



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/25/3365010

Former Gospel Meeting Hall, Carter Knowle Road, Sheffield

Grid Ref Easting: 433323, Grid Ref Northing: 384000

- 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 PTA Developments against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
- The application Ref is 23/03296/FUL.
- The development proposed is demolition of former meeting hall and erection of 53 apartments in buildings of up to five storeys, with formation of site access, associated landscaping and parking.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of former meeting hall and erection of 53 apartments in buildings of up to five storeys, with formation of site access, associated landscaping and parking at Former Gospel Meeting Hall, Carter Knowle Road, Sheffield Grid Ref Easting: 433323, Grid Ref Northing: 384000 in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/03296/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. Although the appellant originally certified that they were the sole owner of the appeal site, subsequently, they submitted an amended application form and certified that they had given the requisite notice of the proposal to the Council in its capacity as a landowner of part of the site. Therefore, I am satisfied that the statutory notification and certification requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 have been complied with and that the appeal can proceed.
3. Following its decision, and accompanying its Statement of Case, the Council has submitted a Section 106 legal agreement. The Section 106 agreement is undated and unexecuted. The principal purposes of the Section 106 agreement are to secure a financial contribution towards the provision of affordable housing and, as applicable, to secure a development viability reappraisal and an additional affordable housing financial contribution. As necessary, I refer to the submitted Section 106 agreement later in my decision.
4. A new local plan for Sheffield is emerging (the Emerging Plan). Limited evidence has been submitted to me in relation to the Emerging Plan, but what is before me indicates to me that the examination of the Emerging Plan is underway and although certain hearing sessions have taken place more are planned. On this basis it seems to me that the content of the Emerging Plan could be the subject of change. Furthermore, the evidence before me does not contain the full content of any of the Emerging Plan's policies which may be of any relevance to the

proposal. In the circumstances, the Emerging Plan is a matter of limited weight in my decision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposed development can viably provide an affordable housing contribution and whether the proposed development accords with relevant policies within the development plan, and within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which concern affordable housing.

Reasons

6. The planning application the subject of the appeal was refused by the Council in December 2024. The evidence before me demonstrates to me that the planning application was the subject of extensive exchanges in relation to viability with a history of viability related submissions being made by the appellant, each being reviewed by the Council. It is also clear from the evidence before me that these exchanges did result in some agreement between the appeal parties on certain elements of the proposed development's viability and appraisal inputs. This included an agreement on the proposal's gross development value (GDV) (£27,926,967) at the time the Council determined the planning application. However, disagreement remained in respect of certain other elements, including the appropriate targeted developer return percentage and the benchmark land value.
7. At the time it made its decision, the Council's stance was that the proposal could not viably deliver the full affordable housing requirement determined by the site's location within Sheffield's South West Affordable Housing Market Area, set out as being 30% of the housing proposed. However, the Council considered that the proposal could viably deliver an affordable housing contribution of £684,000 (coupled with a CIL payment). In contrast, the appellant asserted that no affordable housing contribution was viable.
8. Given the passage of time since the planning application was refused, the appellant's Statement of Case includes a July 2025 viability position statement¹. The Council responded to this within its own Statement of Case including, appended to it, a dedicated viability review² including appendices 1-16.2 of which appendices 16.1 and 16.2 are specific viability report and appraisal responses to the appellant's July 2025 position statement. In part, the appellant's final comments have responded to the Council's Statement of Case and appendices.
9. The content of these updated viability submissions does not alter or evolve the proposed development itself which remains the scheme of 53 apartments as determined by the Council. The Council has commented on the appellant's July 2025 viability position statement whilst, through the Council's notification processes during the appeal, interested parties have also had the opportunity to submit comments on the appellant's submissions. Therefore, and for the avoidance of doubt, it is procedurally fair for me to have regard to the various viability updates compiled since the Council made its decision and, therefore, my decision is made in the light of them.

