
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2025

by Adrian Hunter BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/W/24/3347942

286-316 Scotland Road, Everton, Liverpool L5 5AE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Aspire Studios and Local Solutions against Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 24F/1106, is dated 9 April 2024.
 - The development proposed is change of use of the northern part of the building and the erection of a single storey rooftop extension to form a sui generis HMO (39 bedrooms / 39 persons) with shared communal facilities) across all floors; partial demolition of single storey structure and removal of exposed steel frame at rear; use of basement as a gym, laundry room and cycle parking; provision of outdoor amenity space, refuse storage and cycle parking at rear; public realm landscaping works on Scotland Road frontage; minor reconfiguration of existing car park at rear; infill of existing underpass and closure of redundant vehicular access; replacement of all existing windows with UPVC framed windows; insertion of new windows and doors; replacement of the entirety of the existing corrugated cement particle board roof with a new anthracite-coloured powder-coated metal standing seam roof; installation of PV panels on the west sides of both the replacement roof and the 4th floor extension roof; removal of all existing external ductwork and roller shutters from windows; hard and soft landscaping at rear; continuation of the existing Local Solutions' young persons supported accommodation (32 bedrooms and communal rooms) and its associated support hub, offices and staff facilities, to be reconfigured to occupy the southern part of building (all floors).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for
2. change of use of the northern part of the building and the erection of a single storey rooftop extension to form a sui generis HMO (39 bedrooms / 39 persons) with shared communal facilities) across all floors; partial demolition of single storey structure and removal of exposed steel frame at rear; use of basement as a gym, laundry room and cycle parking; provision of outdoor amenity space, refuse storage and cycle parking at rear; public realm landscaping works on Scotland Road frontage; minor reconfiguration of existing car park at rear; infill of existing underpass and closure of redundant vehicular access; replacement of all existing windows with UPVC framed windows; insertion of new windows and doors; replacement of the entirety of the existing corrugated cement particle board roof with a new anthracite-coloured powder-coated metal standing seam roof; installation of PV panels on the west sides of both the replacement roof and the 4th floor extension roof; removal of all existing external ductwork and roller shutters from windows; hard and soft landscaping at rear; continuation of the existing Local Solutions' young persons

supported accommodation (32 bedrooms and communal rooms) and its associated support hub, offices and staff facilities, to be reconfigured to occupy the southern part of building (all floors) at 286-316 Scotland Road, Everton, Liverpool L5 5AE in accordance with the terms of application 24F/1106 dated 9 April 2024, subject to the conditions listed in the below schedule.

Application for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Aspire Studios and Local Solutions against Liverpool City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

4. Following the submission of the appeal against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period, the Council have clarified the position they would have taken had they determined the application. I have had regard to these submissions, in so far as they provide clarity in terms of the reasons why the Council would have refused planning permission had it done so. The main issues below are therefore informed by the Council's submissions.
5. During the course of the appeal, planning permission was granted by the Council for a similar development on the appeal site. As a consequence, the Council advised that matters in relation to inclusive access no longer formed part of their reasons for refusal. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on that basis.
6. For reasons of precision and clarity, I have taken the description of development for the application form.
7. In relation to the recently granted planning permission, whilst this is clearly a consideration, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the evidence and the plans as submitted with the original appeal submission.
8. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published following the submission of the appeal on 12 December 2024. The references in my decision to the paragraphs in the Framework relate to this new document. I sought the views of the main parties on the implications of the revised national planning policy for their respective cases and have taken these into account in making my decision.

Main Issues

9. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - Whether the proposed development would provide adequate living conditions for future residents, in particular in relation to sunlight and daylight levels to the proposed ground floor rooms;
 - Whether the existing building comprises a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) and if so, whether the design and appearance of the proposed development, including the proposed roof top extension would result in harm; and
 - The effect of the proposed development upon protected species, in particular bats, and whether adequate provision is made for biodiversity net gain (BNG).

