



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2024

by Stephen Normington BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/23/3326630

Bicton Heath House, Knowsley Drive, Bicton Heath, Shrewsbury SY3 5DH

- 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 Mrs Field, Minster Care against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00765/FUL, dated 20 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing care home wing and proposed new build care home wing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing care home wing and proposed new build care home wing at Bicton Heath House, Knowsley Drive, Bicton Heath, Shrewsbury SY3 5DH in accordance with the terms of application Ref 23/00765/FUL, dated 20 February 2023, subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Minster Care against Shropshire Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural matters/Background

3. The Council granted planning permission in 2021 for the "Erection of single storey and two storey extensions and reconfiguration of existing building to create a total of 29 bedrooms with en-suites; to include some demolition" (Ref. 21/01030/FUL) (2021 permission). This was a resubmission of previous planning permissions which had lapsed. I have no evidence to suggest that this permission has been implemented or that it remains otherwise than extant.
4. Prior to my determination of this appeal, the Council granted planning permission on 7 February 2024 for "Proposed demolition of existing care home wing and proposed new build care home wing (resubmission)" (Ref. 23/03972/FUL) (2024 permission). The approved development has a similar footprint and site layout to the appeal scheme and is of similar scale and mass. However, the fundamental difference with the appeal scheme is that the approved development has a different roof form which comprises a series of pitched roofs. I have no evidence to suggest that this permission has been implemented.

5. In my view, the above extant planning permissions constitute 'fallback' schemes and their relevance, where appropriate, is considered later in this Decision.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of prospective occupants with particular regard to open space.
- The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of nearby dwellings with particular regard to overlooking and loss of privacy.
- The effect of the proposed development on existing trees within the site.
- The effect of the proposed development on highway safety and the living conditions of nearby residents with particular regard to parking provision.
- The effect of the proposed development on the special interest of the non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The appeal site comprises an existing care home located in a predominantly residential area and accessed off a cul-de-sac. The surrounding properties comprise predominantly detached two storey dwellings having pitched roofs with some bungalows on Knowsley Drive. A private car park is located to the east and separated from the appeal site by well-established hedgerow planting and fencing. Owing to the juxtaposition with surrounding development and existing boundary features, substantial views of the site are mainly restricted to those from the cul-de-sac forming Knowsley Drive.
8. The care home currently has 50 beds, across two sections comprising the 'main house' (which is the subject of the appeal proposal) and a relatively modern rear extension block. The 'main house' has 22 bedrooms and is identified by the Council as a non-designated heritage asset. The proposed development would involve the demolition of the 'main house' and the construction of a predominantly two storey replacement building with some single storey elements.
9. The proposed replacement building would provide 30 ensuite bedrooms and ancillary facilities including lounge rooms and would incorporate amenity spaces both as first floor terraces and shared external amenity space at ground level. The building would be constructed of red brick with some timber cladding and would have flat roofs, some of which would be provided as 'green' roofs. Overall, the design would comprise a modern contemporary building.
10. The Council considers that the appeal proposal would constitute overdevelopment and result in a built form having a cramped and dominating appearance.

11. In my view, the appeal site is sufficiently large to accommodate a building of the scale and mass of the appeal proposal without the development appearing cramped. The appeal proposal would result in predominantly extending to the front of the 'main house' into the existing car park area whilst still retaining car-parking provision. Moreover, the proposal would have a very similar footprint, scale and mass to the building approved as part of the 2024 permission with the material difference being the replacement of the flat roofs with pitched roofs. Whilst there would be some incursion of built development towards the western site boundary this would not be of a scale that would cause an appearance of overdevelopment.
12. Whilst I recognise that each proposal has to be considered on its own individual planning merits, the Council has previously accepted a redevelopment scheme at the site which has a very similar footprint, scale and mass to the appeal proposal before me. In these circumstances, I have no other substantive evidence to suggest that there are material considerations in the appeal proposal which would result in a cramped form of development beyond that which the Council has found acceptable in the 2024 permission.
13. The materials proposed to be used in the construction of the development are influenced by the local vernacular. Although the use of flat roofs are not a predominant feature in the locality, in this case they serve to reduce the height of the structure than would otherwise be the case with an alternative roof form. Furthermore, given the limited views of the appeal site from public vantage points and its juxtaposition with surrounding development, I do not consider that the use of flat roofs in this case would be materially detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
14. In initial views of the appeal site on the approach from Knowsley Drive, the façade of the 'main house' is prominent but on closer approach it is apparent that the northern façade displays a number of haphazard extensions. The contemporary style of the proposed building would exhibit a more homogenous appearance and, for similar reasons as above, the juxtaposition with residential surrounding development would not cause its appearance to materially conflict with the character of the surrounding area.
15. As a consequence of the above, I am satisfied that the proposal would not constitute cramped and overdevelopment of the site. Furthermore, the contemporary design and use of flat roofs in this case would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the site or the surrounding area. As such there would be no conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy CS6 of the Shropshire Core Strategy (Core Strategy) or Policy MD2 of the Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan 2015.