¹ Updated July 2025 Statement of Viability Position

² Statement of Case – Viability 11 August 2025

10. In its latest appraisal submissions, which accompanied its Statement of Case, the Council's approach is to take the GDV as was agreed in November 2024 and apply a 3.32% uplift which it asserts is supported by a general market trend of inflation in respect of apartments in Sheffield since November 2024. Utilising its preferred appraisal figures for other viability elements, including for the likes of the benchmark land value (£500,000) and targeted developer return (15%) this scenario's effect on viability, as presented by the Council, is that the proposal could viably deliver an increased affordable housing contribution of £818,000 (coupled with a CIL payment).
11. However, subsequent to this, I have received compelling evidence from the appellant that, although this trend of inflation in respect of Sheffield's apartments may have materialised for a period, it did not last. The latest data I have before me (until June 2025) evidences that values are lower than the Council's assertions, indeed lower than they were in November 2024.
12. Based on this evidence, raising the previously agreed GDV by 3.32% is an unsubstantiated approach. Therefore, I cannot accept the Council's latest position that the proposed development's GDV should be raised from that previously agreed to £28,853,702 nor, in turn, the effects which this has on the scheme's viability overall.
13. The appellant asserts, adopting the same approach as the Council of adjusting the November 2024 GDV in-line with inflation/deflation trends, that the proposed development's GDV drops to £27,192,836 given that average apartment values have reduced by 2.63% since November 2024. Utilising a targeted developer return of 15% of revenue, as advocated by the Council, this equates to a targeted developer return of £4,078,925.
14. If I subtract the £818,000 affordable housing contribution from the Council cost figure of £24,525,628 this comes to £23,707,628. If I adopt the position of accepting the Council's preferred appraisal inputs other than the GDV then, with the omission of any affordable housing contribution, the revenue less costs equates to £3,485,208. This is considerably below the targeted return and thereby constitutes an unviable position. Therefore, utilising the approach advocated by the Council - taking the November 2024 agreed GDV, and adjusting in-line with the trend of average apartment sales since, the most up-to-date evidence I have before me demonstrates that the scheme is unviable and cannot provide any affordable housing contribution.
15. A further scenario which it seems to me is a sensible one to test is to determine the proposed development's viability with the GDV set at the November 2024 figure of £27,926,967 yet, otherwise, adopting the Council's preferred appraisal inputs. Not only was the November 2024 GDV agreed at that point, this value approximately marks the mid-point between the GDV submission of the Council, incorporating its 3.32% inflation, and the appellant's GDV, capturing their 2.63% deflation.
16. In this scenario the 15% targeted development return equates to £4,189,045. Again, if I omit any affordable housing contribution, the revenue less costs equates to £4,219,339. This produces a projected profit of £30,294. This is a very marginal profit projection. This is a scenario, one that utilises a GDV both appeal parties have been happy with. It does not show, to any convincing degree, that the

proposed development can viably provide an affordable housing contribution – the projected profit is too modest.

17. Therefore, given what is before me, and the findings I have set out above, I conclude that the scheme cannot viably provide an affordable housing contribution at this time.
18. Policy CS 40 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 (the CS) concerns affordable housing. It sets out that new housing developments will be required to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing where it is practicable and financially viable. Given my findings above, it is not practicable and financially viable for the proposed development to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing in this case at the time I am determining the appeal.
19. That said, and amongst other matters, the supporting text to Policy CS 40 refers to the assistance of a supplementary planning document in delivering Policy CS 40. This is Sheffield City Council's Community Infrastructure Levy and Planning Obligations Supplementary Document (the SPD). The SPD also permits a relaxation on affordable housing provision where evidence demonstrates that a development would not otherwise be economically viable. However, the SPD seeks to secure a viability reappraisal for any scheme which cannot viably deliver the required affordable housing provision at the time it is determined. A Section 106 agreement would be an appropriate means to secure this reappraisal.
20. The only Section 106 agreement before me does, in part, seek to secure a viability reappraisal. However, it is undated and unexecuted and, therefore, it carries no weight. As a result, the Section 106 agreement does not secure the viability reappraisal advocated by the SPD, and the proposal conflicts with the SPD as a result.
21. The SPD is not itself part of the development plan. Nevertheless, when CS Policy CS 40 is read in conjunction with its supporting text, I find that Policy CS 40 should be interpreted in the light of the SPD's content. Since the proposal is not securing a potential viability reappraisal at a future point in time, it removes the prospect that it may be practicable and viable for the scheme to make an affordable housing contribution in the future. As this is the case, I find that the proposal conflicts with Policy CS 40 of the CS. Because the appeal scheme would fail to meet an identified housing need, there is also conflict with policy within the Framework.

