



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 April 2025

by **G Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/24/3354742

318-326 Bridge Studios, Wandsworth Bridge Road, Hammersmith and Fulham, London SW6 2TZ

- 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 Gisamaruk Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
- The application Ref is 2024/00640/FUL.
- The development proposed was described as *'the proposal is for the construction of a two-storey upwards extension to the existing building to provide a total of 6 new residential dwellings comprising 2 x 1-bedroom, 2 x 2-bedroom and 2 x 3-bedroom units. External and internal alterations to the existing building are also proposed to facilitate the development'*.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of two additional floors at roof level in connection with the creation of 2 x 1 bedroom, 2 x 2 bedroom and 2 x 3 bedroom self-contained flats; formation of roof terraces at second and third floor levels; installation of solar panels and rooflights at roof level; installation of 2no windows to replace 1no double doors a replacement door at ground floor level to the front elevation. t at 318-326 Bridge Studios, Wandsworth Bridge Road, Hammersmith and Fulham London SW6 2TZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/00640/FUL, and subject to the condition set out in the attached schedule of conditions.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the development address directly from the initial planning application form even though subsequent documentation and submissions, such as the decision notice, appeal form and appeal documents employ subtle variations on that originally set out. The development description set out in the banner heading above is also as set out on the initial planning application form. It is noted that there are some differences in subsequent documentation to include other elements of work including the installation of solar panels and rooflights at roof level and the installation of windows to replace a door at ground floor level. I have adopted however adopted a slightly revised version in my decision, above. I am satisfied that in so doing the details of the appeal site and the description are clear and neither the main parties nor other interested parties would be disadvantaged.
3. The appellant has submitted with the appeal a signed and dated Unilateral Deed of Undertaking (UU) made pursuant to section 16 of the Great London Council (General Powers) Act 1974. The UU provides for the restriction of applications for, or the holding of, parking permits for controlled parking zones within the borough by occupiers of the proposed residential units (other than in respect of Blue Badges and Blue Badge holders). This is a matter that I shall return to separately, below.

Background and Main Issues

4. My attention has been drawn by both main parties to the appeal site's lengthy planning history¹. Those proposals related principally to the ground and first floors of the building and which, most recently, sought to change the use of the whole or parts of those floors from office use to residential use in varying forms. It has been stated by the Council that the appellant intends to convert the ground and first floors to residential units by way of separate applications for prior approval² but other than their reference numbers I have no further details or plans details those schemes before me.
5. Whilst the Council consider the proposals to be 'inextricably linked' I have no evidence before me as to the progress of works in relation to the ground and first floors or the extent to which that may or may not be the case. I have considered this appeal on its own merits and I am satisfied that the scheme before me does not appear to be dependent upon other schemes for its implementation or completion. It is a matter between the appellant and the Council as to any implications for previous schemes that have been subject to permission granted through the prior approval procedure and I have determined this appeal on the basis of the plans before me, and as considered by the Council at the application stage.
6. The main issues in the case before me are therefore the effects of the proposed development upon:
 - the living conditions of future occupiers of the proposed development, with particular regard to those of proposed units 1 and 4 in respect of outlook and natural light;
 - the attractiveness of the office units to commercial occupiers, with particular regard to daylight and outlook;
 - highway safety; and
 - the provisions for the storage (and collection) of waste and recycling.

Reasons

Living conditions – future occupiers

7. The appeal building is described as having been built in the Art Deco style. Two storeys in height with a flat roof, it has a broadly U-shaped footprint with the two wings extending forward to Wandsworth Bridge Road. Between the 'wings' lies an enclosed, open-roofed atrium from which internal access to the building would be gained. The two additional floors would be built in a similar style, albeit that each of the two floors would be inset front and rear from the extent of the floor below it.
8. The larger second floor floorplate would accommodate four flats; those at the rear being 1-bed flats and the two at the front 2-bed flats. All four would essentially be single aspect, albeit that flats 2 and 3 at the rear would have side-facing windows on return elevations to a projecting build-out, glazed elevations and doors to a covered terrace and rooflights serving each of the main living areas. The refusal

¹ As set out at paragraph 1.3 of the Council's delegated officer report and section 3. Relevant Planning History of the appellant's Statement of Case (UPP)

² LPA Ref Nos: 2023/01889/PMA56, 2023/01890/PMA56 and 2024/03005/PMA56

reasons do not refer in specific terms to flats 2 and 3 in respect of daylight and sunlight, outlook or the standard of living conditions for occupiers thereof.