Living conditions - prospective occupants

16. The Council indicates that the proposed development would not provide a satisfactory level of private amenity space and on-site open space for use by the current and prospective occupants of the care home. In particular, Policy MD2 of the SAMDev requires that open space of at least 30 square metres (sqm) per person should be provided to meet the local needs in terms of function and quality.
17. The Appellant considers that Policy MD2 is applicable to residential development and does not strictly apply to a care home setting. Furthermore,

my attention has been drawn to a High Court Challenge, *R (Fraser) v Shropshire Council* [2021] EWHC 31 (Admin), which related to the application of Policy MD2. The Court held that a scheme which does not provide the required 30 sqm of amenity space per person can nonetheless fully comply with the policy. The overarching test is whether the scheme provides a suitable amount of amenity space, and this involves a planning judgment to be made.

18. The Appellant suggest that the appeal proposal would provide 616 sqm of garden space with an additional 36 sqm provided in the external first floor balconies, bringing the total outdoor amenity space to 652 sqm. This is approximately a 6% decrease on the current provision. However, I accept the Appellant's view that the proposal would result in a significant improvement to the internal amenity space of the care home which would include a quiet lounge, dining room and secondary lounge on each floor. In addition, the prospective occupants would benefit from larger bedroom and ensuite bathrooms. External views from bedrooms would also be improved by the provision of larger windows which would likely be a benefit over the existing situation.
19. I am mindful that the 2021 permission would provide for 29 ensuite bedrooms with similar levels of open space to that which would be provided in the appeal proposal. Furthermore, the 2024 permission, which has a very similar layout and footprint to the appeal proposal, would provide for 30 bedrooms and has a similar amount of outdoor and internal amenity space. Therefore, the Council has previously accepted redevelopment schemes at the appeal site which provide a lower amount of amenity space to that referred to in Policy MD2.
20. In considering the amount of open space provided in the appeal scheme, the nature of the use must be taken into account. The Appellant indicates that the care home provides care for a mix of younger adults with mental health conditions and older residents with dementia, many of whom need close supervision and may have mobility issues. The use of the external amenity areas is co-ordinated to cater for variations in medication times, mealtimes and group activities. As such, not all residents would be able to use the external amenity areas at any one time.
21. Residents would not likely be seeking active open space but rather areas of social space which can provide places to sit and have some interaction with staff, other residents and visitors. Many would need assistance to access external areas. In this context, it is reasonable to conclude that a lower level of outdoor space would be acceptable.
22. Whilst the quantum of external amenity space would be slightly less than existing, the appeal proposals would result in predominantly extending the front of the building into the existing car park area and would not materially impact on the availability of external amenity space. The submitted landscaping plan demonstrates that there would be a degree of improvement to the quality of the external areas. Furthermore, there would be significant improvement in the quality of internal amenity space.
23. Taking into account the nature of the use and the improvements to internal amenity areas that would be provided, on balance, I am of the view that the amount of amenity space proposed would provide adequate living conditions for future residents and would represent a considerable improvement in the quality of such space beyond the current situation. Consequently, I do not

consider that the appeal scheme would materially conflict with the provisions of Policy MD2 of the SAMDev.

