



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2023

by A Hickey MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/W/22/3302291

Bulmer House, 4 Ramshill, Petersfield GU31 4AP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Steve Hogben of Housing 21 against the decision of South Downs National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref SDNP/21/03755/FUL, dated 21 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of the existing Bulmer House and construction of a new 56 apartment extra care scheme and day centre with associated landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing Bulmer House and construction of a new 56 apartment extra care scheme and day centre with associated landscaping at Bulmer House, 4 Ramshill, Petersfield GU31 4AP in accordance with the terms of the application SDNP/21/03755/FUL, dated 21 June 2021, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant's appeal submission documents include amended landscaping plans. The planning appeals procedural guidance¹ advises that, if an applicant thinks that amending their application proposals will overcome the local planning authority's reasons for refusal, they should normally make a fresh planning application. Moreover, it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority, and on which interested people's views were sought. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the scheme which was refused by the Authority.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area including whether or not it would conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the South Downs National Park (SDNP); and;
 - Whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for the future occupiers with particular regard to outdoor amenity space.

¹ Procedural Guide. Planning Appeals – England. The Planning Inspectorate (updated April 2023)

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is situated on the northern side of the B2070 (Ramshill), a busy main route through Petersfield. The appeal site shares its access road with a small number of dwellings, a retirement complex (Ramscote), and Petersfield Cemetery. The site is currently occupied by a vacant care home (Bulmer House). The existing building is irregularly shaped and made up of differing roof heights and shapes set over a maximum two-storey height with small areas of amenity space located around the building.
5. The topography of the area results in a slope that falls from Ramscote to Ramshill. Bulmer House is situated at a higher level to Ramshill, the Cemetery access and residential properties to the southwest but at a lower ground level than properties adjacent to the north-eastern site boundary. Despite these level differences, the appeal site is largely restricted from view from the south and east due to a large band of trees on the boundary. It is also well-screened from the northern boundary by trees and the Ramscote complex.
6. Given that the site entrance is set at a lower level, the appeal building is most prominent from a narrow view at the junction entrance with Ramshill. When viewed from this location, Bulmer House is seen within a verdant setting of surrounding gardens and established trees and shrubs on site such that it is well integrated into the surrounding streetscape.
7. The proposed scheme would see the demolition of Bulmer House. The replacement building would have a greater footprint and be set over 2 and 3-storeys incorporating rooms within a mansard-style roof. This larger footprint would be set across a number of wings projecting out from a central element. Within these wings, there would be courtyard areas of open space linked to other open space areas around the building. Like the existing arrangement, parking would be provided on the opposite side of the road entrance.
8. The proposed building would see some additional built form further to the southern boundary, which would be partially built up on a raised plinth given the site topography. Nonetheless, the care home building to be demolished stretches across much of the site. The appeal building would retain the majority of the set-in from the boundaries of the site and the use of projecting wings with courtyards would break up the current continuous expanse of built form. While closer to the southern side boundary of the site, it would be set back from the site edge a sufficient distance to avoid its mass and bulk appearing incongruous, even accounting for its slightly raised position nearest Ramshill.
9. Views of the appeal site are somewhat restricted but as the building would be taller, it would be glimpsed from wider views along Ramshill close to Madeline Road. Whilst of a greater height and more visible than the building to be removed, the proposed building would be set partially into the ground and would be viewed largely against a backdrop of substantially sized trees. Additionally, from wider views to the west looking back, it would, for the most part, be seen as the backdrop of houses on Madeline Road.
10. The perceived height of the proposed building would be comparable with what would be expected of development in this location, given the topography of the

site, which rises up. Furthermore, on what is the most visually prominent element of the building looking up from Ramshill, the building has been stepped down a storey to reduce the massing on this corner. These factors would considerably reduce the visual prominence and bulk of the building as experienced from outside of the site.

