



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2025

by **D R Kay BA Dip.Arch RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/25/3364192

57 Lansdowne Road, Bournemouth Christchurch Poole, Bournemouth BH1 1RN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Westcoast Developments against Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is 7-2024-11568-F.
 - The development proposed is the erection of four terraced dwellings in the style of a stable block; demolition of existing garage and erection of coach-house style dwelling; and associated landscaping and infrastructure.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of four terraced dwellings in the style of a stable block; demolition of existing garage and erection of coach-house style dwelling; and associated landscaping and infrastructure at 57 Lansdowne Road, Bournemouth Christchurch Poole, Bournemouth BH1 1RN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2024-11568-F, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal relates to a planning application that was not determined by the Council within the prescribed period. I note that the Council would have refused planning permission, should it have made a decision on the proposal. I have had regard to the parties' submissions in establishing the main issue, which I set out below.
3. The appeal site is situated within a conservation area. In making my determination I have been mindful of the statutory requirements placed upon decision-makers by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
4. The appeal site at No57 Lansdowne Road, consists of a large plot of around half an acre in area, defined on the site plan by the red line boundary around most of the site. Included within the boundary is an existing substantial detached three-storey Victorian villa property, referred to by the appellant in their statement as 'Armore House' (AH). Whilst AH sits within the defined red line boundary of the appeal site, the property is not part of the appeal application, a separate planning application¹ having been submitted for the demolition of the garage and the single storey, flat-

¹ 7-2024-11568-E

roofed rear extension, and the conversion of the existing villa to form two semi-detached dwellings, together with associated site works.

5. There is dispute between the parties as to the status of AH. The Council consider the existing building to be a well-preserved example of a late-Victorian villa, which retains much of its original features and detail. They consider it to have a strong historic, architectural and aesthetic value, which makes a positive contribution to the DPCA. Accordingly, they consider AH to be a non-designated heritage asset.
6. The appellant notes that NDHA's are those heritage assets that are identified in accordance with paragraph 039 of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). They further note that the Council have not identified AH as a NDHA either via the plan making process, CA area appraisal or review, or via a local list, as required by the PPG. However, the PPG also allows for a Council to identify a NDHA through the decision-making process. Whilst the appeal is for non-determination, the Council have provided a putative reason for refusal, which includes the effect of the proposal on the setting of AH as a NDHA. They have also outlined the criteria by which they consider AH to be an NDHA. Having examined this, I have reached the same conclusion. I have therefore, determined the appeal on the basis that AH is a NDHA.

Main Issue

7. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the adjacent 'Arnmore House' as a non-designated heritage asset, and the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Dean Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

8. The CA covers a substantial area immediately to the north of the town centre of Bournemouth. The CA is geographically constrained by the A338 Wessex Way to the south, the A347 Wimbourne Road to the west and the main railway line to the east. It was laid out from the 1860's onwards, with most of the development taking place in the latter part of the 19th century. It consists of large properties set within substantial plots, with significant mature trees being a prominent feature. The cricket ground is located at the heart of the CA. As a result, there is a circular form to the highway network with interconnecting roads between, providing access.
9. Properties are separated from the highway network by either dense and high mature hedges, or low-level walls and fences which are heavily planted with mature shrubs behind. Mature trees feature heavily in the substantial plots. The properties are often substantial in size, though some have been subject to significant extension, alteration or re-development in the intervening years. Many are set back from the highway by some distance, such that they are either substantially obscured by their mature boundary landscape treatments, are viewed above them or in gaps through driveway entrances.
10. Given the above, I find the significance of the CA, insofar as it relates to this appeal, to be primarily associated with significant properties, set in substantial plots and which are significantly obscured from views from the public realm by mature trees and dense landscaping. Much of the character of the CA is derived from the curving form of the highways, and the setting of substantial properties within a

mature landscape with feature trees, dense hedges and with glimpses of residential and other properties, of varying ages and in a variety of architectural styles.