Other Matters

22. The evidence before me demonstrates to me that the meeting hall building proposed for demolition is no longer required for its former ecclesiastical related purposes, and I find that the site's redevelopment would not result in harm to, or hinderance of, those with religious beliefs. Therefore, the loss of a building which once fulfilled a community purpose is justified and acceptable.
23. Much of the proposed development would make use of previously developed land for housing within a part of Sheffield with a predominantly residential character. This constitutes an efficient use of land which is advocated by policies within both the development plan and the Framework.
24. The prevailing character of the area the appeal site is situated within is that of a leafy suburb. Semi-detached and detached houses particularly feature, whilst

there are also some other residential property types like bungalows. As a result, the proposal of 53 apartments contained within building blocks with multiple storeys does, I accept, represent a departure from the forms of residential development which typify the area. However, the presence of Mercia School, Carter Knowle Park, and the former meeting hall development on the appeal site itself, means that this particular stretch of Carter Knowle Road already exudes a character and appearance which is somewhat divergent from that exhibited elsewhere in the surroundings of the appeal site. This, in turn, allows the appeal site increased discretion to deliver a development of bespoke and atypical form.

25. The apartment blocks would be served by flat roofs which would assist in limiting their overall height. The plans propose a material palette with tones which would be both complementary to the local area and which would assist with breaking up the mass of the apartment blocks. Furthermore, the apartment blocks would be deeply recessed within the appeal site, set well-back from Carter Knowle Road and, coupled with the trees to be retained and landscaping proposed, the development would not be forceful within the street scene and would successfully assimilate into its context. Overall, the proposed development would be of high-quality, it would be respectful to this part of Sheffield and the density of the development delivered would be appropriate in the circumstances as a result.
26. Adjacent to the appeal site a private access drive leads to the Grange Farm property group. This is a historic group of properties which constitute non-designated heritage assets. Their significance principally derives from their architectural interest, because of their traditional appearance, but also their historic interest because of the evidence they provide of traditional farm buildings and cottages in the Sheffield area. Owing to the private drive access route, and the number of mature trees to their surrounds, the properties benefit from a secluded and leafy setting which also positively contributes to their significance. Due principally to its greater overall scale and mass in comparison to the existing meeting hall, and the siting of proposed Block B, the proposal would result in a more prominent development being positioned adjacent to the Grange Farm group. However, the degree of tree retention proposed would ensure that views of the development from the Grange Farm group would remain softened and filtered, and the group's leafy and secluded setting would be largely preserved. A low level of harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage assets would result from the more imposing presence of the development proposed.
27. The evidence before me, including the submitted Transport Statement, satisfactorily demonstrates to me that the impacts of the proposal's traffic generation upon the road network would be acceptable. Assisted by the imposition of conditions relating to parking management and demolition/construction management, I am satisfied that the proposal's effects upon the extent of parking stress in the area and air quality would be acceptable. I have no firm grounds on which to conclude that the proposal would result in any effects prejudicial to highway safety including in relation to children on route to local schools or the adjacent parkland.
28. Policy T28 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan 1998 (the UDP) requires developments to be adequately served by public transport services and infrastructure. Bus services in the area are not especially frequent, but they are conveniently located and frequent enough to meet that requirement of being adequate. Moreover, situated within a built-up part of Sheffield, a range of services

and facilities are nearby. Although interested parties submit to me that local services and infrastructure are under strain the evidence before me to this end is unconvincing, and I have no firm basis on which to object to the proposal on such grounds.