Living conditions – nearby residents

24. The existing building has a relatively large, two storey extension positioned to the front of the main entrance building (non-designated heritage asset) which would be retained as part of the extant 2021 permission. Although there are no windows on the western elevation of this extension it is positioned close to the site boundary with properties on Foxley Grove. The Appellant indicates that in parts the extension is less than 10m away from the façade of the nearest dwelling on Foxley Grove.
25. The appeal proposal would result in a flat roof single-storey element of the scheme being positioned close to the western site boundary with the nearest property on Foxley Grove with the 2-storey element being located further away to the east. The two storey elements of the appeal scheme would be set further back from the site boundary than the existing buildings. In my view, the appeal scheme would reduce any potential overbearing impact of the existing situation and that which may result as a consequence of an implementation of the 2021 permission.
26. On the western elevation there would be two windows at first floor level serving bedrooms 18 and 19. However, due to the orientation of existing dwellings on Foxley Grove, there would be no direct overlooking of the windows of the nearest properties. In this regard, the Appellant indicates that a separation distance of over 20m would be achieved and I have no evidence to suggest that this may be incorrect. Other windows at first floor level would serve a corridor and would be obscurely glazed. In addition, tree planting is proposed along the western boundary which would provide a degree of screening and negate opportunities for overlooking.
27. It is inevitable that there would be the potential for some degree of overlooking into the gardens of the nearest residential properties. However, I do not consider that this would be of any greater extent than would reasonably be typically expected to occur between residential properties in a suburban environment such as that in which the appeal site is located. As such, any overlooking of the gardens, would not cause a loss of privacy of an extent that would warrant the dismissal of this appeal on such ground.
28. Overall, I do not consider that the appeal proposal would result in any material overlooking or loss of privacy that would be of an extent to cause demonstrable harm to the living conditions of occupants of nearby residential properties. As such, there would be no conflict with the provisions of Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy, Policy MD2 of the SAMDev and paragraph 2.15 of the Type and Affordability of Housing, Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

Effect on trees

29. The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and Tree Survey demonstrate that the proposed development would require the removal of four individual trees. Two of these are identified as category B (moderate value) and two are category C (low value). I have no evidence to suggest that these trees are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

30. The Council's Tree Officer raised no objection to the proposed development but recognised that the loss of these trees would have a moderate impact on tree resource on the site and the wider area which would affect canopy levels and the amenity value provided by the trees. The Tree Officer identified that these concerns could be compensated through new planting but commented that the submitted landscaping plan did not show sufficient details of the proposed replacement planting.
31. The Appellant has submitted a tree planting scheme and planting schedule which identifies that nine replacement trees would be planted at a planting height of between three and four metres. In my view, the proposed planting adequately compensates for the loss of the four trees. Furthermore, given the proposed planting height, the replacement trees would make a significant visual contribution to the character of the site and surrounding area from the date of planting.
32. The Council has also raised concerns regarding proposed works within the Root Protection Area (RPA) of trees T4 and T6. The Appellant identifies that the RPA of these trees already consists of hardstanding which will be resurfaced as part of the proposed development. The AIA identifies that the original sub-base in the location of these trees will be re-utilised and, as such, there will be no need for any excavations within the roots and no likely damage to the trees.
33. Taking into account the evidence provided in the AIA, I consider that a suitable planning condition could be imposed requiring the submission of a method statement for the works proposed in the vicinity of the RPA and that appropriate arboricultural supervision is employed during the period of such works. Subject to the imposition of such condition, I am satisfied that the proposed development would have no material adverse impact on the RPA of trees T4 and T6.
34. The Council also raised concerns that the routing of the proposed drainage infrastructure would have a detrimental effect on the RPA of trees on the site. The AIA sets out that preferably works to install utility apparatus and drainage should be routed outside the RPA but if this is not possible then trenchless insertion methods or the use of hand tools, together with arboricultural supervision, would minimise any risk of root damage.
35. In my view, the use of the above methods to instal drainage systems within the proximity of RPAs is common on construction projects. I also note that the Council's Tree Officer did not raise any significant concerns regarding the proposed drainage installation. Furthermore, an appropriately worded planning condition could be imposed requiring the details of such works and securing arboricultural supervision during the relevant construction period.
36. Taking the above factors into account, I consider that the proposed replanting scheme would adequately compensate for the loss of the four trees and that appropriate measures can be employed, secured by an appropriate planning condition, to protect the integrity of the root system of trees that are to be retained. As such, there would be no material conflict with the provisions of Policies CS6, CS17 and CS18 of the Core Strategy and Policies MD2 and MD12 of the SAMDev.

