



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2025

by **David Wyborn BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/24/3352306

139-147 Camden Road, Camden, London NW1 9HJ

- 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 Vijay Pindoria against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref is 2024/1014/P.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 3 storey residential building comprising 5 flats, with ground floor bin and bicycle stores and frontage paving and planting.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a 3 storey residential building comprising 5 flats, with ground floor bin and bicycle stores and frontage paving and planting at 139-147 Camden Road, Camden, London NW1 9HJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/1014/P, and subject to the following conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. In December 2024, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was issued. The main parties have been given the opportunity to comment on the implications of the revised Framework for this appeal. I have taken the responses into account in my considerations.
3. At the appeal stage, a completed agreement, signed by the landowner and the Council, under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, has been submitted. The Council has confirmed in its appeal statement that reasons for refusal 3-7 could be overcome by obligations in such an agreement. As the Council is party to the agreement, and the obligations provide the financial and other requirements specified in the Council's statement, I am satisfied that the reasons for refusal 3-7 have been addressed. I will consider the agreement later in this decision.
4. A previous proposal for a 4 storey residential block of flats on the site was dismissed at appeal in January 2024¹. This revised proposal seeks to overcome the previous dismissal and I have taken the findings of that Inspector into account in my assessment of this appeal.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are;

¹ APP/X5210/W/23/3323840 – Dismissed 5 January 2024.

- the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, including the nearby Camden Square Conservation Area and Cantelowes Gardens, and
- whether or not the development would provide a satisfactory housing mix of units, having regard to the development plan.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. Camden Road is a long, straight road that forms part of the A503 heading north-east from Camden Town. It is lined by buildings on both sides for much of the road in this general area. Along the north-west side of the road there is quite a mix of buildings, with some more modern blocks, when heading north-east from the junction with St Pancras Way. Towards the appeal site, on this side of the road, the built form becomes generally more modest in scale and is set back behind a mix of trees and hedges that partially screen some of the buildings. On the other side of the road, there are mainly residential properties, again set back from the footway and often behind a low wall with some frontage vegetation.
7. Along this section of Camden Road there is a notable gap in the mainly built up form of this area. Cantelowes Garden (the Gardens) is a public open space that fronts and stretches back from Camden Road, and has part of its boundary with the appeal site. This open space has footpaths passing through, and various public amenities such as a skatepark and multi-use games area surrounded by quite tall mesh fencing. The Gardens are bounded by residential development to the broadly north-west and north-east, which is often partially screened by vegetation. From within the gardens the presence of development around the general boundaries and in the broad vicinity is apparent. This space is an important undeveloped area, albeit that the tall fencing around the games area affects its open character.
8. On the other side of the road from the appeal site and the Gardens is a long row of grand, semi-detached villas. These fall within the Camden Square Conservation Area (the Conservation Area). These 3 storey, with semi-basement, buildings have heritage significance including because of their age, grandeur, detailing and original features. Their layout complements the formal pattern of streets to the broadly south-east, also within the Conservation Area. This row of villas form an important part of the character of the street scene.
9. The buildings and open space on the north-west side of the road provide part of the general surroundings in which the row of villas in this part of the Conservation Area are experienced. However, as the road is quite wide, and the villas are visually distinct from the form and appearance of development on the other side of the road, the land on the north-west side of Camden Road makes only a limited contribution to the setting of this part of the Conservation Area.
10. The appeal site comprises the majority of the area of hard standing to the side of the single storey motor service centre that fronts Camden Road. The other side of the appeal site bounds the Gardens. The long horizontal form of the motor service centre building is a fairly prominent feature of this part of the road and, with the petrol filling station on the other side of Camden Road, these are sites that are quite functional in appearance. The appeal site with its hardstanding, parked

vehicles at times, and metal fencing and gates along the frontage contributes to the functional appearance of this section of the road.