29. The design of the proposed development embodies, and takes into account of, several mitigating factors. These include the apartment blocks' separation from neighbouring land and property, their orientation and layout, the proposed approach to fenestration and balcony design, and the extensive retention of trees along much of the site boundaries. Together, these measures would moderate the development's effects on neighbouring land users, including residents and users of the adjacent recreational land, ensuring that they would not be harmed.
30. Although only apartments are proposed, there is some variety in their occupancy levels, and I am satisfied that a suitable mix and range of housing would be provided.
31. Parts of the appeal site are identified as being at high risk of surface water flooding. However, a final surface water drainage system to serve the proposed development can be controlled by condition, building upon the content of the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy. This satisfies me that the proposed layout, design, and mitigation would ensure that occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Private drainage connections are principally matters to be resolved between landowners, and I have no substantive evidence that existing foul water disposal arrangements on neighbouring land would be detrimentally affected by the proposal.
32. Conditions within my schedule will assist in ensuring that the proposed development protects species, promotes nature conservation and achieves biodiversity enhancements.
33. I have no substantive evidence that the proposed development would be likely to compromise land stability on or near to the site. Neither do I have any substantive evidence that any elements of the proposal's design, including in respect of parking, would be prone to criminal or anti-social behaviour or undermine social cohesion.
34. Some interested party submissions refer to other sites being available for a residential development which, it is asserted, would be more appropriate. However, I am required to determine the proposal before me, at the appeal site, on its own merits.
35. The Council accepts that it cannot demonstrate a deliverable 5 year supply of housing land as required by the Framework, and that its supply is 3.07 years. I discuss the implications of this further below.

Planning Balance

36. Given my findings on a range of considerations within my other matters section above, the proposed development complies with a host of development plan policies. However, in my main issue, I have identified conflict with Policy CS 40 of the CS because of the proposal's failure to secure a potential viability reappraisal to take place at a future point in time, which prevents any prospect of the scheme

making an affordable housing contribution in the future. As a result of this conflict with Policy CS 40, overall, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole.

37. However, I attribute a moderate amount of weight to this policy conflict. The weight must be moderated because, presently the proposal is not viable. Given the guidance of the SPD on drafting development reappraisal obligations, if the proposed development was built out promptly, then any obligation to reappraise the proposal's viability may well never bite. Therefore, potentially no reappraisal would be necessary and, even if it were, it may not be viable for an affordable housing contribution to be made at that future point in time.
38. As the Council cannot demonstrate a deliverable 5 year supply of housing land, paragraph 11 d) of the Framework applies. The application of paragraph 11 d) firstly requires me to consider whether the application of policies within the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed (11 d) i.).
39. The site is at risk of surface water flooding. However, I am satisfied that the planning permission would ensure that site occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future flood risk for the lifetime of the development without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Consequently, the application of policies within the Framework which protect areas or assets of particular importance provide me with no reason to refuse the development proposed.
40. Secondly, paragraph 11 d) requires me to determine whether any adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination (11 d) ii.).
41. The evidence I have before me indicates that the Council can demonstrate only 3.07 years' worth of housing supply. Therefore, the shortfall is significant, and the need for housing is pressing. The proposed development would boost housing supply. With 53 apartments proposed, the contribution to housing supply in this case would be quite significant too. It would, therefore, be very valuable. In the circumstances I attribute a significant amount of weight to it as a benefit.
42. The proposal would deliver the apartments on predominantly previously developed land within an established residential area within Sheffield. Therefore, the proposal would make use of a suitable site within a settlement for new homes. This is a matter which the Framework states should be given great weight.
43. Further modest benefits would be derived from the proposal through biodiversity enhancements, and employment and economic support during both the construction and operational phase of the development.
44. The proposal would fail to secure affordable housing, and it would not secure a potential viability reappraisal at a future point in time, removing any prospect that it could make an affordable housing contribution in the future. Therefore, the proposed development is not meeting local identified affordable housing needs. This is a clear adverse impact of the proposal. In addition, I have identified that a

low level of harm would arise upon a group of non-designated heritage assets adjacent to the site.