Reasons

Living conditions

10. In relation to the ground floor windows to the front of the proposed development, these would face onto Scotland Road, which is a heavily traffic, arterial route, providing access to and from the City Centre, along with access to the Wallasey Tunnel. The building is set back from the road and separated from it by a reasonably wide pavement. As such, I find this is sufficient to ensure that the noise from the road would not be so adverse as to justify withholding planning permission for this reason alone.
11. The outlook from these windows would be directly onto the pavement, which at the time of my visit did not appear to be well used by pedestrians. In any event, I note the appellant's design approach to protect the privacy of future residents. This approach would also ensure that as much light as possible would be able to penetrate these rooms and I am satisfied that the design approach can be secured through an appropriately worded planning condition. On this basis, whilst I do not consider the outlook to be the most attractive for future residents, I find that, overall, the proposed development would provide adequate living conditions for future residents of the ground floor units at the front of the appeal building.
12. The proposed rear ground floor rooms would be positioned in close proximity to the rear boundary wall, which is of a substantial height. It is therefore likely that these spaces would be overshadowed and as such, would experience reduced sunlight and daylight, especially when compared to other rooms within the proposed development.
13. In support of the appeal, a Daylight Calculations Report was submitted by the appellants, which concluded that all but one of the rooms, would pass the standard, and would therefore have access to acceptable daylight and sunlight levels. In this regard however, little detail is provided in the Report to explain the basis for the calculations and the overall conclusions. Neither has the layout been assessed against the recognised British Standard. As such, I have afforded this Report little weight in my consideration of the issue.
14. The proposed rear ground floor rooms are of a reasonable size and are in excess of requisite space standards. Communal facilities are also provided on the ground floor in the form of a kitchen/diner, along with a separate lounge area.
15. Whilst the provision of additional space within the rooms, along with the provision of large communal areas, would provide future residents with an alternative space, I do not consider that this would provide sufficient justification for the provision of living accommodation which would be served by poor outlook and a less than sufficient amount of natural daylight and sunlight. Therefore, due to their location, these rooms would have a very poor outlook for future residents, offering limited natural light and sunlight and, as such, would provide poor living standards for future residents.
16. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other developments where, in their view, the Council have allowed schemes to proceed where the outlook and access to daylight and sunlight is materially worse than that within the proposed development. Whilst I do not seek to bring any of these matters

into question, I am required to consider the appeal scheme on its merits and to consider it against the development plan.

17. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would fail to deliver adequate living conditions for future residents of the rear ground floor rooms and, in this respect, would be contrary to Policy H10 of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033 (LLP), Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)7 and SPG10 and the Framework.

Heritage

18. There is disagreement between the parties as to whether the appeal building comprises a non-designated heritage asset. In the view of the appellant, the building is of little heritage value, having been much altered over the years and, whilst accepting that it is of some architectural value, does not consider it to be special enough to justify its protection. On the other hand, the Council consider the existing building to be a heritage asset due to its age, the positive contribution it makes to the local character and local distinctiveness, and its association with the evolution of the area.
19. The appeal building comprises a substantial 4 storey building, located on the eastern side of Scotland Road, with an enclosed rear yard and parking area. The principal elevation of the building faces onto Scotland Road and includes a number of noticeable and attractive design features. The façade is balanced in terms of its design, which gives the building a rhythmical, regular appearance. Large windows dominate the elevation. As such, whilst parts are in a poor state of disrepair, the appeal building is reasonably attractive and well-proportioned.
20. Evidence is provided by both parties which shows that the building was originally used by the Jacob's biscuit manufacturing company, before operations were relocated to alternative premises within the city.
21. From the submitted evidence, the surrounding area has changed much over the years since the appeal building was erected and is now surrounded by more modern developments created following post-World War 2 clearance. As such, the appeal building, along with a few notable exceptions, including St Anthony's Catholic Church to the north, stand as the only obvious remnants of the historical development in the area.
22. Internally the appeal building has been much altered, with little remaining in the way of original features. Whilst parts are in a poor state of disrepair, in contrast to the internal arrangements, the overall external appearance of the building remains essentially unaltered, with the exception of some modern alterations, such as the insertion of modern uPVC windows and security shutters.
23. As a result, I agree with the Council that the appeal building makes a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the area, and given its age and rarity, along with its historical association with a nationally recognised manufacturer, I find the building to be of heritage importance and, as such, to be a NDHA.
24. Paragraph 216 of the Framework identifies that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application, and requires decision makers to take a

balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

25. The proposed development would involve the retention and refurbishment of both the internal and external elements of the appeal building, along with the addition of an extension at the northern end. Recent single storey additions would also be demolished to improve access, parking and allow for the provision of external space. The removal of the single storey elements, along with proposed measures to improve the external appearance of the building, such as removal of vegetation, cleaning of brick work and removal of service runs, along with historical ventilation equipment, I consider would be of benefit to the appearance of the building.
26. The proposed development would also involve the replacement of all windows, and whilst the window design may differ from those of the original construction, I find that their replacement would benefit the overall appearance of the building. The existing carriage opening at the southern end of the building would be permanently infilled and the existing roller shutter removed. This would represent an improvement, although the replacement would result in the loss of the original opening.
27. It is also proposed to replace the existing roof with a metal roof, which would be covered with solar panels. It is likely that these panels would protrude above the existing roof structure and, when compared with the existing appearance of the roof, would be a detracting feature, although this would only be perceptible from certain viewpoints and, as such, I find this harm to be limited.
28. The proposed roof extension would be positioned on an area currently occupied by a flat roof. It would provide additional accommodation and, along with the proposed lift motor room extension, would protrude above the existing roof level of the appeal building. It would be recessed from the front elevation and as such, despite being higher than the existing roof, visibility from Scotland Road would be limited. Therefore, the existing rhythm and balance of the building would be largely retained. Due to intervening buildings, the addition would also not be readily visible when viewed from the rear.
29. The proposed lift motor room would extend above the proposed addition and the existing roof. As such, it would be more visible in some views. However, I find these views to be limited and, given the location of the lift tower, I do not find that its limited visibility to materially harm the overall appearance of the building.
30. The proposed roof top extension would increase the massing of the existing building, and in design terms would appear different to the main façade, especially in terms of size of window openings and their position in relation to existing openings. However, given the limited visibility of the addition, I do not find that these are so materially harmful to the appearance of the building as to justify the refusal of planning permission for these reasons alone.
31. Overall, whilst the proposed roof top extension would cause some harm to the appearance of the building, due to its position, along with its limited visibility, I find that the harm to the NDHA as a result would be limited. Neither do I find that the proposed roof top addition would have an adverse effect upon the

overall character and appearance of the area, when seen from surrounding viewpoints.

32. Drawing the above together, I have found that the existing building, due to its age, rarity and connection with a historical and well-known brand, is an NDHA. The proposed development would deliver considerable benefits, principally through improvements to the fabric of the building and removal of a number of unsightly features. There would however be some harm to the overall appearance of the building, principally from the provision of the roof top extension, although I have found this harm to be limited. Overall, therefore, taking a balanced judgement, I find that these benefits outweigh the harm I have found.
33. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would accord with Policies UD1, UD2, UD5, UD6, UD7 and HD1.4 of the LLP and the Framework.

Bats and Biodiversity

34. In support of the proposed development, the appellant submitted an ecological report, however the Council raised some concerns in relation to the bat survey and in particular the weather at the time the survey was undertaken. As such, the Council considered that further survey work should be undertaken to address the limitations. No additional survey work has been submitted by the appellant.
35. Having reviewed the submitted evidence, it is clear that, whilst evidence of bats were found, very little activity was recorded on the site and in particular, no bats were recorded as entering or emerging from Buildings 1, 2, or 3. In this respect, from the evidence before me, it would appear reasonable to conclude that it is unlikely bats would be roosting in these buildings.
36. In relation to the limitations of the survey, I note that, under the consideration of the recent application, whilst raising similar issues, the Council, following the submission of further detail from the appellant, accepted the matter had been addressed.
37. Whilst the exact detail of the submissions from the appellant's ecologist has not been submitted as part of this appeal, it is clear from the Council's Committee Report that this additional clarification satisfactorily addressed the issues raised and, the Council accepted the results of the bat survey. As a precautionary approach, the Council attached a condition to the planning permission requiring demolition work to be undertaken during the winter, or if not possible, then a licensed bat ecologist would be required to directly supervise the removal of the potential roost features identified in the bat survey report.
38. To my mind therefore, whilst the detail of the additional submission is not before me, the conclusions of the Council and the approach they adopted on the recent planning permission is. On this basis, I therefore consider that the matter can be adequately addressed through the provision of a suitably worded planning condition as attached to the recent planning permission.
39. In relation to BNG, a revised submission from the appellant confirmed, this to be 232.26%. This is considerably in excess of the 10% requirement as set out in the Council's advice note and the Framework. As such, I find that the proposed development would satisfy these policy requirements.

