



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2024

by B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/24/3340234

Street Record, Raymond Close, Lewisham, London SE26 6DW

- 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 Stern Family Trust against the decision of London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application is Ref DC/22/129171.
 - The development proposed is the construction of 4, two storey plus lower ground floor and roof space, four bedroom houses at Land to East of Raymond Close SE26, together with associated landscaping and cycle storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of 4, two storey plus lower ground floor and roof space, four bedroom houses at Land to East of Raymond Close SE26, together with associated landscaping and cycle storage at Street Record, Raymond Close, Lewisham, London SE26 6DW in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DC/22/129171, and subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 30 July 2024 the Government published a consultation on proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and other changes to the planning system. Whilst a direction of travel has been outlined within the Written Ministerial Statement, which is a material consideration, the changes to the Framework can only be given limited weight at this stage, given that no final document has been published.
3. In any event, the policies that are material to this decision are not subject to any fundamental changes, and I am satisfied that this has not prejudiced any party. Consequently, in reaching my decision I have therefore had regard to the Framework published in December 2023, and any reference to paragraph numbers are to this version.
4. The appeal submission includes additional details such as an alternative highway improvement plan (Ref: P22024/002) which indicates the removal of one car parking space at the end of the close, and updated swept path drawings. The appellant has also provided a renewed parking stress survey.
5. I have considered the proposed new plan and information taking into consideration the principles established by the Courts in Holborn Studios Ltd¹. The drawings and additional information are different from those originally

¹ Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin)

submitted in that they result in slight amendments to the highway area within Raymond Close. However, given that the Council and other interested parties have had an opportunity to comment on the additional information, I have accepted the drawings in line with the Holborn principles.

6. As a result of the additional information submitted by the appellant, the Council confirm that they therefore no longer wish to defend the reason for refusal in respect of highway safety and the effect of construction activities. However, given the number of representations by interested parties in relation to this issue, I have retained it as a main issue.
7. The appellant has also provided an Internal Daylight Assessment in relation to another reason for refusal. This evidence provides additional detail in relation to the living conditions for future occupiers of the proposal, rather than any amendments to the design of the proposal. For this reason, I consider that there would be no prejudice to any party by considering the additional information. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the additional information.
8. One of the Council's reasons for refusal related to whether the proposed units were capable of meeting Part M4(2) of Building Regulations 2015 (as amended) for accessible and adaptable dwellings. The appellant has submitted amended drawings with this appeal which demonstrate sufficient space for an internal lift in each of the four dwellings. This would be sited in the corner of each of the upper ground floor bedrooms, providing access to the lower ground level within the living/dining room. I have accepted the submission of the drawings and taken account of this evidence.
9. The Council has confirmed that the provision of the amended drawings demonstrates that the dwellings would be capable of meeting the Building Regulation standard M4(2) for accessible and adaptable dwellings, and is therefore sufficient to overcome the reason for refusal. They therefore no longer wish to defend the reason for refusal in respect of accessible and adaptable dwellings. From the evidence before me, I agree that the amended drawings overcome the reason for refusal, and I therefore do not address this matter in the reasoning below.

Main Issues

10. The main issues are:

- whether the proposal would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future occupiers, with particular regard to internal levels of sunlight and daylight within the lower ground floor accommodation within units 1 and 2; and
- the effect of the proposal on highway safety for all road users, with particular regard to the use of the shared surface area, provision of car parking spaces and the impacts of construction activities.

Reasons

Living conditions of future occupiers

11. In regard to sunlight and daylight, whilst deep, the lower ground floor kitchen/living/dining rooms would be served by large vertical windows within units 1

and 2 which would open onto the units' private terraces and gardens. In addition, both units would have rooflights which would provide additional light within the rear parts of the room.