11. While the appeal site is an open space within the street scene, it is to a reasonable extent visually separated from the Gardens by the adjoining row of 5 whitebeam trees. The relationship of the appeal site to its surroundings is such that it relates more to the motor service centre building, and its related character, than the Gardens. Consequently, based on my observations at the site visit, I place less importance to the unbuilt nature of the appeal site, and its contribution to the space provided within the street scene in conjunction with the Gardens, than the previous Inspector. In that respect, I am in greater agreement with the appellant on the assessment of the character of the appeal site and to its contribution to the area than with the Council.
12. The proposed development would be three storeys in height. It would occupy the full width of the appeal site up to the boundary with the Gardens, with a modest retained area of yard space next to the motor service centre building. The proposed building would have a contemporary appearance with a flat roof. While the previous Inspector did not have concerns with the design of the building in itself, I consider that the removal of the fourth floor has produced a building with a more attractive and architecturally composed and balanced composition than before. The mix of materials, with decorated brick panels, the pattern and size of windows and other features would combine to produce an interesting, contemporary building on the site.
13. The reduction in height compared to the previous appeal scheme would make a substantial and beneficial difference to how the building would be perceived within the street scene. This would also be assisted by the building being set back a little further at ground level within the site than previously proposed. Furthermore, importantly and as before, the alignment of the upper parts of the front elevation would be behind the front elevational line of the motor service centre building.
14. In views of the proposed building when travelling towards the site along Camden Road from the south west, the building would, in some views, be partially framed by the whitebeam trees and be seen in association with the long elevation of the motor service centre. The three storey height of the proposed building and its bulk, which would be partially offset by the angled rear section, would be clearly visible. However, in the context of the mix of the other built form on this side of the road and the height of other buildings in the area and within the street scene, the proposed height and bulk of the flats would not look out of place with the general built character. In these views when approaching the site on this side of Camden Road, the proposed flats would not be unduly dominant and the scheme would be noticeably lower and clearly separated from the villas on the other side of the road. The result would be that the proposed flats would not draw the eye within the street scene or away from the separate and visually distinct line of villas on the other side of this reasonably wide road.
15. From the other direction, when travelling from the north-east along Camden Road towards the site, the line of whitebeam trees would partially screen and soften the proposed building. The building's modest, but worthwhile, set back from the edge of the footway would also assist in reducing its street scene effect. It would also, in these general views, be seen with the backdrop of other quite bulky and some taller buildings in Sandall Road and they would provide an acceptable context for

the height and position of the building. The three storey height would, therefore, not appear out of character and the architectural variation would also help to break up the appearance of the side elevation. The combination of these factors would produce a building that would not be overly prominent or unsympathetic in these views.

16. At my site visit, I was able to see that the nearest whitebeam to the appeal site had been cut back so that it did not overhang the site. While this unbalances the tree to a limited extent, there is no arboricultural evidence to consider that the trees would be adversely affected by the development and, in any case, they lie outside the appeal site.
17. The proposed building would have its longest elevation adjoining the boundary with the Gardens, and this elevation would be apparent from the adjoining public areas, including from sections of the footpath that runs from Camden Road through to Oseney Crescent. However, the flank wall would extend back a relatively minor section of the total length of the Gardens along this boundary, with the vast majority of the boundary still relatively open because the sunken railway lines which adjoins this side of the Gardens.
18. The proposed development would be confined to a corner boundary of the open space. The reduction in height and, therefore, bulk of the proposed flats would be a noticeable change from the scheme considered by the previous Inspector. Furthermore, the whitebeam trees would also have the effect of filtering views of some parts of this elevation from the Gardens. Together with the bulk as now proposed, and with the mix of materials, brick panel detailing and arrangement of windows, the flats would provide a side elevation with sufficient interest and acceptable height such that the effect would be a modest built addition adjoining and in the immediate surroundings to the Gardens.
19. The Gardens are identified as a Local Green Space under Policy GO1 of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan 2016 (the Neighbourhood Plan). For the reasons explained, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not harm or have an adverse impact so as to lead to a loss in the quantity or quality of the Gardens. Consequently, the scheme would comply with the requirements of Policy GO1.
20. At my site visit, I also viewed the row of villas within the Conservation Area from within the Gardens, and particularly when walking along the length of the footpath from Oseney Crescent towards Camden Road. The front elevations of the villas provide a valuable backdrop in views from within this public open space. However, the visibility of this row of buildings is reduced by the mesh fencing and trees in places such that often the full extent cannot be appreciated in panoramic views. The proposed block of flats would be largely offset in these views towards the villas. Given the position, height, bulk and design of the proposed building, when viewed from within the Gardens in directions towards Camden Road, the proposed development would preserve the setting to the Conservation Area and the way that the row of villas was experienced.
21. Drawing these findings together, there would be some locations within and around Camden Road, where the proposed flats and the existing villas within the Conservation Area could be seen in the same views. However, the scheme would now have an acceptable design and bulk, and the proposed flats would be located

