



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 26 September 2017

Site visit made on 26 September 2017

by D. M. Young BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI MIHE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/16/3163673 150 Haverstock Hill, London NW3 2AY.

- 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 A Kirkwood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2016/2507/P, dated 4 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the change of use from shop (Class A1) to provide a 2 storey 2 bed dwelling (Class C3) with roof terrace including partial demolition of existing building, alteration to front facade, erection of front boundary wall and erection of first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use from shop (Class A1) to provide a 2 storey 2 bed dwelling (Class C3) with roof terrace including partial demolition of existing building, alteration to front facade, erection of front boundary wall and erection of first floor extension at 150 Haverstock Hill, London NW3 2AY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2016/2507/P, dated 1 September 2016, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's Decision Notice as this is more accurate than the version provided on the application form.
3. A revised drawing ref: HH14 07B was submitted with the appeal documentation. This includes amendments to the facade of the dwelling and internal alterations reducing the number of bedrooms from 2 to 1. Although the plan does not supersede that considered by the Council, I was invited by the appellant to consider the drawing in the event I was to find the development unacceptable with regards to the first and third main issues. The Council have taken the opportunity to comment on the drawing and in the circumstances I am satisfied that no injustice would be caused to any party if I were to consider the amended plan.
4. Following determination of the application, the Council adopted the "*Camden Local Plan 2017*" (the LP). This replaces the "*Camden Core Strategy: Local Development Framework 2010*" (the CS) and the "*Camden Development Policies: Local Development Framework 2010*" (the DP) and now constitutes

the Development Plan for the Borough. The Council supplied a long list of policies it considered relevant to the appeal scheme. However having reviewed these, I consider that only policies A1, D1, D2 and T2 are directly relevant to the appeal. The Council also confirmed at the Hearing that the adoption of the LP does not materially change its overall stance in relation to the proposal. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

5. The Council confirmed in its Appeal Statement that the submission of the Sustainability Statement and the imposition of an appropriately worded planning condition overcomes its fifth reason for refusal.
6. Finally, a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) was submitted prior to the Hearing. Amongst other things, this would secure a Construction Management Plan (CMP), ensure the dwelling is 'car free' and make financial contributions to off-site highway works and approval and monitoring of the CMP. However the Council raised a number of drafting concerns which remained unresolved at the close of the Hearing. I therefore wrote to both parties allowing additional time for the submission of a completed and agreed legal agreement. A revised UU dated 12 October 2017 was subsequently submitted. Although the Council considers the UU acceptable, all the proposed obligations need to be assessed against the statutory tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010. I return to this issue later in my decision.

Main Issues

7. The Council accept that the principle of a residential use is acceptable, consequently I consider the main issues to be:
 - 1) The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area,
 - 2) The effect of the development on the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area (the CA) and setting of 148 Haverstock Hill (Grade II listed);
 - 3) The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regards to outlook and daylight, and
 - 4) Whether the size of the dwelling would be acceptable with regards to the living conditions of future occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

8. The development involves the partial demolition of the existing single storey commercial unit and the erection of a first floor extension to facilitate a change of use to a 2-bed dwelling. Although the surrounding area is mainly residential, the Haverstock Hill street scene contains a wide array of building forms ranging from traditional Victorian properties to more modern flatted developments. Many buildings including No 148 are of significant architectural and aesthetic merit and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
9. Nonetheless, it was evident when I conducted my site visit that this is an area that has been subject to a degree of change over the years. Buildings tend to be 3/4 storey's in height and are set back from the road behind wide pavements, attractive frontage walls and mature landscaping. Collectively these features lend the area a spacious and verdant urban character.

10. Against this background the scale, form and use of the appeal building, a rendered, single-storey commercial unit of long standing origin, is somewhat anomalous. It is currently in use as a hairdressers and sandwiched between two larger buildings. It is adorned by a large and visually obtrusive fascia advertisement which conceals most of the upper section of the building. The projecting box sign, CCTV camera, exposed wiring, external strip lights, metal roller shutter and alarm box all exacerbate the building's forlorn appearance and its overall negative effect on the street scene.
11. The proposal involves extending and converting the existing single storey hairdressing salon into a house arranged over two floors with a reception, kitchen/dining room at ground floor level, and two bedrooms and a roof terrace at first floor level. The rendered dwelling would be set-back slightly from the back edge of the pavement allowing a small forecourt containing cycle parking and bin storage, to be provided. The height of the dwelling would align roughly with the side projection to No 148.
12. Putting heritage issues to one side, I can find nothing objectionable in the siting and scale of the proposed building which would be patently more compatible with neighbouring buildings. However, I share the Council's concerns about the contemporary design which in my view lacks architectural subtlety. In this regard, I find the revised scheme which incorporates a cornice line below the first floor windows as well as the retention of the front pilasters, to be a significant improvement. The computer generated images show that these features would help provide articulation to the facade producing clean lines in a modern style.
13. Therefore on the basis of this amended design, I conclude that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with Policy D1 of the LP. Amongst other things this seeks the highest standard of design which respects local context and character.