12. An Internal Daylight Assessment (IDA) has been submitted with the appeal². This concludes that units 1 and 2 would benefit from daylight levels in excess of the requirements of BS EN 17037:2018 recommendations. The IDA does not assess the daylight within the units' cinema rooms. However, given the nature of the use of these rooms I do not consider that future occupiers would expect these areas to be well lit.
13. The Council has queried the limited number of three dimensional model drawings within the IDA. The accuracy of the document is also questioned, as units with fewer windows are shown as achieving better daylight results, and because the siting of the internal lifts do not appear to have been considered.
14. The IDA assesses the Target Daylight Factor (TDF) method of calculation, which is one of two methods suggested by the BRE 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice' (Third Edition, 2022). Units 1 and 2 would receive higher levels of daylight than, for instance, Unit 3, as they have additional rooflights which provide a greater spread of daylight throughout the units.
15. Through-floor platform lifts are proposed for the units, which would not be continuous structures that would permanently obstruct light to the main living areas. Given that the assessed rooms within units 1 and 2 comfortably meet the minimum TDF, it seems to me that, they would continue to achieve good levels of daylight following the installation of lifts. Therefore, given the findings of the IDA, and given that the Council has not provided any calculations to counteract the findings of the assessment, I am satisfied that the proposal would be served by sufficient daylight.
16. The IDA does not assess the sunlight for units 1 and 2. Unit 2 would have large south facing windows which are likely to receive generous amounts of sunlight. As unit 1's primary windows face northwards they are unlikely to receive sunlight. Nevertheless, the unit would be triple aspect and would incorporate large amounts of glazing including rooflights. Furthermore, the unit would comfortably exceed the minimum TDF and would have good levels of outlook from the large glazing on its rear elevation. Considering the new dwelling as a whole, I am not persuaded that people living here would feel that the living environment was particularly gloomy or oppressive.
17. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) or Policy 32 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan (2014) (DMLP). Taken together these seek, amongst other things, developments which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Highway safety

18. The submitted evidence and my observations during my site visit confirm that the existing parking situation within Raymond Close is not working well, and that vehicles are frequently parked in a manner which obstruct the public highway and pavements.

² Prepared by T16 Design, dated December 2023

19. The proposal involves the introduction of a shared surface with designated parking spaces, bollards to prevent pavement parking and to maintain clear pedestrian routes, tactile paving; and double yellow lines to prevent informal parking.
20. 8.3.47 of Manual for Streets (2007) outlines that where there is a shared surface, conventional footways are dispensed with, so technically, footway parking does not arise. This would be the case within Raymond Close. As the entire area at the end of the close would be a shared surface, there would be many opportunities for pedestrians and wheelchair users to freely and safely pass each other. Raymond Close does not provide vehicular through access. During my site visit I found it to be a quiet street and both pedestrian and vehicular movements within the close are largely restricted to residents and their visitors. The addition of four dwellings would not result in a significant increase in highway movements.
21. Collectively, the proposed measures, which would reduce the number of cars parking on pavement areas, would create an improvement in the pedestrian environment for all users. I have not been presented with compelling evidence to demonstrate that the appeal proposal would result in unacceptable effects for children or those who are visually impaired. A planning condition which requires the submission of a car parking management plan would ensure that measures to retain suitable arrangements for car parking are maintained for the lifetime of the development.
22. The alternative highway improvement plan (Ref: P22024/002) removes one car parking space at the end of the close. The swept path analysis submitted by the appellant demonstrates that this alternative layout would enable a 7.5 tonne van to turn within the close, and to leave in a forward gear. This would avoid unacceptable risk to pedestrians and other road users. At present, due to the constrained highways layout and on-street parking situation, refuse collections involve reversing a refuse vehicle into Raymond Close, with operatives collecting the refuse on foot. The highways alterations will enable a refuse vehicle to reverse into Raymond Close to the side garage area, and beyond to the appeal site, if preferred. This would be an improvement on the existing situation.
23. The Parking Stress Survey submitted with the appeal confirms local parking stress within 200 metres walk from the site of approximately 65%. On average, 18 unrestricted car parking spaces on Lawrie Park Road remained vacant.
24. The outline Framework Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) identifies measures to provide additional car parking spaces for neighbouring residents during the construction period. This includes replacing a garage with a parking space during the construction period for general use, and the creation of three additional parking spaces on a temporary basis on the land to the rear of 3 Raymond Close. The parking spaces would be returned to their original use once the development is completed.
25. Consequently, I am satisfied that the proposed parking provision would be adequate for existing occupiers during construction, and sufficient to serve future occupiers. In the event that there was additional on-street parking as a result of the development, this would not cause unacceptable congestion or other harm to highway safety.