on the north-west side of the road. They would be predominantly experienced in this context, and in particular with the motor service centre, rather than with the visually distinct and separated form of the villas on the other side of a fairly wide road. The building would not cause harm to the setting of the Conservation Area from these locations. The building would also not harm the setting of the Conservation Area when viewed from within the Gardens.

22. I am conscious of the Framework requirement that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. For the reasons explained, I conclude that the scheme would cause no harm to the setting and/or heritage significance of the Conservation Area.
23. I am further satisfied that the harm that the previous Inspector identified with that scheme, has been overcome by the present proposal. The changes to the scheme have made a substantial difference to its effect on the area, and it would not now appear as bulky, incongruous or overly dominant. While I attach great weight to the previous Inspector's findings, the scheme before me is different and I am satisfied it would be an acceptable design and size which would provide an appropriate response such as to satisfactorily integrate within its surroundings. Importantly, the building would not harm or undermine the feeling of open space in conjunction with the Gardens, within the street scene or wider area.
24. Consequently, I conclude that the scheme would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area, including the nearby Camden Square Conservation Area and Canteloves Gardens. As a consequence, the scheme would comply with Policies A2, A3, D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 (the Local Plan) and Policies D3, GO1 and SSP7 of the Neighbourhood Plan which seek, amongst other things, that proposals must be well integrated into their surroundings and reinforce and enhance local character.

Housing mix

25. Policy H7 of the Local Plan sets the approach to securing a range of homes of different sizes in all housing developments. The policy requirements include that the Council will seek that all housing development contributes to meeting the priorities set out in the Dwelling Size Priorities Table, and that development includes a mix of large and small homes. The policy also allows, subject to a range of listed factors, that a flexible approach will be taken to assessing the mix of dwelling sizes proposed in each development. One of these factors in the assessment is the site size, including any constraints on developing the site for a mix of homes of different size.
26. The previous scheme, refused at appeal, proposed studio, 1 and 2 bedroom flats and, in this respect, this mix raised no concerns with the Council or Inspector. The present scheme proposes 5 units, with a mix of 3 No 1 bedroom flats and 2 No studio flats.
27. The Dwelling Size Priorities Table includes market 1 bedroom and studio accommodation as a lower priority, with market 2 bedroom units a high priority. In this respect the previous scheme with the 2 bedroom unit was more aligned with the Local Plan approach to deliver higher priority units. However, the supporting text to Policy H7 acknowledges that there is a need and/or demand for dwellings of every size in the Table. Consequently, all housing is a priority, even if it is a lower

priority, and 1 bedroom and studio accommodation are needed as part of the housing mix across the Borough.