The Effect on Heritage Assets

14. The site and surrounding area are within the CA. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that in the exercise of planning powers in conservation areas, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Section 66(1) of the Act requires that, when considering development which affects a listed building or its setting, special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting.
15. At the local level LP Policy D2 states that heritage assets will be preserved and where appropriate enhanced. Where a proposal results in less than substantial harm to a heritage asset, as the Council argues in this case, permission will be resisted unless the public benefits convincingly outweigh the harm. The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (the CAA) was adopted by the Council in 2011. No 148 is identified in that document as a landmark building and described as a stuccoed, two storeys with an attic, and rosette-enriched decoration pre-dating the suburbanisation of the area.
16. I heard much at the Hearing from the relevant heritage experts regarding the CAA as well as those contrasting views on the appeal building's current contribution to the CA and the setting of No 148. Despite its current

appearance, the appeal building is referred to in the CAA as a '*positive building*'. One can only speculate therefore on the building's appearance prior to 2011 and its demise in the intervening years. Despite a commitment to do so, the CAA has not been reviewed since it was first published in 2011. If that review had taken place in recent years, it I find it unlikely that the existing description of the appeal building would be retained.

17. The Framework states that not all elements of a conservation area will necessarily contribute to its significance. From what I saw, the CA derives much of its value from the characteristic Victorian architecture. As is clear from my findings on the first main issue, I simply cannot accept the Council's argument that the appeal building in its current form makes a positive contribution to the CA. On the contrary and acknowledging that the facade and the building are not necessarily one and the same, I find that the building makes a negative contribution to the CA.
18. I cannot totally discount the possibility that the '*ugly elements*' could be removed and the appeal building restored to its '*former glory*' if the right tenant with the necessary resources and motivation could be found. However, quite what is left of the original building, the evidence is unclear. Without a clear understanding of this, it is difficult to attribute significant weight to the Council's position. I have also considered the Council's argument that a lay person would be aware the development is of '*modern construction*'. Whilst that maybe so, this matters little if it would enhance the CA and setting of No 148. In any event the CAA specifically acknowledges that modern additions are a key feature along Haverstock Hill and therefore I do not find this to be a particularly strong argument.
19. Even if there was more certainty about the building's original fabric, I am not persuaded there is a strong likelihood of the building being restored for the following reasons. Firstly, the size and location of the unit outside any recognised high street, is unlikely to lend itself to the type of occupier who would have large sums of capital to invest in the appearance of the building. Moreover, the Council confirmed that it no longer provides shop front improvement grants which might assist with any improvements. Second, the reality is that any future occupier would want to maximise the visual exposure of their business along what is a busy thoroughfare. It is thus unlikely that the size of the existing fascia would be reduced to the extent that they original features behind would be revealed.
20. It is inevitable that the addition of a second storey would add some bulk and mass to the appeal building obscuring a portion of the flank elevation of No 148. However the amount that would be concealed would be relatively small and would not fetter one's appreciation of the building's overall size, shape, architectural detailing or roof form or any of the other key features in the listing description. Moreover, given that there would still be a significant disparity in the size of the appeal building and its immediate neighbours, I am not persuaded that No 148 would read as part of the terrace to the north. Consequently the '*juxtaposition*' to which the Council refers would remain intact, albeit diluted slightly.
21. Although the dwelling would be set-back from the adjacent terrace building, I do not consider this in itself would cause material harm given that most buildings in the CA tend to be offset from the pavement. Moreover a front

boundary wall of a similar height to that fronting No 148 would be constructed across the frontage. The appellant's computer generated images demonstrate that the recessive siting would have tangible benefits on public views of No 148 particularly those to the north-west where the first-floor sash windows mentioned in the listing description would be revealed. These benefits would clearly outweigh any harm that might be caused by the concealment of a blank section of the building's side elevation.