11. From closer views, the appeal site is somewhat severed from the surrounding built form by the mature trees. Nonetheless, when viewed from various points along the access road, the building would not be seen in isolation but in close proximity to Ramscote, which is a substantially sized building in comparison to many others found nearby. As a result, the appeal building would not dominate or appear out of keeping with surrounding built form.
12. The roof would be the most visible element of the building. Although large and devoid of significant slopes and height variations except for a 2-storey element, it is functional in its design to allow for accommodation within the roof space. Additionally, the roof design also offers sufficient variation in its appearance through its use of projecting wings, dormer-style windows, floor-to-ceiling windows, small balconies and varying materials. Through the use of the design features it would not draw the eye or detract from surrounding views, particularly those on Ramshill. Within the wider setting, the surrounding undulating levels and dense tree bands found nearby would mean the proposed building would only be seen sporadically from surrounding paths and dwellings.
13. Whilst there is a degree of repetition to some elevations, the horizontal massing of the building would be broken up through the design and variation of materials such that it would not appear lacking in variety or interest. The intended use of the site means that mobility to and from the building will be a key consideration. On the basis of the drawings before me, I find that the proposed layout at the front of the building is not vehicle dominated but more appropriately designed to accommodate the mobility needs of future occupiers. As such, the main entrance would be recognisable to both occupiers and visitors.
14. Having observed the surrounding area, I also noted that darker brick design features could be found on a number of properties along Madeline Road such that blue brick would not be uncharacteristic of the area. Similarly, whilst numerous buildings in Petersfield are two-storey, there are examples of three-storey buildings including a variety of roof types such that the appeal building would not be out of keeping with development found nearby.
15. The proposed building has been designed, in part, to take into account the extra care needs of the future occupiers and the requirement to make the scheme viable financially whilst considering the existing topography of the site. In addition, the design of the scheme has evolved through various pre-application and design review discussions. From the evidence before me, all these matters have nevertheless resulted in a landscape-led approach scheme that would result in a building of high-quality design which respects local character and is of an appropriate scale for its location.
16. While there may be alternative design elements, including within the external amenity space, which could have been incorporated into the scheme, I have nevertheless found the scheme to be of a high quality and appropriate density for this location. For the above reasons, I do not consider the appeal scheme to be of institutional design.

17. Consequently, subject to appropriately worded conditions in relation to materials, site levels and landscaping, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As a result, the proposal would preserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the national park and would not conflict with the two purposes. It would accord with the aims of Policies SD1, SD2, SD4, and SD5 of the SDLP, and Policy BEP1 of the Petersfield Neighbourhood Development Plan (PNDP). Together these seek, amongst other things, to have a landscape-led design approach that is of high quality, which conserves and enhances the natural beauty and landscape character of the area. The proposal would also accord with the Framework, which seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment and that proposals are sympathetic to local character. It would also accord with the overall aims of the South Downs Adopted Design Guide SPD that seeks new development to respect and build on the National Park's diverse, distinctive landscapes and townscapes.

Living conditions

18. The appeal scheme would include a number of communal outdoor amenity areas that would be positioned around the proposed building but also within, such as a shared roof terrace. No specific planning policy or guidance has been brought to my attention which stipulates minimum size requirements of amenity space for the use proposed. Nevertheless, the Authority has raised concerns related to the amount and quality of these open spaces to be provided but does go on to accept that future occupiers are likely to be less mobile than the general population.
19. Although outdoor connectivity would be partly limited to those less mobile due to the absence of a level circuitous route around the entire building, outdoor routes would still exist to connect areas together, including the communal garden areas. Moreover, a route through the building would ensure connectivity of all the outdoor space.
20. No clear explanation or evidence to adequately illustrate to what extent light levels would be impacted nor an assessment of any compromised living conditions of future occupiers using the outdoor amenity spaces has been provided. I observed that light does break through the surrounding trees to reach the areas to the northern and eastern boundaries of the site.
21. Additionally, whilst some residents may prefer to use communal space located with more sunlight/daylight, there is nothing within the evidence before me that suggests that the use of other communal areas with greater shade would not be accessed by residents. It would be a matter of personal choice for a resident.
22. There is limited opportunity for any extensive scheme of planting within the amenity and courtyard area facing the car parking area. However, the topography of the site with longer range views to the west will provide some visual interest and an important backdrop and respite from the built form and parked vehicles in this area, such that this amenity space will be welcomed by residents using it. Additionally, whilst subject to a condition, the inclusion of planting within these areas will likely provide a degree of separation from the more active carpark and building frontage.