26. The appellant's swept path analysis clearly shows that all construction vehicles would be able to manoeuvre to the site along Raymond Close. Therefore, other highways users accessing properties on Raymond Close would not be obstructed. At this stage, the CLP provides an outline plan, and does not confirm positions for a site compound or a loading location for construction vehicles. However, I have imposed a planning condition which requires the submission of a detailed Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) prior to the commencement of development. I am satisfied that further detail, including the compound and construction vehicle waiting/loading areas can be secured within the detailed CEMP once a contractor has been appointed.
27. Interested parties have raised concerns about the lack of disabled parking. Policy T6.1 of the LP places emphasis upon the need to consider car free or car minimal development for future residential schemes within the Greater London plan area. Due to the particular constraints of the site the development would be unable to provide safe and efficient access into the site for any such disabled parking provision. From my own observations on site, there would potentially be an opportunity for disabled persons to park within a reasonable proximity to the site should they so wish to do so.
28. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, with particular regard to the use of the shared surface area, and the impact and disruption to neighbouring occupiers during construction. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy T2, Policy T4 and Policy T7 of the LP, Policy 33 of the DMLP, Policy 14 of the Lewisham Core Strategy (2011), or Transport for London Streetscape Guidance (2022) and Lewisham Highway Design Guide (2017). Taken together, and amongst other aims, these seek development which would create safe and accessible streets for all users.
29. I also find no conflict with paragraph 115 of the Framework which requires that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Other Matters

30. Interested parties have raised concerns in relation to the effect of the proposal on neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to overlooking, loss of light and the effect on outlook. Given the orientation of the proposal, the separation distances to the nearest neighbouring properties which do not have windows facing the site, and the location of neighbouring properties' rear gardens away from the proposal's built form, I do not find harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
31. Concerns have been raised about the impact on the character and appearance of the site, including suggestions that the proposal would result in overdevelopment of the area. Whilst the proposed houses would be four-storey, due to the significant set down of the site from the road level, the buildings would not appear as unusually or excessively tall buildings when viewed from Raymond Close. The courtyard area within the centre of the site would create a step back in built form, thereby ensuring a visual gap within the development. This would not appear out of character within the street.

32. The proposed material palette of facing brick in a colour similar to surrounding dwellings would reinforce the character and appearance of this particular street scene and the wider area. Overall, I have been provided with no substantive evidence which would prompt me to disagree with the Council's conclusions on these matters which was that there would be no unacceptable harm in these respects.
33. Whilst the proposal does not include affordable housing, I note that the LP, Core Strategy and DMLP policies only require affordable housing to be provided within proposals for 10 residential units or more.
34. Concerns have been raised in relation to the provision of limited sized gardens and amenity space. However, the Council confirm that each dwelling would have a garden which exceeds the minimum requirement for dwellings of this size. In relation to concerns about a future change of use, the proposal relates to single family dwellings, and a future change of use to large Houses in Multiple Occupation would require the submission of a new planning application.
35. Concerns have been raised in relation to construction noise, increase in deliveries, damage to local roads and the safety implications in the area during construction. I have sympathy for existing occupiers as development of this nature would inevitably give rise to some disruption. However, the works would be time limited and I have found that it would not be reasonable to withhold consent on this basis alone. I have imposed a condition requiring the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan to manage the highway and living conditions impacts during construction.
36. In relation to concerns about the loss of green space, landscaping and the impact on trees, I have imposed a condition which requires details of soft landscaping including details of any trees to be retained and further planting. Concerns have been raised in relation to the impact on the natural habitat for wildlife, birds, and insects. In order to mitigate harm to local wildlife, planning conditions are imposed requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the conclusions and recommendations in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Reptile Presence Survey.
37. The addition of four dwellings within a relatively dense residential close is unlikely to cause harmful noise and disturbance as a result of the additional comings and goings or recreational use of the properties by future occupiers and visitors.
38. In relation to concerns about the proximity to the railway lines, I note that Network Rail were consulted on the planning application. Their response raised no objection to the proposal, whilst noting that the applicant should engage with Network Rail's Asset Protection and Optimisation team prior to works commencing on site.
39. I acknowledge the concerns of interested parties about property values in the area. However, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) makes it clear that planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests such as property values could not be a material consideration. Therefore, the effect of the proposal on house prices has not been a determinative matter in my consideration of the appeal.