11. The properties in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site have been subject to significant alteration and extension in the past. The property to the north, No59 Lansdowne Road (No59), has been significantly extended to the rear and converted to several apartments. The pattern of development has therefore resulted in the rear elevation of the original villa being obscured by the three-storey rear extension, and the erection of detached garage buildings in the garden area, together with the creation of parking in the grounds.
12. The property to the south of the appeal site, No.55 Lansdowne Road (No55) has also been the subject of significant extension and alterations, which have also resulted in its rear elevation becoming obscured. Development has also taken place in a portion of its former rear garden; a separate dwelling being erected.
13. AH is a three-storey brick-built Victorian villa believed to have been constructed in the 1880's or 1890's. The property has a wealth of original detail, including double height bay windows, steeply pitched and gabled roofs with feature clay ridge tiles and detailed brick chimneys. The windows are, in the main, original sliding sash forms, sitting within openings defined by stone feature lintels, stone profiled cills and with contrasting brick string courses between. Gables have ornate barge boards, and feature, faux half-timber render details. The principal, and most detailed elevations are those facing south-west towards Lansdowne Road and south-east, facing the boundary with No55. The north facing and east facing elevations, the latter facing the rear garden, are of generally more simple detail.
14. The significance of AH, insofar as it relates to this appeal, is derived from its design and original architectural detail, together with its setting within mature landscaped grounds when viewed from the public realm within the CA.
15. The proposal would introduce an L-shaped terrace of four, two-bedroom, one-and-a-half storey height dwellings, designed as a Stable Block, to the rear garden area of AH. Whilst evidence in relation to the full scheme for AH is not before me, the appeal site plan identifies that the single storey flat-roofed extension, which is currently located to the rear elevation of AH, is to be removed. This would uncover the original rear elevation of AH, providing a gap of around 10m between AH's rear elevation and the gable of the proposed terrace. This space would provide garden, parking and service space for the proposed terrace and AH. There would be no windows in the gable of the terrace, so privacy between the terrace and AH would be preserved, though a blocked-up window detail is present in the terrace's gable at upper floor level, which would provide detail and interest to prevent the gable appearing as a blank mass.
16. The south-east elevation of the L-shaped terrace would be set back by around 2m behind the south-east elevation of AH. The south-west facing elevation of the proposed L-shaped terrace would be a little over 21m from the rear elevation of AH and around 51m from the front boundary of the appeal site with Lansdowne Road. This would be the closest viewpoint of the proposed terrace building from the public realm.
17. However, the proposal also incorporates the demolition of the existing garage building and its replacement, in a slightly revised size and position, with a two-bedroom, one-and-a-half storey height coach-house style dwelling. The south-west

facing elevation of the coach-house, would be aligned with the rear elevation of AH. It would therefore be around 4m further back into the site than the existing garage, being around 32m from the boundary with the public realm. The proposal would re-align the driveway, introducing further landscaped areas in front of AH and the Coach-House, and would introduce further trees, both between the proposal and the public realm, and for reinforcement of the northern and western boundaries.

18. The appeal proposal would be separated from the rear elevation of AH by around 10m and would be capable of enactment independently from the outcome of the separate application for conversion of AH. It would not result in the covering up of AH's rear elevation in the process of development, which has occurred in other developments in the immediate vicinity. It would therefore preserve the significance of AH in this respect. The proposal would result in the loss of some of the rear garden area, and a small number of small trees. However, as confirmed by the Council's tree officer, it would not affect the larger, more important trees on the appeal site, which are covered by a TPO. The proposed additional trees, controlled by an appropriately worded condition for landscaping, tree replacement and enhancement, would adequately compensate for this and maintain the verdant character and appearance.
19. However, I find that AH, as a NDHA, is experienced mainly from the public realm. The proposal would be located to the rear garden area of the property. The Coach House and Stable Block would be located 32m and 51m respectively, into the site from the closest vantage point from the public realm, with areas of landscaping and further tree planting between them, which would restrict views of the buildings. The design of the Coach House and Stable Block buildings complement the materials and detail of AH.
20. Whilst the proposal may not follow the original pattern of development, the siting and design of the buildings would respect the scale of AH, being subservient to the existing property. The existing views of AH from the public realm would, therefore, not be unduly changed by the appeal proposal. The scheme would therefore preserve the setting of the existing AH building. For the above reasons, I therefore find that the proposal would not cause harm to the significance of Arnmere House as a NDHA.
21. Turning to the effect of the proposal on the CA, Arnmere House as a NDHA makes a positive contribution to the CA as a designated heritage asset. However, I find that contribution comes primarily from the existing AH building itself, in its mature garden landscape setting, as it is experienced from the public realm within the CA. The property has significant landscaping to the garden in front of the property. This includes a low-level wall with a head height fence with significant mature shrubs behind, fronting Lansdowne Road. This obscures much of the view of the property, other than that which is seen either above the shrubs in distant views, or through the vehicular access point when the gates are open. Mature trees, which would be unaffected by the proposal, complete this setting.
22. Views to the rear garden of the property are severely restricted, partly by the existing AH building itself, and partly by its garage. What views there are, consist mainly of views of the upper portion of trees at the rear boundary with the railway, which are seen above the roof of the existing garage building.