22. Based on the foregoing, I conclude that the development would accord with Policies D1 and D2 insofar as they seek to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas and protect the setting of listed buildings. There would also be no conflict with the statutory duties under the Act in relation to listed buildings and conservation areas or paragraphs 133 and 134 of the Framework.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

23. Policy A1 of the LP states that outlook, sunlight daylight and overshadowing will all be considered in seeking to ensure that development does not compromise the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours.
24. In this case there can be no doubt that this is a site with significant constraints given the multitude and proximity of neighbouring windows and buildings. The appellant's assessment of overshadowing is contained in a Daylight/Sunlight Assessment. The report examines the level of light to each window in a 'do nothing' and 'with development' scenario and is based on the tests laid down in the Building Research Establishment Guide "*Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a good practice guide*" 2011 (the BRE guide). The BRE assessment method is endorsed in the "*Camden Planning Guidance – Housing*" (CPG2) and is therefore tantamount to Council policy.
25. The Council accepts the findings of the report which concludes that the impact on sunlight/daylight to surrounding windows would be *negligible*. Despite that, the Council argued at the Hearing that there would be an adverse impact on the occupier of No 151a.
26. This unorthodox, part single-storey/part 2-storey property is set back and wedged between the appeal property and No 152. Natural light to the ground floor is received via a series of roof lights. The only area of disagreement between the main parties relates to the effect of the development on the rooflight serving the lounge area otherwise referred to as window 1009. Along with rooflight 1010 this is the only opening to the lounge area. I was able to view that room as part of my site visit and was surprised to see that despite an absence of traditional wall mounted windows the room retains a reasonable level of natural light which was aided by overspill light from the kitchen in addition to the front door.
27. The appellant acknowledges that there would be a large reduction in sunlight to window 1009. Table 3.1 of the Daylight Report identifies that the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) of this window would be reduced from 58.5% to 31%. VSC is a measure of the amount of sky visible from a centre point of a window on the outside face, and a window that achieves 27% or more is considered to provide good levels of light, but if with the development in place the figure is both less than 27% *and* would be reduced by 20% or more, the loss would be noticeable.

28. Accordingly in this case whilst the loss of light to window 1009 would be noticeable, it would still exceed the 27% threshold. The reduction in daylight to window 1010 would be less significant with a small reduction to VSC. Overall, therefore I consider that the living room to 151a would still receive an adequate level of daylight.
29. In terms of sunlight, the issue is again window 1009. It is accepted would suffer a significant reduction in Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH). To pass the APSH test the centre point of the window would need to receive more than one quarter of its annual sunlight hours, including at least 5% in the winter months (between 21 September and 21 March). The APSH for 1009 is currently 53% over the whole year and 16% in the winter months. In the 'with development' scenario this would be reduced to 8% and 0% respectively. Window 1009 therefore fails the APSH test. However, I acknowledge that the BRE guide advises that in a densely developed urban area it is likely that existing development will not have the levels of light that could be expected in a suburban situation. The guidelines should therefore be applied with a degree of flexibility.
30. This is an unusual case as the windows concerned are rooflights as opposed to conventional wall mounted windows. As a result, the trajectory of the sunlight makes it more difficult for the occupier of 151a to sit and enjoy the sunlight in the same way as one could by sitting next a conventional window and feeling the sun on one's face. Although the rooflight is fairly generous in size, the sunlight only reaches a limited part of the room directly below the opening. It is not clear whether the lounge in its current configuration allows the occupier to sit in direct sunlight. It is also pertinent that the lounge is part lit by rooflight 1010 which would only experience a small reduction in daylight/sunlight. Finally, it should be borne in mind that window 1009 would still retain an acceptable level of daylight.
31. Taking all these factors into consideration, I conclude, on balance, that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with regard to daylight/sunlight. Consequently, there would be no conflict with Policy A1 of the LP.
32. Whilst the outlook of some neighbouring properties might change as a result of the proposal, there is no right to a view over adjoining land or to an open outlook. I am not persuaded there would be a significant loss of outlook from window 1009 given that it is a rooflight. Although there would be some loss of outlook from the bedroom window to No 152 this already faces the side and largely blank elevation of No 148. Although the first floor extension would obscure part of that view, this is a built-up residential area where new development will invariably cause some intrusion into views. With that in mind, the level of encroachment would not be sufficient to bring the development into conflict with LP Policy A1. Moreover, no overriding reasons have been provided as to why a bedroom window that provides adequate light should also provide an outlook. Based on the above, I am satisfied there would be no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Living conditions – Future occupiers

33. The Council has three concerns. Firstly, the overall size of the unit would be below the 70m² for a 2 bedroom, 3 person dwelling set out in the "Technical

housing standards - nationally described space standard" (the NDSS). Secondly, the main bedroom is too small and, thirdly, there would be inadequate daylight to the open-plan kitchen.