40. Concerns in relation to land ownership does not affect the acceptability of the appeal proposal in terms of its planning merits. The concerns expressed regarding the appellants' engagement with residents during the planning process are outside the remit of this appeal decision. I have noted the concerns with regard to safety and structural stability. However, these matters are for consideration under building regulations and any dispute would be private matters between the owners.
41. A number of other matters have been raised by interested parties and I have taken them all into account. This includes matters such as noise from the MVHR system, fire safety, designing out crime, solar panels, local water supply, and infrastructure. However, whilst I take these representations seriously, I have not been presented with compelling evidence to demonstrate that the appeal proposal would result in unacceptable effects in relation to any of these matters.

Conservation Area

42. The northern part of the appeal site is within the Cobbs Corner Conservation Area (CA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires me, in determining this appeal, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
43. The CA covers an area encompassing the commercial properties surrounding the roundabout between Kirkdale and Westwood Hill and residential streets mainly to the north and north-west, which are lined by Victorian and Edwardian houses, mostly terraces or pairs of semi-detached houses.
44. Its significance is derived from the form and architectural interest of the Victorian and Edwardian houses generally arranged along consistent building lines. The appeal site is an area of rough land adjoining the railway line and which is physically and visually annexed from Raymond Close by a tall brick wall. Consequently, the appeal site contributes very little to its significance as a designated heritage asset.
45. The proposed development would be set down into the site, and its built form would be laid out to retain openness through the central part of the site. The semi-detached form of the dwellings would be in keeping with the character of this part of the CA. Given the site's limited width, a visual green buffer between it and the adjoining railway lines would be maintained. The proposal would not be overly prominent, and it is my view that the proposal would not be detrimental to the CA and would thus preserve its significance as a whole.

Conditions

46. I have had regard to the planning conditions that have been suggested by the Council. I have considered them against the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). I have made such amendments as necessary to comply with those documents and for clarity and consistency.
47. In addition to the standard time limit, I have imposed an approved plans condition in the interests of certainty.
48. Conditions related to external materials, soft and hard landscaping, boundary treatments and refuse storage are necessary in the interests of the character

and appearance of the area. I have, however, modified the condition related to external materials to remove reference to boundary treatments in order to prevent repetition with other conditions.