23. The proposal would be situated to the rear of AH, between 32m and 51m into the site from the closest vantage point in the CA. However, it would introduce additional landscaping and tree cover between its' buildings and the public realm. AH itself would be unchanged by the proposal, other than development within its curtilage, though there would be additional tree planting to the boundary with Lansdowne Road.
24. The siting of the proposed buildings would lead to smaller plot sizes for all of the plots than is characteristic of the area. However, I find that any views of the proposal would be severely restricted, both by its distance into the site and the intervening landscaping between the buildings and the public realm. What views there would be, would be fleeting glimpses through the vehicular access point. This would be little changed from that which would currently be experienced, which would also be consistent with that experienced with other properties in the surrounding area. Views of the trees to the rear boundary with the railway, would be maintained above the roof lines of the Coach House and Stable Block, in a similar manner to how they are currently experienced.
25. For the above reasons, having regard to my duty under section 72(1) of the Act, I conclude that the appeal proposal would preserve the character or appearance of the CA. It would also not affect the way in which the CA, as a designated heritage asset, would be experienced.
26. Therefore, I conclude the proposal would not conflict with Policy CS39 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012), saved Policy 4.4 of the District Wide Local Plan (2002) or with Chapter 16 of the Framework, which require, among other things, that development conserves or enhances the character or appearance of designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

27. The Environment Act 2021(EA) requires development to provide a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain, unless it meets an exception set out in the statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).
28. The parties agree that the development would be required to provide statutory BNG. Therefore, if the appeal were to succeed, it would be subject to the statutory pre-commencement biodiversity gain condition ('the condition') as set out in the Act. In this scenario, the Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) states that it would generally be inappropriate, when determining a planning application for a development subject to BNG, to refuse on the grounds that the biodiversity gain objective will not be met. The PPG advises that more broadly, consideration may be required as to whether 'the condition' is capable of being successfully discharged.
29. The appellant submitted a completed BNG Matrix (Defra – Statutory Biodiversity Metric). The pre-development biodiversity value was calculated as 0.29 for Habitats and 0.24 for Hedgerow on the 16 July 2024. The post development biodiversity value is calculated as 0.32 for Habitats and 0.27 for Hedgerow, representing an 11.56% and 14.72% gain respectively. The appellant has therefore demonstrated that the proposal would be capable of meeting the minimum 10% BNG requirements of the EA.

30. 'The condition' sets out that development cannot begin until the Biodiversity Gain Plan (BGP) has been approved. It would be for the Council to consider the BGP, and whether, or not, the measures set out at that time are acceptable and secured. As such, I am as satisfied that 'the condition' is capable of being discharged.
31. There were objections raised to the proposal by adjacent residents. However, I find that due to a combination of the design of the buildings, their scale and siting, the intervening separation distances, boundary treatments and landscaping, whilst the proposal may result in a change to the outlook of adjacent residents, the effects of the proposal would not unduly harm their living conditions to an extent that would justify refusal as a result.
32. The Council have confirmed, having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), as at the 1 April, they could demonstrate a housing land supply figure of 2.1 years. The appellant notes that having regard to the December 2024 updates to the Framework, this figure is now likely to be lower than that stated by the Council. However, the figure acknowledged by the Council, is well below the 5 years required by the Framework. Accordingly, paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is engaged for decision making purposes.
33. However, the application site is immediately adjacent to AH, an NDHA and is within the Dean Park CA. All of these are designated heritage assets as referenced in paragraph 11(d) (i) and footnote 7 of the Framework. However, I have found the proposal would not cause harm to either AH as an NDHA, or to the character or appearance of the CA, as a designated heritage asset, it therefore accords with the development plan in these regards. It is, therefore, unnecessary to further consider the question of housing supply, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in national policy, as this would not alter the outcome of my decision.

Habitat Sites

34. The appeal site lies within the vicinity (beyond 400m but within 5Km) of the Dorset Heathlands SPA (Special Protection Area), Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site and Dorset Heaths SAC (Special Area of Conservation). The site is also within the 13.8km Zone of Influence of the New Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site. These Habitat Sites are all recognised for their national and international importance for nature conservation. Their qualifying features are their protected priority habitats and species including Hen-harrier, Merlin, European honey-buzzard, Eurasian hobby, European nightjar, Woodlark, Wood warbler and Dartford warbler, as well as other typical species of forest and heath areas.
35. Evidence shows that these protected Habitat Sites are under significant pressure from an increasing number of people living nearby. As the population grows, urbanisation and increased visitor number effects from human pressures and damage caused by domestic pets have the potential to cause ongoing adverse effects on the protected habitats and species.
36. Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council (BCP), together with Dorset Council and with advice and agreement from Natural England, have prepared the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020-2025 – Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The SPD sets out a strategy for the avoidance and mitigation of impacts of new residential development upon the Dorset Heathlands, through a financial

contribution from developers for mitigation schemes within the area. The mitigation would be provided by funding of the Urban Heaths Partnership who undertake monitoring and management of heathland sites. This is known as Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).