34. There is some doubt as to what the relevant space standard is in Camden. Although the Council's prefers those in the NDSS, the Council's own standards contained in CPG2 are slightly lower. CPG2 is adopted guidance and post-dates the NDSS by approximately 3 months. According to the Council, it is being reviewed to bring it into line with the NDSS. The appellant also pointed out that the government intends to undertake a review of the NDSS itself. Whilst that maybe so, I must determine the appeal in relation to the policies that are in force now.
35. The shortfall in relation to the main bedroom would be marginal, between 0.8-1.3m², depending on which standard is used. Although space standards should not be viewed as maxima, the Council were unable to direct me to any significant harm that might befall those future occupiers. Consequently, and bearing in mind the size of the second bedroom, this modest shortfall would be insufficient in itself to withhold planning permission.
36. Irrespective of whether one takes the space standard from the NDSS or CPG2 the overall size of the unit would comply with neither. To that end, I consider that the dwelling would not provide a satisfactory living environment for future residents due to inadequate internal living space. However, the appellant's amended plan ref: HH14 07B reconfigures the first floor layout so as to provide a single bedroom unit. The Council accepted at the Hearing that this would overcome its concerns and I see no reason to take a contrary view.
37. It became clear at the Hearing that it would be possible to reposition the rooflight to provide adequate daylight to the kitchen area. As such, subject to a suitably worded planning condition, I consider that the living conditions of future occupiers would be adequately safeguarded and there would be no conflict with the NDSS or CPG2.

Obligations

38. The Framework sets out policy tests for planning obligations; obligations must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The same tests are enshrined in the statutory tests set out in regulation 122 of the CIL regulations. "*The Planning Practice Guidance*" (the PPG) states that planning obligations should assist in mitigating the impact of development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms.
39. Off-street parking would not be provided for the future occupiers of the dwelling and the site is within the Belsize Controlled Parking Zone (CA-B) which according to the Council is highly stressed. Policy T2 of the LP requires all new development in the borough to be car free. It goes on to state that legal agreements will be used to ensure that future residents are aware that they cannot apply for on-street parking permits. The appellant has now submitted an amended UU which uses the Council's standard car-free housing clause. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the car free housing obligation meets the necessary tests and addresses the Council's sixth reason for refusal.

40. Aside from car-free housing, the appellant disputes the need for the other obligations. The UU provides a 'blue-pencil' clause to the effect that if my decision letter concludes that any provision of the UU is incompatible with any one of the tests then the relevant obligation shall cease to have effect.
41. I accept given the site's constrained nature that a Construction Method Plan (CMP) is necessary to ensure that construction activity does not impinge on pedestrian or highway safety. However, rather than dealing with this as is customary through a Grampian style planning condition, the Council has sought to have it included in the UU. When I asked why the matter could not be dealt with by condition, the Council argued that the CMP could be more specific and enforceable if it formed part of the UU. However, neither reason stands up to scrutiny. From an enforceability point of view, there is no obvious practical advantage to a CMP being part of a UU. On the contrary, if dealt with by condition, a Breach of Condition notice, to which there is no right to appeal, could be issued quickly by the Council without the costly and time consuming involvement of the Courts. It is also patently not the case that the UU route would enable the Council to request additional details above and beyond that possible through a planning condition. The standard Inspectorate condition (my condition 11) is comprehensive enough and I have not been presented with any evidence to show why such a condition would be deficient in this case.
42. I now move onto the requested contribution of £1,140 which the Council argue is required to cover the costs of reviewing, approving and monitoring compliance with the CMP. The first point to make is that the CMP could and should be dealt with by a planning condition. That being the case, it would be open to the appellant to submit an approval of details application for a fee of £97. Putting that issue to one side, I accept that for some large and complex developments involving on/off-site highway works, there might be justification for a contribution of this kind. However, that is simply not the case here. In fact no highway works are proposed. In all likelihood, the CMP would simply relate to the approval of parking, loading and storage areas immediately adjacent to the appeal site. Thus its review and approval would be a straightforward task and would not involve large amounts of time. I am also not persuaded that the monitoring of such a simple plan over a relatively short period would incur any significant costs to the Council. Therefore and with regard to the principles set out in the Oxfordshire County Council judgement¹ I consider that the works would fall fairly and squarely within the scope of the reasonable everyday functions of the Council. I therefore find the suggested CMP contribution to be unnecessary and wholly disproportionate to the proposed development. It does not therefore meet the requisite tests.
43. The Council's seventh reason for refusal refers to a failure to provide a UU to secure highway contributions to undertake external works outside the site. However, no alterations of any kind are proposed to the public highway. The Council's Statement clarifies that the £3,174.34 contribution is actually for potential damage to the footway flags and kerbs. It is argued that the contribution is supported by Policy DP21 of the DP. However, there is nothing in that now defunct policy which requires developers to pay speculative amounts to the Council for damage that has yet to occur. In my view given the modest scale of the development, I find it difficult to agree with the Council