49. A condition related to cycle storage is necessary in the interests of promoting sustainable transport. I have imposed conditions related to energy and sustainability performance and gas fired boilers in the interests of sustainability and air quality. A condition requiring a Car Parking Management Plan is necessary in the interests of highway safety. Conditions requiring the installation of railway noise and vibration mitigation measures and requiring that dwellings are constructed to meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) are necessary in the interests of the living conditions of future occupiers.
50. Conditions requiring a Construction Environmental Plan and restricting the hours of construction and associated deliveries are necessary to protect neighbouring residents' living conditions. In the interest of contamination remediation I have imposed the suggested condition requiring a desk top study and site assessment to survey and characterise the nature and extent of contamination.
51. Conditions related to a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP): Biodiversity and the installation of protection measures for reptiles are necessary in the interests of biodiversity protection. Details of a surface water management scheme, including sustainable urban drainage, are required in the interests of surface water management.
52. Bearing in mind the PPG's advice that the blanket removal of freedoms to carry out small scale domestic alterations that would otherwise not require an application for planning permission are unlikely to meet the tests of reasonableness and necessity, I have not been provided with sufficient evidence as to why it would be reasonable or necessary to restrict all classes of permitted development rights. However, given the small size of the site and relationship with surrounding buildings, I consider in the particular circumstances of this case that a condition which withdraws some permitted development rights for further extensions including outbuildings for the new dwellings is necessary. Therefore, I have modified the condition to restrict classes A and E.
53. I have not imposed the suggested conditions requiring the provision of electric vehicle charging points and water efficiency measures as the PPG sets out that compliance with other regulatory requirements, such as the Building Regulations, will not meet the test of necessity and may not be relevant to planning.

Conclusion

54. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with the development plan and the Framework. The appeal is therefore allowed.

B Pattison

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; 101 Rev B; 17-1270-01G; 17- 1270-03; 17-1270-04; 17-1270-05; 17-1270-02D 7; P22024 002; TRK07(1); TRK07(2); TRK07(3); TRK08 and P22024/002
- 3) No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The plan shall cover:
 - (a) Dust mitigation measures.
 - (b) The location and operation of plant and wheel washing facilities
 - (c) Details of best practical measures to be employed to mitigate noise and vibration arising from the construction process
 - (d) Details of construction traffic movements including cumulative impacts which shall demonstrate the following:-
 - (i) Rationalised travel and traffic routes to and from the site.
 - (ii) Full details of the number and time of construction vehicle trips to the site with the intention and aim of reducing the impact of construction related activity.
 - (iii) Measures to deal with safe pedestrian movement.
 - (e) Security Management (to minimise risks to unauthorised personnel).
 - (f) Details of the training of site operatives to follow the Construction Environmental Management Plan.
 - (g) Details of the construction hours and activity.

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

- 4) No development shall take place until:
 - a) (i) A desktop study and site assessment to survey and characterise the nature and extent of contamination and its effect (whether on or off site) and a conceptual site model have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council.
 - (ii) A site investigation report to characterise and risk assess the site which shall include the gas, hydrological and contamination status, specifying rationale; and recommendations for treatment for contamination encountered (whether by remedial works or not) has been submitted to an approved in writing by the Council.
 - (iii) The required remediation scheme has been implemented in full.
 - b) If during any works on the site, contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified ("the new contamination") the Council shall be notified immediately and the terms of paragraph (a) shall apply to the new contamination. No further works shall take place on that part of the site or adjacent areas affected, until the

requirements of paragraph (a) have been complied with in relation to the new contamination.

c) The development shall not be occupied until a closure report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. This shall include verification of all measures, or treatments as required in Section a) i & ii) and relevant correspondence (including other regulating authorities and stakeholders involved with the remediation works) to verify compliance requirements, necessary for the remediation of the site have been implemented in full. The closure report shall include verification details of both the remediation and post-remediation sampling/works, carried out (including waste materials removed from the site); and before placement of any soil/materials is undertaken on site, all imported or reused soil material must conform to current soil quality requirements as agreed by the Council. Inherent to the above, is the provision of any required documentation, certification and monitoring, to facilitate condition requirements.

- 5) No development shall take place until a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP): Biodiversity has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The CEMP: Biodiversity shall include the following:
- i) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities;
 - ii) Measures to avoid or reduce impacts during construction;
 - iii) Location and timings of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features, including but not limited to trees, nesting birds, bats and small mammals;
 - iv) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works;
 - v) The role of a responsible person (Ecological Clerk of Works) and lines of communication; and
 - vi) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP): Biodiversity shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

- 6) The development shall not progress above the damp proof course of the new houses until a scheme of soft landscaping (including details of any trees or hedges to be retained and proposed plant numbers, species, location and size of trees and tree pits) and details of the management and maintenance of the landscaping for a period of five years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council.