28. Supporting this housing approach, Policy H1 of the Local Plan concerns maximising housing supply and includes that where sites are underused or vacant, expecting the maximum reasonable provision of housing that is compatible with any other uses needed on the site. In this case, the majority of this side yard area to the vehicle service centre is considered underused and available for housing development. Permission has already been refused for 6 units on the site because of the adverse impact and the present scheme seeks to maximise the coverage of the site area together with the provision of three floors of development. Given the constraints to development, including the dismissal of a denser scheme, while larger units could be possible on the site, within the now acceptable volume of the proposed development, such an approach would likely reduce the number of units. This would not then maximise the housing supply as required by Policy H1 of the Local Plan.
29. As the evidence indicates that there is not a Framework compliant supply of housing land for the Borough, and the Policy H1 strategic objective is to deliver 16,800 additional homes by 2030/31, each additional unit is worthwhile.
30. The constraints of the site limit the overall volume of development that can be accommodated and, also, I consider that smaller units would be generally more compatible for this site, in part, because meaningful on-site outdoor amenity space is necessarily limited. As I have explained, seeking to increase the size of units would, in all likelihood, lead to a reduction in the number of units on the site. In all these circumstances, the balance should fall in favour of the provision of 5 smaller units rather than a likely lesser number of units with more bedrooms. In summary, I consider that the site size and related constraints do provide a justification to allow a flexible approach to assessing the mix of dwelling sizes and this meets with one of the factors listed as an exception in Policy H7 of the Local Plan.
31. Consequently, the mix of units proposed would be acceptable in terms of the overall policy approach. I emphasise that this judgement is based on the circumstances of this site and location, and to maximise the housing delivery. The provision of 5 units is modest in number and a larger development may have more flexibility to provide a range of unit sizes, as was the case with the dismissed scheme on this site.
32. Consequently, in conclusion and having regard to the particular circumstances of this site, including the need to provide a development that is compatible with the character and appearance of the area, the scheme would provide a satisfactory housing mix that would meet with the requirements of Policy H7 of the Local Plan.

Planning Agreement

33. The signed and completed planning agreement, with the Council as a signatory, includes a number of obligations. In accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, all obligations must meet the three tests in Regulation 122, which are also set out in paragraph 58 of the Framework.
34. The planning agreement includes an obligation to pay an agreed financial sum towards affordable housing. This addresses reason for refusal No 3 and is necessary to accord with the requirements of Policy H4 of the Local Plan.

35. The obligation to secure the development as car free, including by preventing occupants from holding a residents' parking permit, is necessary to accord with Policies T1, T2 and CC1 of the Local Plan. This would address reason for refusal No 4.
36. The highways contribution financial sum is necessary including to cover the removal of the vehicular crossover which serves the site, reinstating the footway and repaving the footway adjacent to the site. This is a necessary part of the scheme to ensure that the development is acceptable in planning and highway terms. This would address reason for refusal No 5.
37. The obligations in terms of the vehicle maintenance unit operational statement is important to ensure that the vehicle service centre, which is outside the red lined application site, would operate in such a way that the appeal site would be redundant to its present use and car parking would not be displaced. This is a necessary obligation to make the impacts resulting from the loss of the majority of the yard area acceptable in planning terms. This would address the sixth reason for refusal.
38. The obligations include to submit and agree a Construction Management Plan, provide a Construction Management Plan Bond and the Implementation Support Contribution. These are all necessary to ensure that the works take place in an agreed way which would not harm or affect the amenities of the area, especially given the location of the site immediately adjacent to a Red Route, and to accord with Policies A1 and T4 of the Local Plan. This would address the seventh reason for refusal.
39. These obligations, both individually and collectively, meet with the tests for obligations in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and I attach them full weight in the considerations in this appeal.

Other Matters

40. I have had regard to the objections from local residents and the Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee. I have considered the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area in the first main issue. I do appreciate that there have been several applications on this site in the past, all of which have been refused, and with each proposal the number of storeys has gradually been reduced. However, I have found this proposal acceptable, and I consider the scheme is substantially and materially different to the proposal that the previous Inspector dismissed in January 2024.
41. Other objections have been raised. These include concerns with the windows in the development overlooking the children's play area. While there may be some intervisibility, the play areas are in a public park and already open to public view and I do not consider that the proximity of this residential development to the Gardens should be problematic. Other matters raised such as natural subsidence and noise appear to be general issues, and there is no evidence, subject to the residential accommodation being provided to a suitable standard to address the external noise environment, for this to form an objection to the development.
42. There have been no official objections to the scheme on highway grounds, and subject to the Construction Management Plan being effective during any build

period, I am satisfied that there would not be an unreasonable effects on highway or pedestrian safety.