23. The courtyard garden to the north-eastern edge of the building would be narrower and less open than other open space areas to be provided externally. Nevertheless, it would still provide an area of open space for residents to enjoy without feeling the host building is overbearing on this space and provide connectivity to the wider amenity space.
24. The proposed scheme would see the introduction of Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHP) close to amenity space on the northern boundary. This area would also serve as a parking space and is close to the existing access to Ramscote. While there is likely to be an existing level of noise in this area which vehicle parking and the ASHPs would add to, it is unlikely to be at such a level to prevent occupiers of the building not wanting to use this area of the outdoor amenity space.
25. The proposed open space areas would be spread throughout the site. In the absence of any standard prescribing minimum space requirements for care homes, I take the view that the quantity of space to be provided would be adequately sized. Furthermore, there are many species of plants, flowers and vegetables that can grow in more shaded areas should residents choose to use these areas.
26. As such, the totality of outdoor areas would be capable of providing high-quality outdoor amenity space appropriate to the needs of the future occupiers. Therefore, the proposed outside amenity space would be acceptable in terms of its size and quality, given the nature of the proposal. As such, it would comply with Policy SD5 of the SDLP in so far as it requires new development to provide high-quality outdoor amenity space appropriate to the needs of its occupiers or users.

Other Matters

27. The appeal site is located outside, but close to, the Petersfield Conservation Area (CA). For the purposes of the Framework, the CA is a designated heritage asset. The CA closest to the appeal site derives its significance from the traditional layout and appearance of the buildings, some of which vary in style, age and use. In addition, there are numerous nearby listed buildings. Of these heritage assets, the most likely to be affected by the proposed scheme is the Grade II listed Church of England Cemetery Chapel and Grade II listed Non-conformist Cemetery Chapel at Petersfield Cemetery. There is also Grade II listed Cliff Cottage which sits close to the appeal site entrance on Ramshill.
28. Given the presence of these heritage assets, I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the buildings their setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.
29. Both Grade II listed Chapel buildings sit within Petersfield Cemetery. They derive their significance from their traditional appearance and prominence, given a lack of built form and spaciousness around the Cemetery. These buildings are best viewed within or directly adjacent to the Cemetery grounds, given the topography of the surrounding area. Grade II listed Cliff Cottage derives its significance from its simple but visually pleasing appearance, which is enhanced by its angled position towards Ramshill as the road begins to slope upward.

30. There is very limited intervisibility between the appeal site and the Cemetery, such that views of the appeal building would be largely restricted. Given the existence of substantial bands of trees, this limited intervisibility would also exist, albeit to a lesser extent, with Cliff Cottage. As such, the proposal would preserve the special historical interest and setting of these listed buildings. Furthermore, the design is appropriate and because of the substantial visual separation of the site from the CA, the appeal scheme would not harm the setting of the conservation area.
31. A completed and signed Unilateral Undertaking (UU) was submitted following the Authority's decision notice being issued along with a CIL compliance Statement provided by the Authority. The UU included obligations relating to the provision of 100% affordable housing and the submission and monitoring of a Travel Plan.
32. The Authority has concluded that the development would fall under the C2 Use Class (Residential accommodation and care to people in need of care). I have no reason to come to a different conclusion. Policy SD28 of the SDLP relates to affordable housing provision. The supporting text for this policy states that such provision is required for uses falling within the C3 (Dwellinghouses) Use Class. The South Downs Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2020) clarifies that affordable housing is *not* required for development falling under the C2 Use Class.
33. Policy HP3 of the PNDP does not expect on-site affordable housing but does expect developers to make a financial contribution to be agreed with the local planning authority. While Policy HP3 is not specific about use classes, it is clear it expects some form of affordable housing provision.
34. Therefore, there appears to be a conflict between these two policies. Under the SDLP there is no requirement for this C2 development to make any contribution to affordable housing; under the PNDP there would be. Planning Practice Guidance is clear that where a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published². In this case, this would be the SDLP.
35. Therefore, while the provision of 100% affordable housing would exceed the requirements of both policy SD28 and HP3 and could be seen as a benefit of development, there is no absolute requirement to provide it to meet the requirements of the most recent development plan policy. It is therefore not necessary to make the development acceptable in policy terms. On this basis, it would not meet the statutory test and I have not given the obligation any weight in my decision.
36. The Travel Plan would support and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in accordance with objectives within the Framework and Policy SD19 of the SDLP. I am satisfied that the obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable, is directly related to the development and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Therefore, it would accord with the three tests set out in paragraph 57 of the Framework and

² Paragraph: 044 Reference ID: 41-044-20190509

Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010. I have therefore taken this obligation into account.

