planting;
 - Details and specifications of green roofs;
 - Specification and location of wildlife boxes;
 - Details and location of any new lighting (external and internal light spill from windows) and how lighting will avoid impacting existing and new wildlife features; and
 - Details of ongoing management, monitoring and remedial works as required for all biodiversity features and habitats.The Strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plan.
- 8) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the following materials:
 - Brick – Red Bespoke brick co. Spanish Red, Buff Ibstock Brunswick Buff or similar, Blue Wienerberger Rinko Falls.

- Roofing – Sandtoft Humber Flanders plain Clay & Bauder Sedum Blanket system.
 - Stone – Cast stone cills (semi-dry): Acanthus stone & Cast stone window cills: Acanthus Cast Stone.
 - Driveway – coloured tarmac: Ulticolour light buff.
- 9) No development above ground level shall take place until details of the design of the proposed rooflights and joinery details, including drawings at a scale of 1:20, 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) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details provided in the B.J Unwin Forestry Consultancy BS5837 Tree Constraints, Tree Impacts and Tree Protection Method Statement and the associated Tree Retention and Protection Plan drawing No. CHTRP-APR23.
 - 11) Within 6 months from the date of first occupation of the last of the approved dwellings the properties shall be connected to super-fast broadband.
 - 12) No development above ground level shall take place until details of the renewable and/or low carbon energy generation measures, including drawings showing the design and position of the proposed measures at a scale of 1:50, shall 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.
 - 13) Prior to first occupation of the dwelling hereby approved, details to demonstrate that the predicted non recycled water consumption of the property will be no more than 110 litres per day per person shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The development shall, thereafter, be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 14) Demolition, clearance, or construction works, including construction deliveries, shall take place only between 08:00 and 18:00 on Monday to Friday and between 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturday and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.
 - 15) Prior to the first occupation of any of the development hereby permitted, details of the height and finish of the front stone boundary wall and details of any new gate piers to be erected shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details before the buildings are first occupied and shall thereafter be maintained for the lifetime of the development.
 - 16) No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until the surface water drainage system for the site has been completed in accordance with the approved details. The surface water drainage system shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved management and maintenance plan.

*** END OF CONDITIONS ***