9. However, flats 1 and 4 would have different layouts and a different orientation to those of flats 2 and 3, as well as being larger in terms of bedroom numbers and bedspaces. Given the proposed layout, there would be no return elevations for either flat within which additional windows could be sited, as is proposed to be the case with flats 2 and 3. Nor would there be scope for a rooflight to provide additional light in the manner of flats 2 and 3.
10. The main shared living space for each of these flats would therefore be served by a single, broadly east facing window, and these areas would be of considerable depth. The appellant seeks to make the argument that these living spaces, as well as both bedrooms for each flat, would benefit from a glazed screen and door that would open out to a terrace area. However, that terrace area is shown to be enclosed with its roof being formed from the floor of the terraces of the floor above. The glazed elevations that open out onto this area are therefore both recessed behind the Wandsworth Bridge Road façade and set back underneath the upper floor of the proposed extension.
11. Nevertheless, the appellant's updated Daylight and Sunlight Assessment³ (DSA) demonstrates that each of the bedrooms and the kitchen / living / dining area achieve the relevant Target Daylight Factor as allowed for by Building Research Establishment (BRE) Report '*Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice*' and BS EN17037: 2018 +A1:2021 '*Daylight in Buildings*'. Whilst these thresholds may be those that apply to 'hard to light' dwellings where a scheme relates to a conversion / extension scheme, the DSA demonstrates that the required daylight factor would be achieved over between 66.3% and 75.1 % of the room area, whereas the daylight factor target is expressed as a percentage figure over 50% of the room.
12. Whilst these figures are significantly lower for flats 1 and 4 than they are for flats 2 and 3, I am satisfied that they meet the minimum standards that I have been directed towards. Although the Council reiterates the position that the proposal would result in poorly lit rooms, I have not been directed towards any compelling evidence to challenge the conclusions of the appellant's DSA, or that otherwise demonstrates that flats 1 or 4 fail to achieve required standards, or other standards or requirements set out in the London Plan 2021 (LonPlan), Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan⁴ (LP) or the '*Planning Guidance*' Supplementary Planning Document⁵ (PGSPD).
13. It is not disputed by the parties that the flats, and the rooms therein, are sufficiently spacious and satisfy LonPlan space standards⁶ requirements. That the main bedrooms and the kitchen / living / dining areas of flats 1 and 4 have secondary windows to the return elevation to the terrace will provide those rooms with an additional source of daylight, albeit limited, and a secondary aspect and outlook. Moreover, the outlook on to Wandsworth Bridge Road is one across a reasonably wide street with an open aspect towards taller buildings, opposite.

³ Bridge Studios, 318-326 Wandsworth Bridge Road, London SW6 '*Daylight and Sunlight Assessment*' Job No: 5904, Issued: September 2024, Issue No: 1 – T16 Design

⁴ February 2018

⁵ February 2018

⁶ Policy D6 and table 3.1

14. For the reasons set out therefore, I am satisfied that it has been demonstrated that flats 1 and 4 would achieve adequate levels of natural light to the main habitable rooms. I am also satisfied that the incorporation of the terraces that these rooms open out to would provide a satisfactory additional form of outlook, and thus mitigation in the absence of a true dual-aspect outlook. There would be no conflict with LonPlan Policy D6 or LP Policies HO4 or HO11 as a consequence and the scheme as a whole would provide 6 additional dwellings of an overall quality consistent with the aims and objectives of the LonPlan and LP Policies in this respect.