All planting, seeding or turfing shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the completion of the development, in accordance with the approved scheme. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

- 7) The development shall not progress above the damp proof course of the new houses until details of hard landscaping including materials showing

delineated car parking spaces and including the details of the permeability of hard surfaces has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. All hard landscaping works which form part of the approved scheme shall be completed prior to the occupation of the development and be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

- 8) The development shall not progress above the damp proof course of the new houses until details of the proposed boundary treatments including any gates, walls or fences have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The approved boundary treatments shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the buildings and will be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.
- 9) The development shall not progress above the damp proof course of the new houses until a detailed schedule and specification including manufacturer's literature or detailed drawings has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. Details shall include:
- Brickwork, bond, mortar & pointing;
 - Brick detailing, coping & roof junctions;
 - Windows, reveals, cills and arched heads (sections 1:5);
 - External doors.

The works shall be carried out in full accordance with the details approved prior to the first occupation of the development and maintained thereafter.

- 10) The development shall not progress above the damp proof course until a scheme for surface water management, including specifications of the surface treatments and sustainable urban drainage solutions, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The approved measures shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the buildings and will be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.
- 11) The development shall not be occupied until details of facilities for the storage of refuse and recycling facilities, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The facilities shall be provided prior to occupation of the development and shall thereafter be permanently retained and maintained.
- 12) The development shall not be occupied until details of the secure and covered cycle parking facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The facilities shall be provided prior to occupation of the development and shall thereafter be permanently retained and maintained.
- 13) The development shall not be occupied until details for the installation of Ultra-Low NOx boilers with maximum dry NOx emissions less than 40 mg/kWh or other form of low emission / renewable energy heating have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Council. Where any installations do not meet this emissions standard, it should not be operated without the fitting of suitable NOx abatement equipment or technology as determined by a specialist to ensure comparable emissions. The installation shall be carried out in strict accordance with the agreed details and permanently retained and maintained as such. Within 3 months of

installation emissions certificates to verify boiler emissions shall be provided to the Council.

- 14) The development shall not be occupied until the railway noise and vibration level mitigation measures outlined within the Assessment of Railway Noise and Vibration Assessment (Peter Moore Acoustics, 2017 - Ref 171101/1) have been installed. The measures shall be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.
- 15) The development shall not be occupied until the energy and sustainability performance measures outlined within the Sustainability and Energy Statement (Element Sustainability, November 2017) have been installed. Once installed the mitigation measures shall be maintained thereafter.
- 16) All dwellings hereby approved shall be constructed to meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'.
- 17) No deliveries in connection with construction works shall be taken at or despatched from the site other than between the hours of 8 am and 6 pm on Mondays to Fridays and 8 am and 1 pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays.
No work shall take place on the site other than between the hours of 8 am and 6 pm on Mondays to Fridays and 8 am and 1 pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays.
- 18) The development shall not be occupied until a car parking management plan for the whole of Raymond Close has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The measures specified in the approved details shall be implemented prior to the occupation of development and shall be adhered to for the lifetime of the development.
- 19) Throughout the entire construction period (including site clearance), all protection measures for reptiles shall be undertaken in accordance with the details contained within the Reptile Presence/Absence Survey and Mitigation Plan (Ecoassistance, October 2022 -Ref 756).
- 20) Throughout the entire construction period (including site clearance), all ecological protection measures shall be undertaken in accordance with the details contained within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Ecoassistance, July 2022 -Ref 698). Prior to the occupation of the development the mitigation and enhancement measures recommended within the above technical report, including the proposed bat and bird boxes, shall be installed, and thereafter be permanently retained and maintained.
- 21) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no further extensions or alterations or outbuildings to the new dwellings hereby permitted shall be erected under Part 1, Classes A and E without the prior permission of the Council.

END OF SCHEDULE