37. I have undertaken my own assessment of all the evidence, including a site visit to the area surrounding the appeal site. For the purposes of Framework paragraph 177, taking into account the nature, scale and setting of the scheme I do not find the proposed scheme to be a major development and agree with the Authority in this regard. In addition, whilst the PNDP provides for an indicative number of dwellings, it does not set a maximum. Instead, Policy HP3 of the PNDP requires proposals to conform with the site design frameworks of the plan and also with the Authority's other development plan policies. I have already established that the proposed scheme would be acceptable in terms of its character and appearance. There is nothing within the design framework of the PNDP to alter my findings. Therefore, I find no conflict with the relevant sections of the PNDP as the appeal scheme would conform to the design principles and delivery considerations set out.
38. Interested parties have raised concerns with regard to loss of outlook, loss of light, overbearing impact, loss of biodiversity and noise from the proposed development. Having regard to the location of the building and its scale and massing within the plot, it will inevitably be visible at certain locations from nearby dwellings. However, I do not find that it would be located at such a close distance to any surrounding properties that it would result in a loss of light or outlook or be overbearing. The building would be in operation 24 hours a day, as such, there will be noise from within and externally. However, there is no substantive evidence before me to conclude this would be significantly above noise generated from the care home that previously operated on site. The loss of trees and other vegetation is unfortunate but not harmful. Nonetheless, adequate mitigation has been proposed, as has adequate protection for protected trees.
39. The existing building on site is of some age. Even if the appeal building was modernised, it is unlikely to be able to accommodate the proposed scheme due to its restricted size. Additionally, land stability and levels can be adequately controlled by the imposition of suitably worded conditions.
40. Objections have also been received from interested parties in relation to the provision of parking places. However, there is no substantive evidence that the scheme would result in an undersupply of parking which would reflect the findings of the Council on this matter. Additionally, given the likely low speeds of vehicles entering and exiting the Bulmer House site, I find no reason that additional speed control measures are required.
41. Matters of rights of way and land ownership are outside the scope of the appeal. Additionally, as the appeal site is allocated within the PNDP matters related to the demolition of the existing building will likely have been considered at that stage.
42. I acknowledge that the proposed scheme would achieve a BREEAM 'Very Good' rating. This is below the required standard set out in Policy SD48 of the SDLP, which requires multi-residential developments to achieve BREEAM 'Excellent'. However, I am mindful that both the Authority and the appellant are in agreement that only minor additional changes are required that would see the scheme achieve the required BREEAM 'Excellent' rating. For this reason, I find that it would be acceptable to attach a condition to achieve this.

43. I have therefore found that the development complies with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations that would indicate a decision other than in accordance with the plan should be made.

Conditions

44. The Council have suggested that 26 conditions be imposed, which I conclude on below. In imposing conditions, I have had regard to the approach in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have accordingly combined and modified the wording or form of certain conditions without altering their fundamental aims. Where pre-commencement conditions have been imposed these have been agreed by the appellant.
45. In addition to the statutory time limit condition (1), a condition specifying the plans that are approved and that the development shall be undertaken in accordance with them (2) is required in the interests of certainty. To protect the character and appearance of the area, it is also necessary to impose a condition requiring details of the external surfaces of the development and have these approved by the Council (6).
46. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, and given the steeply sloping nature of the site, a condition requiring the agreement of site existing and proposed site levels is necessary prior to development commencing (3). Also, in the interests of highway safety and neighbouring amenity, a condition is necessary to ensure the preparation of a Construction Transport Management Plan (4). This condition must be pre-commencement so that it covers the whole development process, including demolition and site clearance. Similarly, to provide a satisfactory standard of development, details of proposed foul and surface water drainage are also necessary prior to development commencing and I see no reason why these should be separate conditions (5).
47. A condition related to details and noise levels of external plant equipment is required to protect the amenity of the surrounding area (7). There is no substantive evidence before me to conclude that these details cannot be submitted once development has commenced. A condition is required for an Operational Management Plan and is necessary in order to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers (17).
48. A landscaping condition is necessary in order to ensure the proposed landscaping is improved and completed and maintained (8). As there is no sufficient justification to make this a pre-commencement condition I have amended the wording to above slab level. Conditions are also required in relation to details of external lighting (9) and roof light windows (21) in the interest of protecting wildlife and dark night skies. A condition requiring details of all means of enclosure and restriction of additional gates, fencing or other means of enclosure is required in the interest of visual amenity (10). A condition is also required for full details of the proposed green roof in the interest of ecology and long-term management (13). To ensure the development demonstrates a high level of sustainable performance, conditions are also required to demonstrate that the scheme achieves a BREEAM 'Excellent' rating (14, 15, 16).
49. Conditions are also required in relation to ecological matters (11, 12, 20). To ensure adequate provision and appropriate layout of car parking and cycling

spaces, a condition is needed (18). A condition is required to restrict the use of premises to those applied for in the interest of managing future uses of the site (22). A condition requiring accordance with the arboricultural assessment is required in the interest of protecting trees (19). Also, a condition is required in relation to unexpected contamination in the interest of safety (23).