The office units

15. The building's existing flat roof has two large, glazed lantern rooflights and two smaller skylights. These provide light to the rear portion of the first floor floorplate, in addition to two windows on one side elevation and three on the other.
16. Although the proposed two storey rooftop extension would allow the two, smaller rooflights to be retained in the existing positions, the larger two rooflights would be directly affected by the proposal and reduced in size. The appellant's updated DSA now includes an assessment of the target daylight factor for the rear portion of the first floor office space. It concludes that a sufficient level of natural light would remain.
17. Although the Council again reiterate concerns in this respect, citing the additional effect of the two storey extension on available daylight, the rear of the building faces broadly westwards. Given the extent of its rearward projection and the nature of the buildings to the side and rear of it, levels of direct sunlight and natural light would remain reasonably good to these rooflights. Whilst the extension may result in a loss of light during mornings, I am satisfied that the appellant has demonstrated that sufficient natural light would be available to the floor below.
18. The Council has not provided compelling evidence to the contrary in this respect, nor have I been presented with compelling evidence that the effects of the proposal would compromise the viability of the commercial space at first floor. Matters of amenity are not so readily or regularly assessed as they are for residential neighbours. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that the appellant has demonstrated that the proposed two storey extension would not result in a harmful reduction on the levels of natural light received at first floor level via the existing and proposed rooflights.
19. LP Policy E2 sets out the Council's approach to seeking to retain land and premises for employment uses, seeking to protect such uses unless where continued use would have an adverse impact on residential uses, alternatives would have a demonstrably greater benefit or that it can be demonstrated it is no longer required for employment purposes. However, as the proposal seeks to create the additional residential units on newly extended floors above the commercial uses of the ground floor, there would be no direct impact upon the commercial floor areas below. Nor has the Council advanced compelling evidence to support its assertion that the appeal scheme would render the commercial use of the ground and first floors unviable.
20. There would be no conflict with LP Policy E2 as a consequence, nor has it been demonstrated that there would be conflict with LP Policies DC4 or HO11 in relation

to commercial uses. Whilst mindful of the site's planning history, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans as before me.

Highway safety

21. LP Policy T4 states that any proposed development will be required to conform to its car parking standards. It goes on to state that unless there is a proven and significant lack of public transport available, schemes will be required to include car parking permit free measures.
22. The proposal would result in the creation of 6 additional residential units, ranging in size from 1-bed, 2-bed and 3-bed flats, with no on-site or off-street parking provision made. As the site lies within an area designated with a PTAL3 rating, it is considered to have a good level of public transport accessibility and, thus, as per LP Policy T4, car parking permit free measures would be required.
23. Although no such mechanism was before the Council at the time of its determination of the planning application, a unilateral deed of undertaking (UU) was submitted with the appeal. The UU sets out provisions to dissuade or prevent future residents from applying for, or holding, a parking permit (other than those for Blue Badge holders) for controlled parking zones within the borough.
24. The Council's delegated officer report sets out the principle of using such a mechanism to secure a 'car-free' scheme. Whilst the subsequent appeal submission states that the submitted UU was 'under review by the Council's legal team', the Council has made no further submissions in this respect. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the provisions of the signed and dated UU meet the tests if Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations and so I have taken it into account. As such, harm arising from additional parking stress would be avoided in the interests of the free flow of vehicular, cycle and pedestrian traffic and there would be no conflict with LP Policy T4 or LonPlan Policies SI1, T2 or T6. Nor would the scheme be contrary to LP Policy CC10 as this measure would reduce potential adverse air quality impacts that would otherwise have been likely to arise from additional vehicle movements.