Conditions

43. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. I have amended the wording where necessary in the interests of clarity or to meet the tests in the Guidance. I have also had regard to the appellant's comments on the draft conditions.
44. The statutory time limit is required and a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition is required for the submission and agreement of external details such as windows, facing materials and external doors and gates. Part of the justification and acceptance of the development is the high quality architectural and articulated finishes and, consequently, it is necessary in the interests of the visual amenities of the area that such details be submitted and agreed. I have removed the requirement on the proposed scale of the drawings, as if the Council is not satisfied with the level of detail, which should be proportionate for each element, then it can seek further details and/or reject those submissions.
45. The proposed residential use would be next to the motor service centre, with potential noisy activities, such as from the use of wheel guns, and near the end of the building with its roller shutter doors. There is also the nearby skateboard park within the Gardens. More generally the site is close to the A503 and near to the sunken railway line that serves some trains in and out of London St Pancras. There is, therefore, the potential for a noise and vibration environment that could affect the living conditions of residents if appropriate design and insulation as part of the development was not agreed and implemented. This requirement is supported by the comments from Network Rail. I therefore consider that the range of detailed conditions suggested by the Council are necessary and reasonable in this case. Subject to appropriate details, I am satisfied that the provision of a suitable habitable environment is achievable having regard to the submitted Noise and Vibration Assessment (September 2022).
46. The Council has suggested a condition which would require the submission of a Construction Management Plan. However, there is already a need to submit such a Plan as part of the planning agreement. This requirement is more appropriate as part of that planning agreement because of the associated payment of the bond. Any requirements in the draft condition could be incorporated into the Construction Management Plan required by the planning agreement. A separate condition to cover this matter is, therefore, not necessary.
47. In the interests of the promotion of sustainable transport options, a condition for the provision and retention of cycle parking, as shown on the submitted plans, is necessary.
48. Given the past and present uses of the site, there is the potential for land contamination. The Desk Study Report (September 2022) advises that the risk is moderate/low and that further investigations should take place. A condition is, therefore, necessary to protect the future health and wellbeing of occupants of the flats. It is necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because this important matter should be investigated and the details of any site decontamination agreed before building works start.

49. The solar panel array to the roof of the building is an important part of the scheme in the interests of sustainability. A condition is required to ensure its provision and that the scheme would meet with the appropriate level of carbon emissions. Agreement to these details can be achieved prior to installation, rather pre-commencement.
50. Finally, I have had regard to submissions from Network Rail and, in particular, its concerns with drainage. The tracks are on a much lower level than the nearby appeal site. If constructed the site would be almost entirely covered in hard surfaces and it is necessary that surface water does not drain on to the nearby railway or road.
51. The application form confirms that surface water will be drained to the main sewer network. However, the Design and Access Statement explains that the final drainage (SuDS) design should ensure that run off rates achieve greenfield standards (if feasible). There is, therefore, some uncertainty as to how the surface water will be dealt with on the site. Given the relationship of the site to the road and railway, and the needs of safety for both operations, the surface water drainage issues need to be addressed. Consequently, it is necessary for a condition to require the submission, agreement and implementation of a surface water drainage system.

Conclusion

52. I have found that the scheme would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and would, in the specific circumstances of this site, provide a satisfactory mix of residential units. The obligations in the planning agreement would address the other reasons for refusal. The scheme would therefore comply with the policies of the development plan when considered as a whole. Other material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, I conclude that subject to the planning agreement and the specified conditions, the appeal should be allowed.