40. Pulling this together, I therefore find that, the proposed development would not result in harm to protected species and would deliver an appropriate level of BNG and, as such would accord with Policies STP2, GI8 and GI10 of the LLP, Biodiversity Net Gain Policy Advice Note March 2024 and the Framework.

Planning balance

41. The proposed development would allow for the refurbishment of the existing office accommodation, along with the provision of new co-living HMO accommodation and the retention of existing young person's accommodation on the site. These improvement works, along with the provision of much needed accommodation are considered to be significant benefits of the scheme and, as such, I find they weigh greatly in favour of the proposed development.
42. I have concluded that the existing building is an NDHA. The proposal would include a number of measures and changes that would improve and benefit the heritage aspects and overall appearance of the building. However, I have found that the appearance of the proposed rooftop extension would harm the NDHA, although this harm would be limited. Therefore, taking a balanced approach as advocated in the Framework, I find that the proposed development would not harm the NDHA.
43. In relation to the living conditions of future occupiers, I have concluded that the proposed development would result in poor living conditions for future occupiers of the rear ground floor units, in particular Unit 3. This harm weighs against the proposed development. However, given the overall number of units being provided and their intended use, along with the availability of communal areas, I have afforded this harm limited weight in the planning balance.
44. In relation to bats and BNG, I have concluded that the proposed development would accord with the development plan and the Framework in these respects.
45. The Council found no harm in respect of the effect on parking or access, drainage or flood risk. These form neutral matters in the overall planning balance. Neither have I found that the proposed development would harm the overall character and appearance of the surrounding area.
46. Drawing all this together, I have found that the proposed development would fail to deliver adequate living conditions for future residents, and this weighs against the proposed development. On the other side of the balance, the proposed development would deliver substantial benefits in the form of new, much needed accommodation, along with improvements to the appearance of the existing building. Overall, I find that, in this instance, the benefits that the proposed development would deliver, are sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conditions

47. In their initial submissions, the Council provided an outline of the conditions they wished to see attached, should the appeal be allowed. Following the grant of the planning permission by the Council, they subsequently requested that similar conditions, to those attached to that planning permission be attached to this appeal. I have therefore considered the necessary conditions on this basis.
48. The conditions suggested by the Council have been considered against the tests of the Framework and advice provided by Planning Practice Guidance.

They have been found to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case. I have made modest drafting changes for clarity.

49. A condition in relation to time limits is necessary to provide certainty, however the Council have sought a 2 year period, as opposed to the more standard 3 year period. Whilst a 2 year period was attached to the recent planning permission granted by the Council, there is no substantive justification before me to support attaching this to the appeal proposal, therefore I have retained the standard 3 year period.
50. Conditions relating to the approved plans, are necessary to provide certainty. Conditions relating to the external finishes, submission of sample materials, external works, window details and landscaping are required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
51. To protect the living conditions of future residents, I attach a condition requiring details of the glazing to the ground floor windows to be submitted. For the same reason, a condition relating to acoustic mitigation and ventilation is necessary. A condition to make sure the lift is in place prior to occupation, along with the provision of accessible toilets, is necessary to ensure inclusive access.
52. I attach conditions relating to waste management, construction traffic management and submission of phasing details to safeguard highway safety. Conditions regarding nest and bat boxes, biodiversity net gain and the timing of demolition works are required to safeguard biodiversity. A condition regarding the provision of secure cycle parking is required in the interests of sustainable transport. Also, conditions regarding water management and drainage are necessary to ensure sustainable water management.
53. Conditions relating to the number of residents in both the HMO accommodation and supported accommodation are necessary to provide certainty and accord with the description of development.
54. A condition requiring the submission of a management plan for the supported accommodation has been suggested by the Council. Having considered it, I do not find that such a condition is necessary or reasonable and, as such, it would fail the tests.

Conclusion

55. For the above reasons, and having considered all matters, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the attached conditions.

Adrian Hunter

INSPECTOR.