The provisions for the storage (and collection) of waste and recycling

25. The appeal building has an enclosed but open entrance forecourt; essentially an open roofed atrium between two 'wings' at the front of the building. This area provides the main entrance from Wandsworth Bridge Road into the building and it is within this area where it is proposed that containers for the storage of waste and recyclable materials would be placed.
26. The Key Principles set out at PGSPD WM1, WM2, WM3, WM4 and WM11 establish the Council's detailed approach to waste and recycling provisions within residential development. LP Policies CC7 CC13 set out the broad approach to securing appropriate provision in the interests of securing high quality development that does not cause harm to the living conditions of residents.
27. The Council acknowledge that the proposed waste storage area would be sited within 10 metres of the public highway at ground floor level. This would be consistent with the provisions of PGSPD Key Principle WM4 and its supporting text. Nor have objections been raised regarding the size of the proposed storage area or the sizes of the storage containers that would be placed there for

residents. The relevant provisions in these respects are set out within PGSPD Key Principles WM1, WM2 and WM4.

28. Although the Council has reiterated its concern regarding the provision of a coded access and that it would not provide a practical solution for access for collection purposes, I have not been directed to any LP policy support for this position. Indeed, to the contrary, the appellant has quoted extracts of Appendix 5 of the PGSPD regarding waste management arrangements, stating that the provision of 'a standard Fire Brigade 1, 2 or 4 pattern' code can be an acceptable way in which to facilitate access to secured waste and recycling storage areas.
29. Subject therefore to a suitably worded condition, I am not persuaded that this matter would provide an impediment to the proposal and it has not been demonstrated that the scheme would be contrary to LP Policies CC7 or CC13, or GPSPD Key Principles WM1, WM2, WM3, WM4 or WM11. I am satisfied therefore that the appeal scheme would be capable of making appropriate and adequate provision for the storage (and collection) of waste and recyclable materials.

Other Matters

30. Local residents object to the proposal on a wider basis than that captured in the Council's reasons for refusal. There are residential properties on Hugon Road and Breer Street that back on to, or are close to, the rear of the appeal site. The addition of two extra stories to the appeal building has raised objections on the basis of loss of privacy and overshadowing and loss of natural light.
31. The additional floors have been designed in such a way that their rear elevations are inset from the rear of the existing building. There would, therefore, be a greater distance between the two additional floors and the neighbouring properties than is currently the case with the existing rear, two storey elevation. Furthermore, the closest rear facing window openings at flats 2 and 3 would feature a patterned brick finish that would break up and mitigate intervisibility between them and neighbouring property. Other main living spaces are either served by windows on return elevations or are rear facing but are set further away from those properties by virtue of the further set-back at third floor level.
32. With regard to the effect of the additional two storeys on natural light and the potential for overshadowing, there will inevitably be some effect given the orientation of the appeal site relative to properties on Hugon Road and Breer Street. However, the two additional storeys are modest in their extent at roof level and would be pulled in from the rear-most extremity of the building, whilst the more open southerly aspect would be unaffected. These matters did not form part of the Council's reasons for refusal and, having carefully considered the representations of interested parties and visited the site, I am not persuaded that these matters are sufficient, individually or cumulatively to lead me to a different conclusion.
33. The proposed balcony areas are small and thus their capacity to host large gatherings are correspondingly limited. Whilst the provision of additional residential units would be likely to lead to different patterns of activity to that of commercial space, the site is located on a busy road with a range of nearby uses. I am not persuaded that the proposal would give rise to sufficiently harmful levels of noise or disturbance to amount to an unneighbourly presence that would justify the dismissal of this appeal.

34. The addition of two extra floors at the appeal building would inevitably change the outlook from some properties opposite on Wandsworth Bridge Road, particularly those in elevated positions that had an outlook over the roof of the appeal building. However, the right to a view is not a material consideration to which I give any weight, whilst the additional building storeys have been designed in a manner that is consistent with the scale, character and appearance of the existing building.