37. In consultation with NE, BCP have also developed and published a Planning Position Statement: New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar Site document dated November 2025 (the New Forest Strategy). This sets out a strategy for the avoidance and mitigation of impacts of new residential development upon the New Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site, through a financial contribution from developers for mitigation schemes within the area. The New Forest Strategy defines the level of contributions to SAMM's mitigation schemes, which provides adequate mitigation for small developments of this nature.
38. The proposal would result in the addition of five dwellings to the site. Consequently, it would lead to an increase in residents and would, in combination with other development proposed in the area, be likely to have significant effect on the nearby Habitat Sites. However, these likely effects could be mitigated by financial contribution to SAMM's measures defined in the SPD and the New Forest Strategy, though these contributions need to be legally secured.
39. I am satisfied that the submitted Unilateral Undertaking makes provision to appropriately secure the required SAMM's contributions, in accordance with the SPD and New Forest Strategy. I am satisfied that the obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and is directly related to the development. The information before me indicates the figures are based on standard methods of calculation and that the parties have agreed to the figures. I have little basis to find otherwise. Hence, on that basis, I consider that the obligation would be fairly and reasonably related to the development proposed and that it passes the statutory tests in this regard.
40. Natural England were consulted under Regulation 63(3) of the Habitat Regulations. Their response confirmed that they were content that the SDP and New Forest Strategy measures are sufficient to avoid any adverse impact on the integrity of the relevant designated Habitat Sites and features. Further, they confirmed that they were content with these measures being secured by way of a Unilateral Undertaking, under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. They raised no further concerns.
41. Taking the above into account, I find that the mitigation measures identified are sufficient to avoid any harmful effects of the appeal proposal, on the conservation objectives of nearby designated Habitat Sites. Further, they can be appropriately secured. I am therefore, satisfied that the proposal would not result in a likely significant adverse effect to the integrity of these Habitat sites.

Conditions

42. I have had regard to the 15 conditions suggested by the Council and the comments provided by the appellant. Where necessary I have amended the wording, in the interests of precision and clarity, and in order to comply with the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework.

43. In addition to the standard time limit for implementation (1), in the interests of certainty, I have attached a condition specifying the approved plans (2). Pre-Commencement Conditions are necessary to establish a construction management plan (3) in the interests of public safety, and to ensure 'no-dig' root protection for retained trees (4) during construction.
44. Conditions are necessary to control the materials used in the external envelope (5) and the details for key elements of the design (6), together with Conditions to control the hard and soft landscaping (7), and its long-term maintenance (8) in the interests of the visual appearance of the Conservation area. A Condition (13) requiring tree protection during the construction process is also necessary to ensure that trees covered by the TPO are not harmed.
45. I have imposed Conditions relating to the provision of access, parking and turning (9), together with electric vehicle charging (10), visibility splays (11) and cycle parking and storage (12) to ensure highway safety and the provision of adequate facilities for future occupants. I have also applied a Condition to ensure the inclusion of measures to accommodate wildlife within the scheme (14), and a Condition controlling the storage and management of waste bins to ensure highway and public safety (15).
46. The Framework, at paragraph 55, directs that planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development (PD) rights, unless there is clear justification for doing so. The Council have requested the removal of these PD rights. I have considered their request, in the light of the Framework. I find that as the appeal site is within a CA, and the adjacent AH is a NDHA, it would be justifiable to restrict PD rights in this case, in order to prevent uncontrolled harm to the CA. I have therefore applied a Condition (16) which restricts such PD rights.

Conclusion

47. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would accord with the development plan, read as a whole. This would also be supported by material considerations from policies in the Framework. I find no justification for determining other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

D R Kay

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 drawing no's: 9633/300B - Site Location, Block Plan, Site Layout Plan and Bike Store; 9633/301- Floor Plans units 1 – 4, 9633/302 – Elevation Plan units 1 – 4; 9633/303 – Floor & Elevation Plan unit 5; 9633/304 – Proposed Street Scene Plan; 9633/305A – Proposed SUD & Drainage Plan, 9633/307 – Floor and Elevation plan existing garage.