45. However, overall, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission in this case would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits which would principally stem from the proposal's contribution to housing supply and the delivery of housing on a site suitable for it. Therefore, the proposal benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This is a material consideration of significant weight, so much so, that it leads me to conclude that planning permission should be granted despite the conflict with the development plan.

Conditions

46. The Council has provided a schedule of suggested conditions that it considers would be appropriate. I have considered these conditions in the light of the tests for the imposition of conditions set out within the Framework and the content of the Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG). Both the Framework and content within the PPG are clear that planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they would satisfy all 6 tests for their imposition. Having regard to the Framework and the PPG, and in the interests of clarity or precision and to avoid duplication, I have made some amendments to the conditions suggested to me.
47. Condition 1 sets out the standard time limitation. Condition 2 is necessary to ensure that the proposed development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the reason of certainty.
48. Conditions 3 and 21 are necessary in order to manage the demolition and construction phases of the development in the interests of the living conditions of local residents, highway safety and reducing the effects of the proposal upon air quality. Condition 3 is a pre-commencement condition as a demolition and construction method statement must be devised before works begin on site. Also to protect the living conditions of existing residents, and the prospective occupiers of the development, conditions 17, 18 and 19 each figure in my schedule. Of those, condition 18 refers to the submitted Noise Impact Assessment. This assessment sets out sound reduction recommendations and specifications necessary to ensure that the internal noise levels of the apartments proposed would be acceptable. I have no reason to dispute the assessment's conclusions nor find that its recommendations are not appropriate. Consequently, I find it only necessary to condition compliance with the mitigation measures set out within the Noise Impact Assessment and the requirements for the submission of further mitigation and validation, as suggested by the Council, are not clear to me. Therefore, my condition does not contain requirements to this end.
49. Conditions 4, 12, 14, and again 17 referenced above, are each necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, including to precisely determine the proposed planting and to protect existing landscape features. Condition 4 is a pre-commencement condition as trees scheduled for retention must be protected before works which could otherwise damage them start.
50. Policy GE11 of the UDP seeks to protect and enhance the natural environment and promote nature conservation whilst the Framework advocates that planning decisions facilitate net gains for biodiversity. Therefore, I have imposed conditions 5 and 6. Each are pre-commencement conditions as the additional protected

species surveying, and the devising of final ecological enhancement measures, must take place before the site's habitats are disturbed.

51. To ensure that the site is made safe from the risks posed by contamination, I have imposed conditions 7 and 20. The former constitutes a pre-commencement condition. This is necessary because the details of the remediation required must be determined before the likes of ground works take place.
52. Conditions 11, 15 and 16 are necessary in the interests of highway safety, to ensure that parking provision is appropriate and to promote the use of sustainable transport modes. Furthermore, CS Policy CS 53 seeks to manage the demand for travel, including through the implementation of travel plans for new developments. So that the proposed development accords with this Policy, I have imposed a proportionate travel plan requirement via condition 10.
53. The Council's suggested conditions included further transport related requirements necessitating bus stop improvements to take place and works relating to statutory undertakers' equipment. However, having particular regard to Policy T28 of the UDP, the proposed development would be adequately served by existing public transport services and infrastructure, and it has not been shown to me that these additional infrastructure improvements and works meet all of the tests for condition imposition including those of necessity and relevance to the development permitted. Therefore, I have not imposed a condition requiring these elements.
54. Condition 8 will ensure that the proposed development is served by an adequate surface water drainage system, and it will allow for the precise drainage measures proposed by the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy to be devised in full detail.
55. Together, Policies CS 63, CS 64 and CS 65 of the CS seek to ensure that developments are energy efficient and reduce carbon emissions with significant developments expected to provide a minimum of 10% of their predicted energy needs from decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy. So that the proposal accords with these Policies, condition 9 is in my schedule.
56. Policy BE12 of the UDP relates to public art, advocating that art be an integral part of major developments. In order for the proposed development to comply with this Policy, I have imposed condition 13.
57. Policy CS 74 of the CS, and Policies BE5, BE10 and H15 of the UDP, seek to ensure that developments are accessible and meet the needs of their users including, amongst others, the disabled. However, none of these Policies set out a prescriptive requirement that all apartments must have a step-free level threshold between the internal accommodation and its private outdoor amenity area, and I am aware of no other guidance relevant to the proposed development which necessitates this. I have not been provided with sufficient justification that every single apartment must have this step-free threshold, therefore, I have not imposed the Council's suggested condition to this end.
58. The Council have also proposed a condition relating to electric vehicle charging points. The Council's Committee Report sets out that the adopted policies of the development plan do not explicitly require the provision of such charging points. The Council refer to the Emerging Plan's requirements for electric vehicle charging points, but I set out earlier the reasons why the Emerging Plan is a matter of