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

(i) Drawing Numbers

L05 rev A Location Plan

L06 rev A Existing Site Plan

L07 rev G Proposed Site Plan

P40 rev A Existing Basement Plan

P41 rev A Existing ground floor Plan

P42 rev A Existing First Floor Plan

P43 rev A Existing Second Floor Plan

P44 rev A Existing Upper Second Floor Plan

P45 rev A Existing Third Floor Plan

P46 rev A Existing Roof Plan

P50 rev D Proposed Basement Plan

P51 rev F Proposed Ground Floor Plan

P52 rev D Proposed First Floor Plan

P53 rev E Proposed Second Floor Plan

P54 rev B Proposed Upper Second Floor Plan

P55 rev C Proposed Third Floor Plan

P56 rev B Proposed Fourth Floor Plan

P57 rev B Proposed Roof Plan

EO1 rev A Existing Elevations 1 of 2

EO2 rev A Existing Elevations 2 of 2

EO3 Proposed Elevations 1 of 3

EO4 Proposed Elevations 2 of 3

EO5 Proposed Elevations 3 of 3

EO6 Proposed Elevations Technical 1 of 3

EO7 Proposed Elevations Technical 2 of 3

EO8 Proposed Elevations 3 of 3

(ii) Supporting Documents

Planning Statement, Roman Summer, July 2024

Ventilation Strategy Report Parker Wilson Consulting

External Building Fabric Report, Clement Acoustics

Energy Statement Report Parker Wilson Consulting 26.03.2024

Bat Survey Report, Ecological Services, June 2024

Biodiversity Net Gain Statement, Ecological Services, April 2024

Conditions Assessment, received 10th June 2024

Biodiversity Gain Plan, 10th April 2024, received 10th June 2024

Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool, received 30th May 2024

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Survey Report, Pennine Ecological, February 2024, received 10th June 2024

Habitat Survey Map, received 10th June 2024

3. Prior to their implementation and use on site, samples or specifications of all materials to be used in the external construction of this development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be completed using the approved materials before the development is occupied/brought into use.
4. Notwithstanding the indicative detail shown on the approved drawings, no new windows or doors shall be installed until a schedule, including drawings at 1:20 scale with cross sections at 1:2 (or similar), has been submitted for written approval by the local planning authority. This schedule shall include all sill, lintel, and jamb / reveal details, final paint colour, glazing type and any materials used to obscure views into or out of the building. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
5. The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in materials, colour, style, bonding and texture those of the existing building.
6. No works shall take place, including any demolition, site clearance or ground works, until a Construction Method Statement comprehensively detailing the phasing and logistics of demolition/construction has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The method statement shall include, but not be limited to:
 - (i) Construction traffic routes, including provision for access to the site
 - (ii) Entrance/exit from the site for visitors/contractors/deliveries
 - (iii) Location of directional signage within the site
 - (iv) Siting of temporary containers
 - (v) Parking for contractors, site operatives and visitors
 - (vi) Identification of working space and extent of areas to be temporarily enclosed and secured during each phase of demolition/construction

- (vii) Temporary roads/areas of hard standing
- (viii) Schedule for large vehicles delivering/exporting materials to and from site
- (ix) Storage of materials and large/heavy vehicles/machinery on site
- (x) Measures to control noise and dust
- (xi) Details of street sweeping/street cleansing/wheelwash facilities
- (xii) Details for the recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
- (xiii) Hours of working
- (xiv) Phasing of works including start/finish dates
- (xv) A public engagement strategy for the duration of the build from pre-commencement through to completion

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

7. No development shall take place, including any demolition, site clearance or ground works, until a full phasing plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. For the avoidance of doubt, works to upgrade the hostel shall be completed prior to the first occupation of the HMO. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved phasing plan and shall only be varied with the prior written approval of the local planning authority.
8. No part of the residential accommodation at ground floor level shall be occupied or brought into use until the windows at ground floor level have been fitted with the obscured glass, details of which are to be agreed in writing prior to installation. The specified windows shall be retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.
9. The number of persons in residence within the HMO accommodation hereby approved shall not exceed 39 at any one time.
10. The number of persons in residence within the supported accommodation hereby approved shall not exceed 32 at any one time.
11. The passenger lift within the HMO accommodation shall be in full working order prior to first occupation of the HMO accommodation.
12. The HMO accommodation hereby approved shall not be occupied or brought into use until the areas indicated on the submitted plans to be set aside for cycle parking have been provided in accordance with the details and specifications. The cycle parking shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the development.
13. The approved landscaping scheme shall be completed either: not later than the first planting season following first occupation of the development; or during the appropriate planting season progressively as the development proceeds, in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

All works must be carried out to BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape and BS 4428: 1989 Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations.