Highway safety and parking provision

37. The Appellant indicates that there are currently 8 car parking spaces available within the appeal site. The proposal would increase the on-site parking provision to 13 spaces. The Appellant also indicates that the Council has no known policy requirements regarding the design and number of car parking spaces for a care home land use.
38. The Council has not drawn my attention to any particular car parking requirements that would be applicable to the development proposed, nor do I have any evidence that the current care home use results in cars having to frequently park on the nearby residential streets.
39. The submitted evidence suggests that the proposal would not require any additional staff during the daytime but would require one additional member of staff to be employed for night time duties. The Highways Supporting Statement (HSS) has considered the impact on car parking as a consequence of the additional proposed bedrooms using the TRICS Database. This identifies that the proposal would have a minimal impact on car parking requirement with a maximum of 1 to 2 additional vehicles spread across the working day.
40. Taking the above factors into account, I am satisfied that the proposed additional 5 car parking spaces would be sufficient to meet the likely increase in parking demand arising from the proposed development. Furthermore, the proposal would provide a degree of betterment in terms of the overall availability of car parking spaces from the number that currently exists.
41. Turning to traffic generation on the local highway network, the HSS demonstrates that the proposal would result in no increase in two-way trips on the AM peak (08.00 to 09.00) and would generate one additional trip during the PM peak (17.00 to 18.00). The HSS also identifies that the proposed uplift of eight care-home bedrooms is calculated as generating a total of 3 two-way trips in the busiest interpeak hours (14:00 to 15:00 and 15:00 to 16:00). This equates to an additional vehicle on the local highway network every 20 minutes and I accept the Appellant's view that this would result in a negligible impact on the local highway network.
42. Swept path analysis drawings demonstrate that the proposed layout provides satisfactory manoeuvring space for use by refuse collection and servicing vehicles.
43. I have no contrary evidence to suggest that the analysis contained within the HSS may be incorrect. In my view, the proposal would have negligible impact on the local highway network and would provide sufficient parking provision to accommodate the likely increase in parking demand arising from the additional eight bedrooms. Furthermore, I do not consider that the proposal would result in any demonstrable increase in on-street parking demand on the nearby residential area.
44. As a consequence of the above, the proposal would not be materially detrimental to highway safety or the free flow of traffic on the local highway network. As such, there would be no conflict with Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.

Non-designated heritage asset

45. The part of the existing care home which is proposed to be demolished dates back to the mid-19th Century and is identified by the Council as a non-designated heritage asset. The proposal would result in a total loss of heritage significance of the building.
46. The submitted Heritage Statement identifies that, although the core of the building survives as a former country villa, the building has been significantly altered, including the façade and much of the interior. In particular, the former appearance of the north elevation has been largely altered to remove nearly all the intended faux-Medieval character. There is piecemeal survival of traditional features.
47. The Heritage Statement concludes that the current building is the shell of a 19th century former villa, with occasional survival of some traditional features of common type and materials. The building is considered to hold only a limited amount of evidential architectural interest and the Heritage Statement identifies that a low level of heritage significance remains. Overall, the proposal is considered to result in Less than Substantial Harm to the non-designated heritage asset, but this is at the very lowest part of that spectrum.
48. Paragraph 209 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) identifies that in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Furthermore, Policy MD13 of the SAMDev identifies that proposals which are likely to have an adverse effect on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset will only be permitted if it can be clearly demonstrated that the public benefits of the proposal outweigh the adverse effect.
49. The appeal proposal will result in the complete loss of the non-designated heritage asset. Therefore, in accordance with the national and local policy background set out above it is necessary for me to consider, in the planning balance below, the public benefits of the proposed development in coming to a balanced judgement regarding the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Other matters

50. I have taken into account the concerns of Shrewsbury Town Council, Shrewsbury Civic Society and local residents regarding, amongst other things, the loss of the designated heritage asset, loss of trees, loss of privacy, impact on wildlife, noise and disturbance from construction works and the effect on drainage infrastructure. Some of these matters have been considered above or can be made the subject of an appropriate planning condition which is considered below. Although the remaining matters have been carefully considered, they do not alter the main issues which have been identified as the basis for the determination of this appeal, particularly in circumstances where the Council's reasons for the refusal of planning permission does not identify any objection to the appeal scheme for these other reasons.
51. My attention has also been drawn to a recent appeal decision for redevelopment of a site at Market Drayton to provide a circa 60 bed care home (Ref. APP/L3245/W/23/3323546). However, I do not have full details of the

nature of the proposals or all of the circumstances and material considerations that were relevant to the determination of that appeal. Consequently, I cannot be sure that this is wholly representative of the circumstances in this appeal. In any case, this has not led me to a different conclusion on the main issues of this appeal which I have determined on its own merits.