limited weight in my decision. Separately, Building Regulations impose certain requirements upon developments in respect of vehicle charging infrastructure. In the circumstances, no particular justification or compelling reasoning has been presented to me to justify the imposition of a planning condition requiring different requirements to Building Regulations. Therefore, I have not imposed a condition relating to electric vehicle charging.

59. There are no adopted development plan policies before me which require development proposals to be accompanied by an Employment and Development Plan. Neither do I consider that there are any policies of the Framework which demand one. It has not been demonstrated that a condition requiring the submission of an Employment and Development Plan would meet the tests for imposing conditions. Therefore, such a condition does not feature in my schedule.
60. Finally, given the absence of a signed and executed Section 106 agreement, I have given consideration to utilising a condition requiring one to be entered into to secure an affordable housing viability reappraisal. However, in my planning balance, I have identified that it is appropriate that planning permission be granted in its absence. Therefore, such a condition would not meet the test of necessity. Consequently, it does not feature in my schedule.

Conclusion

61. For the reasons I have set out, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole, however, the material considerations in this case indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

H Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:

Proposed Access Arrangement 23052-GA-01 Revision E
Block B – Floor Plans 3.05 Revision B
Block B – Floor Plans 3.06 Revision B
Block B – Elevations 4.02 Revision B
Block C – Elevations 4.03 Revision C
Block D – Elevations 4.04 Revision C
Block E – Elevations 4.05 Revision B
Block E – Elevations 4.06 Revision B

Block C – Villa 5.03 Revision B
Block D – Apartment 5.04 Revision B
Block E – Apartment 5.05 Revision B
Block B – Fenestration Study 4.07
Block B – Townhouse 5.02 Revision B
Block B – Floor Plans 3.04 Revision C
Block C – Floor Plans 3.07 Revision B
Block D – Floor Plans 3.08 Revision C
Block D – Floor Plans 3.09 Revision B
Block D – Floor Plans 3.10 Revision B
Block E – Floor Plans 3.11 Revision B
Block E – Floor Plans 3.12 Revision B
Block E – Floor Plans 3.13 Revision A
Tree Protection Plan 1513-004 Revision D
Location Plan as Proposed 1.01 Revision B
Lower Ground Floor 1.02 Revision A
Site Plan – Ground Floor Plan 1.03 Revision C
First Floor as Proposed 1.04 Revision B
Second Floor as Proposed 1.05 Revision B
Third Floor as Proposed 1.06 Revision B
Fourth Floor as Proposed 1.07 Revision B
Roof Plan as Proposed 1.08 Revision B
Site Sections – As Proposed 2.01 Revision B
Site Sections – As Proposed 2.02 Revision B
Site Sections – As Proposed 2.03 Revision A
Site Sections – As Proposed 2.04 Revision B
Site Sections – As Proposed 2.05 Revision B
Site Sections – As Proposed 2.06 Revision A
Site Sections – As Proposed 2.07 Revision B
Street Elevation – As Proposed 2.08 Revision B
Context Elevations – As Proposed 2.09
Context Elevations – As Proposed 2.10

3. No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a demolition and construction method statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The statement shall provide details of:
- i) the parking of vehicles for site operatives and visitors;
 - ii) storage, loading and unloading areas for plant and materials;
 - iii) site accommodation/welfare facilities;
 - iv) security hoardings/site enclosures;
 - v) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during demolition and construction including the use of wheel washing facilities, water suppression and road sweepers;

- vi) the demolition and construction access and egress arrangements;
- vii) external lighting; and
- viii) measures to control noise and vibration including in respect of any piled foundations.