Pre-Commencement Conditions

- 3 No development shall take place, including any demolition works, until a construction management plan or construction method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan/statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition/construction period. The plan/statement shall provide for:
 - i. 24-hour emergency contact number.
 - ii. Hours of operation.
 - iii. Parking of vehicle of site operatives and visitors (including measures taken to ensure satisfactory access and movement for existing occupiers of neighbouring properties during construction).
 - iv. Routes for construction traffic.
 - v. Locations for loading/unloading and storage of plant, waste and construction materials.
 - vi. Method of preventing mud being carried onto the highway.
 - vii. Measures to protect vulnerable road users (cyclists and pedestrians)
 - viii. Any necessary temporary traffic management measures.
 - ix. Arrangements for turning vehicles.
 - x. Arrangements to receive abnormal loads or unusually large vehicles.
 - xi. Methods of communicating the Construction Management Plan to staff, visitors and neighbouring residents and businesses.
- 4 Prior to the commencement of the approved development, a suitable scheme of no dig surfacing, from an engineer, for the access driveway where it falls within the root protection areas of trees to be retained, is to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme is to be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Pre-Occupation Conditions

- 5 Notwithstanding the details shown on the plans hereby approved, no development above slab level shall take place until full details of the external materials to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall include:
 - i. A plan identifying locations of materials
 - ii. A brick panel measuring one square metre for each different brick illustrating the brick, bonding and mortar colour
 - iii. Details of the type, colour and texture of all materials to be used for the roofs of the buildings including verge details
 - iv. Details of rainwater goods including colour

- v. Details and materials (including colour) of the construction of doors, windows (including method of opening), soffits and fascias
- vi. Details and materials for the construction of porch canopies

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

- 6 Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development above slab level shall take place until architectural details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the following:
- i. Window and door reveal and cills.
 - ii. Design and location of meter boxes.
 - iii. Location and colour of external flues and vents.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details

- 7 Prior to development above slab level taking place, a scheme for hard and soft landscaping, including a programme of implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning Authority. The approved works shall be completed in accordance with the implementation programme. Hard landscaping shall include details of all boundary treatments, hard surfaces and demarcation of parking spaces. Soft landscaping shall include planting plans, written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes, proposed numbers and densities where appropriate, and full details of landscape maintenance regimes after the completion of works. Any trees or plants which are planted in connection with the development hereby approved which within a period of five years from planting, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of the same size and species as those originally approved.
- 8 Prior to first occupation of the approved development, a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All landscaping shall be managed in accordance with the approved landscape management plan.
- 9 Prior to first occupation of the approved development, the proposed access, parking and turning areas shall be constructed and arranged in accordance with the approved drawings and permanently retained and kept available for their intended purpose, thereafter.
- 10 Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted plans, within 3 months of the commencement of the development, details of the provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Points and associated infrastructure shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Those details shall be in accordance with the BCP Council Parking SPD (adopted 6th January 2021). The approved details shall be implemented and brought into operation prior to the occupation of any residential unit hereby approved or any use hereby approved commencing. The Electric Vehicle Charging Points shall be permanently retained for use thereafter.

- 11 Prior to first occupation of the approved development, the pedestrian visibility splays as shown on the approved plans shall be cleared of all obstructions over 0.6m in height above ground level and no fence, wall or other obstruction to visibility over 0.6m in height shall be erected within the area of the splay at any time.
- 12 Notwithstanding details shown on the submitted plans, within 3 months of the commencement of the development details of the final arrangement and provision of cycle parking and associated accesses, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking, including associated access arrangements, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed details and completed prior to occupation of the development hereby approved. The cycle parking shall be retained, maintained and kept available for the occupants of the development thereafter.
- 13 The tree protection measures as detailed in the Arboricultural Method Statement and on the Tree Protection Plan dated 15th January 2023 and 14th January 2023 and prepared by Gwydion's Tree Consultancy shall be implemented in full and in accordance with the approved timetable and maintained and supervised until completion of the development.
- 14 Prior to development above slab level taking place, details of a scheme to include biodiversity enhancements to be used in the development as specified at paragraph 5.11 – 5.13 in the Ecological Assessment Report prepared by Pro Vision Ltd, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include new fencing to have at least one hedgehog gap of 13 cm and 13 cm per fence run to allow movement of hedgehogs, and at least one built in bat tube or brick to be installed on aspects and heights as recommended by the Bat Conservation Trust http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/bat_boxes.html. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.
- 15 Waste and recycling bins associated with the new residential unit shall be placed out for collection at the front edge of the site where it meets the footway on collection days only, where they should not obstruct any access, parking or turning, before being returned to the approved storage point following collection.
- 16 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no enlargements of the dwelling(s) shall be constructed without the grant of further specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

***** End of Schedule*****