Planning Balance

52. I have found that the proposed development would not be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, would not have a significant detrimental impact on the living conditions of the occupants of nearby residential properties and would make adequate provision for the parking of cars associated with the use of the extended care home. In addition, I am satisfied that the proposal would make adequate provision of internal and external amenity space for the use of the existing and prospective future occupants of the care home.
53. The proposed development would considerably improve the quality of accommodation for residents of the care home and provide significant benefits to residents and staff by virtue of the proposed purpose designed and built building that would provide enhanced facilities. It would provide the opportunity to improve the quality of the care that residents would experience. These are public benefits of the proposal to which I attach significant weight.
54. The proposal would result in the complete loss of the special interest of the non-designated heritage asset. However, the submitted Heritage Statement assesses the heritage significance of the building as low. In coming to a balanced judgement, and in the absence of any other material planning harm, I am of the view that the loss of the non-designated heritage asset is demonstrably outweighed by the public benefits of the proposed development. As such, the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

55. I have considered the proposed planning conditions, including a number of pre-commencement conditions, that have been provided by the Council. I have considered these against the advice given in paragraph 56 of the Framework and the guidance contained in the section on 'Use of Planning Conditions' in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Where necessary I have amended them in the interests of clarity, precision, conciseness or enforceability.
56. In addition to the standard time limit, I have imposed a condition (No. 2) relating to the approved plans in the interests of certainty. A condition is necessary requiring the submission and implementation of a Construction Method Statement in order to protect the living conditions of existing residents of the care home and the occupants of nearby properties (No. 3).
57. Also in the interests of protecting the living conditions of the occupants of nearby properties, a condition is necessary requiring the windows on the western elevation that are defined as 'windows to be obscured' to be retained as such (No. 13). However, the Council's suggested condition refers to a plan reference that does not appear to have been submitted by the Appellant in the appeal before me, nor does it appear to form part of the suite of plans submitted as part of the application on which the Council made its decision. Consequently, I have amended the suggested condition.

58. In order to ensure that surface and foul water can be adequately drained, a condition is necessary requiring the submission and implementation of a foul and surface water drainage scheme (No. 4).
59. In order to protect the character and appearance of the surrounding area, a condition is necessary requiring the submission of details of roofing and external wall materials (No. 5). For the same reason, a condition is necessary requiring the submission and implementation of details of hard and soft landscaping (No. 10)
60. Conditions are necessary to protect the integrity and health of trees that are to be retained and to ensure that appropriate arboricultural supervision is available both prior to, and during, the demolition and construction works (Nos. 6, 7 and 8).
61. A condition is necessary to ensure that an appropriate photographic survey of the internal and external features of the non-designated heritage asset is undertaken in order to record the historic fabric of the building prior to development (No. 9).
62. Conditions are also necessary to ensure the provision of roosting and nesting opportunities for bats and the submission and implementation of details of external lighting to minimise disturbance to bats (Nos. 11 and 12).

Conclusion

63. For the above reasons, taking into account the development plan as a whole based on the evidence before me and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR

CONDITIONS SCHEDULE

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved plans, drawings and documents as listed below.
 - Arbtech AIA 01 (based on 30810-NMA-110-Pr) Tree Planting Scheme
 - 30810-NNA-1110-P01 Proposed Ground Floor Plan
 - 30810-NNA-1125-P01 Proposed Ground Floor Plan Southern Wing
 - 30810-NNA-1130-P01 Proposed First Floor Plan Southern Wing
 - 30810-NNA-1105-PR-P01 Demolition Plan
 - 30810-NNA-1155-P01 Proposed Elevations Southern Wing
 - 30810-NNA-1120-P01 Proposed Roof Plan
 - 30810-NNA-1100-P02 Proposed Site Plan
 - 30810-NNA-1000-P02 Location Plan
 - 30810-NNA-PR-1115 REV P02 Proposed First Floor Plan
 - 30810-NNA-PR-1150 REV P02 Proposed Elevations and 3D Views
- 3) Prior to the commencement of the development, including any works of demolition, a Construction Method Statement shall have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
 - v) measures to prevent the deposition of mud and dirt on the surrounding roads;
 - vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during demolition and construction;
 - vii) measures to control the emission of noise during demolition and construction;
 - viii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
 - ix) delivery, demolition and construction working hours.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition and construction period for the development.
- 4) No development shall take place until a scheme of foul drainage and surface water drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented before the development is occupied/brought into use (which ever is the sooner).

- 5) Prior to the commencement of above ground works, samples and/or details of the roofing materials and the materials to be used in the construction of the external walls shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved details.
- 6) No development shall commence until a method statement for the protection of trees and their roots during demolition and construction work has been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted statement should include details of the foundation design and installation method of below ground construction works and drainage and any other infrastructure. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved method statement.
- 7) No ground clearance, demolition, or construction work shall commence until a scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to safeguard trees to be retained on site as part of the development. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the commencement of any demolition, construction or ground clearance and thereafter retained on site for the duration of the construction works.
- 8) Prior to the commencement of the development, including demolition works, a suitably qualified tree specialist shall be appointed to undertake supervision and monitoring of the tree protection works at pre-commencement stage and throughout the construction period as outlined in the method statement and submit to the local planning authority a satisfactory completion statement to demonstrate compliance with the approved tree protection measures.
- 9) No development approved by this permission shall commence until an appropriate photographic survey (Level 2 minimum), as defined in English Heritage's guidance 'Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice') of the interior/exterior of the non-designated heritage asset has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 10) No above ground works shall be commenced until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details of the soft landscaping works shall make provision for the implementation of the details set out on Plan No. Arbtech AIA 01 (based on 30810-NMA-110-Pr) Tree Planting Scheme. The landscape works shall be carried out in full compliance with the approved plan, schedule and time scales. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall upon written notification from the local planning authority be replaced with others of species, size and number as originally approved, by the end of the first available planting season.
- 11) Prior to first occupation/use of the buildings, the makes, models and locations of bat and bird boxes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The following boxes shall be erected on the site:

- A minimum of 2 external woodcrete bat boxes or integrated bat bricks, suitable for nursery or summer roosting for small crevice dwelling bat species.

- A minimum of 6 swift bricks. Swift bricks should be positioned: 1) Out of direct sunlight; 2) At the highest possible position in the building's wall; 3) In clusters of at least three; 4) 50 to 100cm apart; 5) Not directly above windows; 6) With a clear flightpath to the entrance; and 7) North or east/west aspects preferred. (See <https://www.swiftconservation.org/Leaflet%20%20-%20Swift%20Nest%20Bricks%20-%20installation%20%26%20suppliers-small.pdf>)

- A minimum of 1 artificial nest, of either integrated brick design or external box design, suitable for starlings (42mm hole, starling specific).

- A minimum of 1 artificial nests of either integrated brick design or external box design, suitable for sparrows (32mm hole, terrace design).

The boxes shall be sited in suitable locations, with a clear flight path and where they will be unaffected by artificial lighting. The boxes shall thereafter be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

- 12) Prior to the erection of any external lighting on the site, a lighting plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The lighting plan shall demonstrate that the proposed lighting will not impact upon ecological networks and/or sensitive features, e.g. bat and bird boxes (required by planning condition No. 11). The submitted scheme shall be designed to take into account the advice on lighting set out in the Bat Conservation Trust's Guidance Note 08/18 Bats and artificial lighting in the UK. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained for the lifetime of the development.
- 13) Prior to the commencement of the development details shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority showing the location and design details of the windows in the western elevation that are to be obscured. Such windows shall be permanently formed as a fixed light and glazed with obscure glass, with a transparency level of no less than 3, and shall thereafter be retained for the lifetime of the development. Other than as shown in the approved details, no further windows or other openings shall be formed above ground floor level in that elevation.