The approved demolition and construction method statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition and construction periods of the development.

4. All works to trees shall accord with the recommendations of the Tree Protection Plan 1513-004 Revision D. No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until all trees identified for retention by the Tree Protection Plan 1513-004 Revision D have been protected in accordance with the details shown on the same plan. The protection measures shall be retained until the completion of the development works.
5. No development shall take place until a pre-commencement badger survey has been carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist and the results have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The survey shall provide an updated assessment of the presence of badgers, and it shall provide updated mitigation and construction methodology measures in relation to both badgers and foxes, building upon the content of Section 5 of the submitted Badger Survey Report Rev A September 2024. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved survey's mitigation and construction methodology measures.
6. No development shall take place until a scheme of ecological enhancement measures, based upon the content of the Biodiversity Impact Assessment Revision 4 and the Landscape Masterplan 1513-006 Revision M, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme of ecological enhancement measures shall detail:
 - i) All habitats to be retained and created to serve the development;
 - ii) The inspection, monitoring and management schedule of the retained and created habitats, which shall cover a period of 30 years from the implementation of the approved ecological enhancement measures;
 - iii) The provision of 3 swift boxes, 3 generic oval hole nest boxes, 6 bat boxes and hedgehog and herptile friendly means of enclosures; and
 - iv) An implementation programme for the habitat creation, and the bird and bat boxes and hedgehog and herptile friendly means of enclosures.

The development shall be carried out and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details, and the development shall not be occupied until the habitat creation, and the provision of the bird and bat boxes and hedgehog and herptile friendly means of enclosures have been completed, unless the approved implementation programme specifically permits an alternative completion stage.

7. No development shall take place until a detailed site contamination remediation scheme has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning

authority. The scheme shall include an appraisal of remediation options, identification of the preferred option(s), the proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, and a description and programme of the works to be undertaken including the verification plan. The remediation scheme shall be sufficiently detailed and thorough to ensure that upon completion the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to its intended use. The approved remediation scheme shall be carried out and, upon completion, a verification report by a suitably qualified contaminated land practitioner shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority before the development is occupied.

8. No development other than demolition shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Should the design not include sustainable drainage methods evidence must be provided to show why these methods are not feasible for this site. The submitted details shall:
- i) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
 - ii) detail that the surface water discharge from the completed development site shall be restricted to a maximum flow rate of 44.8 litres per second;
 - iii) provide details of the culvert re-routing/diversion and confirmation that no buildings or structures shall be erected within 4 metres of it;
 - iv) include a timetable for the implementation of the surface water drainage scheme; and
 - v) provide, a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

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

9. No development other than demolition shall take place until an energy statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Unless the energy statement demonstrates to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that it would not be feasible or viable to do so, the energy statement shall demonstrate how a minimum of 10% of the predicted energy needs of the completed development shall be obtained from decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy, or an alternative fabric first approach to offset an equivalent amount of energy.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved energy statement, and all the agreed decentralised and renewable, low carbon energy or fabric first measures shall be retained thereafter.

10. No development above ground level shall take place until a travel plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved travel plan shall:

- i) detail the measures to be deployed to encourage and facilitate that the occupiers of the development maximise the use of sustainable transport options and are less car-dependent; and
- ii) include an implementation timescale for the various travel plan measures to be deployed.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved travel plan and the agreed travel plan measures shall be retained thereafter.

11. No development above ground level shall take place until details of the layout, design and specification of all cycle parking have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The details shall demonstrate that at least 1 covered cycle parking space shall be provided per dwelling. All cycle parking spaces shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details, and they shall be available for use before first occupation of the development, or in accordance with a programme of the phased implementation of cycle parking spaces which must have first been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved cycle parking shall be retained thereafter.