Conditions

35. I have considered the list of conditions suggested by the Council in light of the guidance set out in the Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. Where necessary I have made amendments and changes as set out below. I am satisfied that in so doing neither of the main parties nor interested parties would be disadvantaged. For the avoidance of doubt any references to condition numbers below refer to the numbering as suggested by the Council.
36. I agree that a time limit condition is necessary in the interests of certainty and good planning. So too a plans condition albeit that I have changed the plans condition from that suggested to one which lists the plans by name and drawing number in the interests of precision.
37. Two materials conditions have been suggested by the Council – suggested conditions 3 and 4. However, there would be both a degree of duplication between them and also a tension between some of their contradictory requirements, particularly so given the mix of materials present within the existing building. I have therefore combined their provisions with amendments to create a single condition in the interests of the satisfactory appearance of the development. A condition restricting the installation of external paraphernalia such as grilles, satellite dishes, aerial, security cameras and other fixtures is also necessary in the interests of the satisfactory appearance of the extended building upon completion.
38. Conditions regarding the submission, agreement and subsequent implementation of matters relating to cycle storage and refuse and recycling container siting are necessary in the interests of encouraging travel by means other than private car, ensuring suitable and accessible provision of waste and recycling receptacles and in the interests of the living conditions of occupiers. Conditions regarding noise and insulation and a strategy for ventilation are similarly necessary in the interests of the living conditions of occupiers of the approved residential units.
39. In the interests of highway, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and the living conditions of occupiers of nearby properties during the construction phase, I shall impose conditions regarding construction logistics and management plan in the manner suggested by the Council. The use of outside roof areas should be controlled by condition in order to avoid undue harm to privacy in the interests of the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.
40. Finally, details of the green roof are necessary to be secured by condition in the interests of the satisfactory appearance of the development upon completion and the moderation of surface water run off from the building's roof. Details of water efficiency measures are necessary to ensure efficient use of water. I shall impose conditions to this effect accordingly.

Conclusion

41. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

G Robbie

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall not commence later than the expiration of 3 years beginning with the date of this planning permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos:

Location Plan 318-326WBR-A-01-001-rev 1; Block Plans 318-326WBR-A-01-002 rev 1; Proposed Ground Floor Plan 318- 326WBR-A-03-101 rev 1; Proposed First Floor Plan 318-326WBR-A-03-102 rev 1; Proposed Second Floor Plan 318- 326WBR-A-03-103 rev 1; Proposed Third Floor Plan 318-326WBR-A-03-104 rev 1; Proposed Roof Plan 318- 326WBR-A-03-106 rev 1; Proposed Section A-A' 318-326WBR-A-05-101 rev 1; Proposed Section B-B' 318- 326WBR-A-05-102 rev 1; Proposed Elevation 318-326WBR-A-06-101 rev 1; Proposed Elevation 318- 326WBR-A-06-102 rev 1; Proposed Elevation 318-326WBR-A-06-103 rev 1; Proposed Elevation 318- 326WBR-A-06-104 rev 1; Proposed Front Visualisation 318-326WBR-A-02-101 rev 1; Proposed Rear Visualisation 318- 326WBR-A-02-102 rev 1; Proposed Street Visualisation 318-326WBR-A-02-103 rev 1 Daylight and Sunlight Assessment (5423 2); Flood Risk Assessment (AEG02216); Cycle storage spec; Viability Report (dated 30th July 2024).
3. Full details, including physical samples where appropriate and necessary, of the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the building, including glazing and fenestration details, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, in writing, prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thus approved.
4. No new grilles, satellite dishes, aerials, meter boxes, security alarms, lighting, security or other cameras or other fixtures or plant shall be mounted on the external faces or roof of the building other than those shown on the drawings hereby approved.
5. Prior to the first occupation of the residential units hereby approved full details of the cycle storage fixtures / fittings to serve the areas shown for this purpose on the approved plans have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle storage shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans and the approved fixture / fitting details prior to the first occupation of the residential units and shall be so permanently maintained for this designated purpose.
6. Prior to the first occupation of the residential units hereby approved full details of the refuse storage, including the design and external appearance, within the areas shown for this purpose on the approved plans shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The refuse storage shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans and the approved details prior to the first

occupation of the commercial and residential units and shall be so permanently maintained for this designated purpose.

7. Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, a noise assessment shall be submitted to the Council for approval of external noise levels incl. reflected and re-radiated noise and details of the sound insulation of the building envelope, orientation of habitable rooms away from major noise sources and of acoustically attenuated mechanical ventilation as necessary to achieve internal room- and (if provided) external amenity noise standards in accordance with the criteria of BS8233:2014. Approved details shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development and thereafter be permanently retained.
8. Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council, of an enhanced sound insulation value $D_{nT,w} + C_{tr}$ and $L'_{nT,w}$ of 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.
9. Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council, of the sound insulation of the floor / ceiling / walls separating the commercial part(s) of the premises from noise sensitive premises. Details shall demonstrate that the sound insulation value $D_{nT,w} + C_{tr}$ [and $L'_{nT,w}$] is enhanced by at least 15dB above the Building Regulations value and, where necessary, additional mitigation measures are implemented to contain commercial noise within the commercial premises and to achieve the criteria of BS8233:2014 within the dwellings/ noise sensitive premises. Approved details shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development and thereafter be permanently retained.
10. Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, a Ventilation Strategy Report to mitigate the impact of existing poor air quality for the self-contained dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall include the following information:
 - a. Details and locations of the ventilation intake locations.
 - b. Details and locations of ventilation extracts, to demonstrate that they are located a minimum of 2 metres away from the air ventilation intakes, openable windows, terraces.
 - c. Details of the independently tested mechanical ventilation system with Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) and Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀) filtration with air intakes on the rear elevation to remove airborne pollutants. The filtration system shall have a minimum efficiency of 90% in the removal of Nitrogen Oxides/Dioxides, Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀) in accordance with BS EN ISO 10121-1:2014 and BS EN ISO 16890:2016.

The whole system shall be designed to prevent summer overheating and minimise energy usage. The maintenance and cleaning of the systems shall be

undertaken regularly in accordance with manufacturer specifications and shall be the responsibility of the primary owner of the property. Approved details shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation/use of the development and thereafter permanently retained and maintained.

11. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, details of a post installation compliance report of the approved ventilation strategy as required by condition 10 to mitigate the impact of existing poor air quality shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall be produced by an accredited Chartered Building Surveyor (MRICS). Approved details shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter permanently retained and maintained.
12. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, details of the installation / commissioning reports of the Zero Emission MCS certified Air Source Heat Pumps or electric boilers to be provided for space heating and hot water for the six self-contained dwellinghouses (Class C3) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Approved details shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation/use of the development and thereafter permanently retained and maintained.
13. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a Construction Logistics Plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Council. This shall be in accordance with Transport for London Guidance on Construction Logistics Plans and shall include, but not be limited to, details of the numbers, size and routes of construction vehicles, and other matters relating to traffic management to be agreed. Approved details shall be implemented throughout the project period.
14. Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, a construction management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. Details shall include control measures for dust, noise, vibration, lighting, delivery locations, restriction of hours of work and all associated activities audible beyond the site boundary to 0800-1800hrs Mondays to Fridays and 0800 -1300 hrs on Saturdays with no works permitted on Sundays and Bank Holidays, advance notification to neighbours and other interested parties of proposed works and public display of contact details including accessible phone contact to persons responsible for the site works for the duration of the works. Approved details shall be implemented throughout the project period.
15. With the exception of the private roof terrace areas shown on the approved drawings no part of the remainder of the flat roof areas provided by the development hereby approved shall be used as a terrace or other accessible amenity space. No walls, fences, railings or other means of enclosure other than those shown on the approved drawings shall be erected around the roofs, and no alterations shall be carried out to the approved building to form access onto these roofs.
16. Prior to the first occupation of the residential units hereby approved, details of the proposed green roof, including a planting and maintenance plan and demonstration of how it will reduce surface water run-off from the site, shall be

submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The development shall not be occupied until the scheme has been carried out in accordance with the approved details, and the approved details shall thereafter be permanently retained in this form.

17. Prior to the first occupation of the residential units hereby approved full details of proposed water efficiency measures to limit internal use of water to no more than 105 litres per person per day shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These measures shall be installed in accordance with the approved details, and shall thereafter be permanently retained for this purpose.

**** end of schedule ****