David Wyborn

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos: 100, 101, 200, 210, 211, 212, 213 (roof plan), 230, 240, 241, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257 and the details in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report (October 2022).
- 3) Before the relevant part of the work is begun, detailed drawings, or samples of materials as appropriate, in respect of the following, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

a) Details including sections of all windows (including jambs, head and cill), ventilation grills, Juliet balconies, external doors and gates;

b) Manufacturer's specification details of all facing materials (to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority) and samples of those materials (to be provided on site).

The relevant part of the works shall be carried out in accordance with the details thus approved and all approved samples shall be retained on site during the course of the works.

- 4) All habitable rooms exposed to external transport/commercial noise in excess of 55 dBA Leq 16 hour [free field] during the day [07.00 to 23.00 hours] or 45 dBA Leq 8 hour [free field] at night [23.00 to 07.00 hours] shall be subject to sound insulation measures to ensure that all such rooms achieve an internal noise level of 35 dBA Leq 16 hour during the day and 30 dBA Leq 8 hour at night. The submitted scheme shall ensure that habitable rooms subject to sound insulation measures shall be able to be effectively ventilated without opening windows.

No dwelling shall be occupied until the approved sound insulation and ventilation measures have been installed to that property in accordance with the approved details. The approved measures shall be retained thereafter in perpetuity.

- 5) The maximum day time noise level in outdoor living areas exposed to external transport noise shall not exceed 50 dBA Leq 16 hour [free field]. The scheme of noise mitigation as approved shall be constructed in its entirety prior to the first occupation of any dwelling and shall be retained thereafter in perpetuity.
- 6) No vibration shall be transmitted to adjoining or other premises and structures through the building structure and fabric of this development as to cause a vibration dose value of greater than $0.4\text{m/s}^{(1.75)}$ 16 hour day-time nor $0.26\text{m/s}^{(1.75)}$ 8 hour night-time as defined by BS 6472 (2008) in any part of a residential and other noise sensitive property.
- 7) Enhanced sound insulation value $D_{nT,w}$ and $L'_{nT,w}$ shall be at least 5dB above the Building Regulations value, for the floor/ceiling /wall structures separating different types of rooms/ uses in adjoining dwellings, namely [eg. living room and kitchen above bedroom of separate dwelling]. Approved details shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development and thereafter be permanently retained.

- 8) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, the 6 long stay cycle parking spaces and 2 short stay cycle parking spaces shown on drawing 210 shall be provided. The aforementioned cycle parking spaces shall be permanently retained thereafter.

9) Part A:

No development shall commence until a site investigation is undertaken and the findings are submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The site investigation should assess all potential risks identified by the desktop study and should include a generic quantitative risk assessment and a revised conceptual site model. The assessment must encompass an assessment of risks posed by radon and by ground gas. All works must be carried out in compliance with LCRM (2020) and by a competent person.

Part B:

No development shall commence until a remediation method statement (RMS) is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This statement shall detail any required remediation works and shall be designed to mitigate any remaining risks identified in the approved quantitative risk assessment. This document should include a strategy for dealing with previously undiscovered contamination. All works must be carried out in compliance with LCRM (2020) and by a competent person.

Part C:

Following the completion of any remediation, a verification report demonstrating that the remediation as outlined in the RMS have been completed should be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. This report shall include (but may not be limited to): details of the remediation works carried out; results of any verification sampling, testing or monitoring including the analysis of any imported soil and waste management documentation. All works must be carried out in compliance with LCRM (2020) and by a competent person.

- 10) Prior to installation, details of a solar panel array and associated Energy & Sustainability Statement to achieve a 20% reduction in carbon emissions below Part L of 2013 Building Regulations shall be submitted to and be approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the development and permanently retained thereafter.

- 11) No development above ground level shall take place until details of the implementation, adoption, maintenance and management of a surface water drainage system have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Those details shall include:

- i) a timetable for its implementation; and,
- ii) a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the effective operation of the surface water drainage system throughout its lifetime.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The drainage system shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance plan.

End of Schedule