Any trees/plants which die, become diseased, damaged or are removed within 5 years of planting shall be replaced with trees/plants of similar sizes and species or as may otherwise be agreed with the local planning authority in the first available planting season thereafter.

An audit trail of the plant stock used for the scheme must be retained for biosecurity reasons and made available to the Local Planning Authority on request.

The newly planted trees must be irrigated in accordance with following schedule and include at least 75 litres of water per session ideally delivered using watering bags. Watering must be carried out on the first working day after each date for the 3 years following the planting: 15 April; 1 & 15 May; 1 & 15 June; 1, 8, 15 & 22 July; 1, 8 & 15 August; 1 September.

14. The landscaped amenity spaces hereby approved shall be retained throughout the lifetime of the development and no part shall not be obstructed or used for purposes other than for the amenity of the residents of the development.
15. The HMO accommodation shall not be occupied until a scheme and appropriate scaled plan identifying the number of, and suitable locations on the site for the erection of bird nesting boxes and bat boxes together with a timetable for implementation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme of nesting and bat boxes shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and timetable and maintained for the lifetime of the development.
16. Within the HMO, the approved internal layout, including all living rooms and kitchens shall be retained in perpetuity and, for the avoidance of doubt, the bedrooms shall not be fitted with cooking facilities or let as self-contained units or bedsits.
17. All external demolition works to the roof areas and other structures should be carried out in the winter (November to February). If this is not possible a licensed bat ecologist is required to directly supervise the removal of the potential roost features identified in the bat survey report (Pennine Ecological. February 2024. 286-316 Scotland Road. Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Survey Report).
18. The acoustic mitigation measures and ventilation strategy outlined in The External Building Fabric Report by Clement Acoustics (ref: 18780-EBF-01 RevB) and the Ventilation Strategy Report by Parker Wilson Consulting shall be implemented in full prior to the occupation of the development.
19. The HMO Management Plan as appended to the Planning Statement (as amended) shall be implemented in full throughout the lifetime of the development.
20. An accessible toilet built in full compliance with BS8300 design guidelines including minimum internal dimensions of 2200mm x 1700mm, shall be provided within the Local Solution office and youth hub area for use by all

employees and visitors to the facility prior to first occupation and use of the space following the completion of the refurbishment works.

21. Details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage system shall be 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;
- (iii) contact details of the person/company responsible for this maintenance.

The sustainable drainage system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied/brought into use, and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

22. No development shall take place until a scheme for surface water drainage based on the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Policy Framework, with evidence of an assessment of the site conditions, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

23. Details of the following external works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before they are implemented:

- (i) Type and fixing details of the solar panels.
- (ii) All new boundary treatment, gates and means of enclosure
- (iii) External Lighting

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied/brought into use.

24. The Biodiversity Gain Plan to be submitted as required under the deemed condition shall be prepared in accordance with following approved documents: Biodiversity Net Gain Statement, Ecological Services, April 2024; Conditions Assessment, received 10th June 2024; Biodiversity Gain Plan, 10th April 2024, received 10th June 2024; Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool, received 30th May 2024; Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Survey Report, Pennine Ecological, February 2024, received 10th June 2024; and Habitat Survey Map, received 10th June 2024.

25. No part of the development shall be occupied or brought into use until a Waste Management Strategy has been submitted to, and improved in writing by, the local planning authority. For the avoidance of doubt the Strategy shall set out operational proposals for the storage, transfer and collection of waste ensuring that appropriate arrangements are made and that logistical requirements are appropriately considered and addressed. The strategy shall be subsequently implemented in accordance with the approved details.

26. No development shall take place, until a full phasing plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved phasing plan and shall only be varied with the prior written approval of the local planning authority.