12. No development above ground level shall take place until a scheme of landscaping works, based upon the content of the Landscape Masterplan 1513-006 Revision M, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme of landscaping works shall detail:

- i) Topsoil specification and depths;
- ii) Proposed planting including the species, plant supply sizes, planting locations and plant numbers/densities;
- iii) management provisions and maintenance schedule;
- iv) all means of enclosure, boundary treatments and retaining structures;
- v) all hard surfacing materials and a footpath connection to the adjacent Carter Knowle Park including details of its construction and surfacing;
- vi) minor artefacts and structures (eg external furniture and signage);
- vii) external lighting; and
- viii) an implementation programme of all landscaping works

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and the development shall not be occupied until the approved landscaping works

have been completed, unless the approved implementation programme specifically permits an alternative completion stage.

If, within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any plantings (or any plantings planted in replacement for them) are removed, uprooted, destroyed or die or become seriously damaged or defective, replacement plantings of the same size and species as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place within the first planting season following the removal, uprooting, destruction or death of the original plantings unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

13. No development above ground level shall take place until a scheme of public art has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied until the scheme of public art has been carried out in accordance with the approved details. The public art shall be retained thereafter.
14. No development above ground level in respect of each of the apartment blocks hereby permitted shall take place until details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of that apartment block have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details to be submitted shall include, amongst them, the following:
 - i) A sample panel of the proposed masonry erected on the site illustrating the colour, texture, bedding and bonding of the masonry and mortar finish to be used;
 - ii) Details at a scale to 1:20, or similarly detailed scale, of the following:
 - Windows and doors and their reveals
 - Parapets
 - External wall construction
 - Brickwork detailing
 - Rainwater goods
 - Railings, balustrades, privacy screens and any other boundary treatments to balconies and terraces
 - Screenings and entrance enclosures to basement and ground floor car parks
 - The junctions between different materials

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved material details and samples.

15. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the access arrangements, including the visibility splays and pedestrian crossing on Carter Knowle Road, have been implemented in accordance with the details shown on drawing 'Proposed Access Arrangement 23052-GA-01 Revision E. Once implemented, the visibility splays shall be retained, and no obstruction within them shall be allowed above a height of 1 metre.

16. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a parking management plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The parking management plan shall:
- i) Set out the strategy for the allocation of parking spaces to individual apartments, and for the allocation and management of the visitor parking spaces;
 - ii) Confirm the provision of no fewer than 13 visitor parking spaces, including 2 visitor disabled parking spaces.

All parking spaces shall be implemented and available for use before first occupation of the development, or in accordance with a programme of the phased implementation of parking spaces which must have first been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. All parking spaces shall be allocated and managed in accordance with the approved parking management plan for the lifetime of the development.

17. No plant or machinery shall be installed unless full details of it, including its acoustic emissions data, have first been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Thereafter, the submitted plant/machinery shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.
18. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the façade sound reduction recommendations and specifications detailed within the submitted Noise Impact Assessment NIA-10960-23-11133-v2 Carter Knowle Road including the internal noise section 5.2, detailing required sound reduction, and the site layout at Appendix C. The façade sound reduction recommendations and specifications shall thereafter be retained.
19. All windows annotated with 'obscure glazing' on the approved plans shall be fitted with obscure glass to a minimum privacy standard of Level 4 Obscurity before the first occupation of each relevant apartment. All privacy screens to private balconies, as identified on the approved plans, shall also be installed before the first occupation of each relevant apartment. Thereafter, the obscure glazing and the privacy screens shall be retained.
20. Any contamination that is found during the course of construction of the development hereby permitted that was not previously identified shall be reported immediately to the local planning authority. Development on the part of the site affected shall be suspended until a risk assessment has been carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Where unacceptable risks are found, the development shall not resume or continue until remediation and verification schemes have been carried out in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
21. Demolition and construction works shall take place only between the hours of 07.30 and 18:00 on Mondays to Fridays inclusive and 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturdays and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.