50. As the installation of EV charging points will be covered by a condition imposed related to BREEAM, there is no reason for its imposition as a separate condition. Similarly, a condition regarding an updated travel plan is also not necessary as this is required by the UU.

Conclusion

51. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Hickey

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: HT827-0-01 Rev P1, HT827-0-02 Rev P1, HT827-0-10 Rev P2, 01_Rec/002, 01_Rec/003, 01_Rec/004, HT827-1-01 Rev P2, HT827-1-02 Rev P2, HT827-1-03 Rev P2, HT827-1-04 Rev P1, HT827-2-10 Rev P2, HT827-2-12 Rev P1, HT827-3-11 Rev P1, HT827-3-12 Rev P1, HT827-9-15 Rev P1, W137, 2131-TFC-00-00-DR-L-1001, 2131-TFC-00-00-DR-L-1002, 2131-TF-XX-00-DR-L-3001 and 2131-TF-XX-00-DR-L-3002.
- 3) No development shall commence until details of site levels and longitudinal and latitudinal sections including datum information of existing and proposed levels through the site have been submitted to and approval in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter proceed in full accordance with the approved details.
- 4) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
 - a) A programme for carrying out of the works and methods and phasing of construction works;
 - b) Construction work shall only take place in accordance with the approved method statement;
 - c) The arrangements for public consultation and liaison during the construction works;
 - d) Measures to minimise the noise (including vibration) generated by the construction process to include hours of work, proposed method for constructing foundations, the selection of plant and machinery and use of noise mitigation barrier(s);
 - e) Details of any floodlighting, including location, height, type and direction of light sources and intensity of illumination;
 - f) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - g) The arrangements for deliveries associated with all construction work;
 - h) Loading and unloading of plant, machinery, and materials and access and egress;
 - i) Storage of plant and materials used in demolition (if any) and constructing the development;
 - j) Location of temporary site buildings and compounds;
 - k) Protection of pedestrian routes during construction;
 - l) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding, where appropriate;
 - m) Wheel washing facilities;
 - n) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - o) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste, including spoil, resulting from demolition and construction works.

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

- 5) No development shall take place until a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters from the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, surface water must drain separately from foul water. The surface water drainage scheme should be based on the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance with evidence of an assessment of the site conditions, and include details of how the scheme shall be managed after completion. The development shall be completed, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) No development above slab level shall commence until details including samples of the materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
- 7) No development above slab level shall commence on site until a scheme which specifies the provisions to be made for the control of noise emanating from all external fixed plant associated with the development has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The noise mitigation scheme shall be implemented and maintained in full accordance with approved details. The rating level (L_Ar,Tr) of the noise emitted from the external fixed plant shall be restricted to 5 dB below the existing background sound level, determined to be 49 dB L_A90,60mins during the day time (0700-2300 hours) and 33 dB L_A90,15mins during the night time (2300-0700 hours). The noise levels shall be determined at the nearest noise sensitive premises. The measurements and assessment shall be made according to BS 4142:2014+A1:2019.
- 8) No development above slab level shall commence until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include:
 - a) Written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment;
 - b) Planting methods, tree pits & guying methods;
 - c) Schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate;
 - d) Retained areas of trees and hedgerows;
 - e) Details of all hard-surfaces, including paths, kerb edges, access ways, boundary treatments, bin and cycle stores and parking spaces, including their appearance, dimensions and siting;
 - f) Details of the siting, specifications and management of the Sustainable Urban Drainage systems;
 - g) A landscape schedule and management plan designed to deliver the management of all new and retained landscape elements to benefit people and wildlife for a minimum period of 5 years including details of the arrangements for its implementation;
 - h) A timetable for implementation of the soft and hard landscaping works.

The scheme of Soft and Hard Landscaping works shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details and timetable. If, within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any tree or plant (or any tree or plant

planted in replacement of them) is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies or becomes seriously damaged or defective, another tree or plant of a similar 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 tree or plant.

- 9) No development above slab level shall commence until details of all external lighting is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.
- 10) No development above slab level shall commence until details of all fencing, gates or other means of enclosure have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and carried out in accordance with the approved details. No other fences or means of enclosure nor any hard-surfaces, buildings or enclosures or additional site accesses shall be constructed or erected.
- 11) No development above slab level shall commence until an Ecological Enhancement Plan is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This Plan shall be in accordance with the ecological enhancement measures detailed within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (Urban Edge, March 2020), and include details for the provision of Swift nesting bricks. The development shall thereafter be undertaken in full accordance with the approved details and retained in perpetuity in a condition suited to their intended purpose.
- 12) No development above slab level shall commence until a site-wide detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP shall include, details of measures to retain existing boundary features; long term objectives and management responsibilities; the management regime of the landscape scheme; measures to enhance ecology through the provision of landscape species. The approved measures shall thereafter be implemented in full and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 13) Prior to the construction of the green roofs, as shown on approved Plan HT827-1-04 Rev P1, full technical details of its design and specification of the species, planting methods, and details of its means of drainage, future management and maintenance shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall, thereafter be implemented in accordance with these details. In the event that part of or the whole of the green roof does not become established or fails it shall be repaired or replaced with a like for like replacement within the first available planting season.
- 14) Prior to development above slab level, detailed information in a Design Stage Sustainable Construction Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall include:
 - i) Interim stage BREEAM NC certification and associated assessment report,
 - ii) SBEM calculations,
 - iii) Product specifications,

- iv) Grown in Britain or FSC certificates,
- v) Sustainable material strategy,
- vi) Building material strategy,
- vii) Building design details,

Demonstrating that the development will:

- Achieve BREEAM NC excellent standard,
- Reduce predicted CO2 emissions by 20% due to on-site renewable energy compared with the maximum allowed by building regulations and
- Provide at least 5no. Electric Vehicle charge points with a minimum power rating output of 7kW and universal sockets,

And to achieve these specific BREEAM NC credits:

- Ene 01 – mandatory credits (minimum 4);
- Ene 04 (passive design analysis);
- Wst 01 (diversion of resources from landfill credit);
- At least half of Material credits;
- Pol 03 credit (minimum no. 2 SuDS credits achieved);
- Wst 05 credit; and
- Provision of green roof.

The development shall be constructed in full accordance with these agreed details.

- 15) Prior to installation of the timber cladding to be used on development hereby approved, the certification of the timber cladding shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. It shall certify that the timber cladding is sustainably sourced and is 'Grown in Britain' where possible or Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) or Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC) certified.
- 16) Within 3 months of the occupation of the development, detailed information in a post-construction stage sustainable construction report demonstrating how the development has been carried out in accordance with all of the requirements set out in condition 14 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This documentary evidence shall include, but not be limited to interim stage BREEAM NC certification and associated assessment report together with post-construction SBEM calculations.
- 17) The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until an Operational Management Plan (to include details on how the premises will be managed to mitigate any potential impacts on noise and disturbance to neighbouring residential properties from residents/visitors, staff using the site, the management of refuse/recycling and deliveries, and the activities of the day centre) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan shall be implemented and maintained thereafter.
- 18) Prior to the development being brought into use, the car parking and cycle parking as shown on approved HT827-0-10 Rev 2 shall be laid out in full. They shall thereafter be retained at all times for their designated purpose.

- 19) The development hereby approved shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Implications Assessment including the appendices ref J57.89 dated 31 March 2021.
- 20) The development shall proceed in accordance with the ecological mitigation measures detailed within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Urban Edge Environmental Consulting, March 2020).
- 21) The roof lights windows hereby approved shall be fitted with blackout blinds, to be closed during hours of darkness prior to first occupation. Once installed, the roof blinds shall be maintained in working order and retained in perpetuity.
- 22) The development hereby approved shall only be used as Extra Care Housing (Use Class C2 (Residential accommodation and care to people in need of care) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended)), with day centre facilities on the ground floor, as shown on Floor Plan HT827-1-01 Rev P2 for resident and non-resident use, and for no other purpose or any provision equivalent to that class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification.
- 23) If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

END