¹ Oxfordshire County Council v SSCLG [2015] EWHC 186,

that there is any likelihood of damage being caused to the highway kerbs and the paving flags.

44. I appreciate that the Highway Authority has had to undertake repairs to damage to the highway in the past and may have had problems recouping the cost from developers. no substantive evidence is before me in this regard and therefore it is difficult to attach significant weight to these arguments. It is also pertinent, that there are powers a speculative contribution and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
45. I have considered the 2 appeal decisions submitted by the Council. However, I have very few details of these cases so I do not know whether the highway obligations were contested. Nonetheless, both decisions², concern much larger developments which unlike the current scheme would generate significant amounts of construction activity over a prolonged period. In the Netherhall Gardens case it also appears that the scheme involved highway works which is not the case here. I acknowledge that the Inspector in the Arthur Stanley House case accepted a contribution towards resurfacing the footway adjacent to the site. However, I do not know the exact circumstances of the work involved or what evidence was before the Inspector to demonstrate the likelihood of damage occurring during construction works.
46. In terms of a CMP, both decisions serve to demonstrate that in some cases involving larger, more complex development, it might be appropriate to secure a CMP via a legal agreement. However, there is nothing in the cited decisions which leads me to conclude that it is inappropriate to secure a CMP in most cases via a planning condition. Based on the above, I am giving limited weight to the submitted appeal decisions. Instead I have determined the appeal scheme before me based purely on its own merits.

Conditions

47. The Council has suggested a number of planning conditions which I have considered against the advice in the PPG. In some instances I have amended the conditions provided by the Council in the interests of brevity.
48. The time-limit condition and that specifying the approved plans are necessary in the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty. A condition requiring revised details of the cycle parking is necessary to ensure compliance with the Council's sustainable transport policies. A materials condition is necessary to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development. A privacy screen to the terrace is necessary to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers. However, given that terraces are predominantly used for sitting out, I consider the requirement for a 1.8 metre screen to be excessive. I have therefore amended the requirement to a 1.4 metre screen. Conditions pertaining to water usage, sustainable construction, energy efficiency and solar panels are necessary to comply with Council objectives in these areas. The bin storage area is shown on the approved plans and therefore a separate condition is unnecessary.

Conclusion

49. For the reasons given above and taking into account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

² APP/X5210/W/15/3141159 & APP/X5210/A/13/2205355

D. M. Young

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Mr Ian Phillips	Appellant's Planning Consultant
Mr Jack Warshaw	Appellant's Heritage Witness
Mr Nick Hawkins	Appellant's Daylight Witness
Mr Andrew Kirkwood	Appellant

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Ms Tessa Craig	London Borough of Camden – Case Officer
Mr Nick Baxter	London Borough of Camden – Conservation Officer
Mr Steve Cardno	London Borough of Camden – Highway Officer
Mr Charles Thvaire	London Borough of Camden – Daylight Witness
Ms Olga Obushenhova	London Borough of Camden – Legal Advisor

INTERESTED PERSONS

Ms Barabara Brend	Neighbouring resident
Ms Anita Hoffman	Neighbouring resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

- 1 Signed and dated UU dated 7 September 2017.
- 2 Copy of Policy DP21.
- 3 Extract from Inspector's Report pertaining to the LP dated April 2017.
- 4 Council's illustration showing floorplan and window locations to No 151a Haverstock Hill.

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: 1/1250 location plan, HH14 01A and HH14 07B.
- 3) Notwithstanding the details shown on plan HH14 07B, before the development commences, details of secure and covered cycle storage area for 2 cycles shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The approved facility shall thereafter be provided in its entirety prior to the first occupation of the new unit and permanently retained thereafter.
- 4) Detailed drawings, or samples of materials as appropriate, in respect of the following, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the relevant part of the work is begun:
 - a) All facing materials;
 - b) Section, elevation and plan of all windows and doors at 1:20 scale.

The relevant part of the works shall be carried out in accordance with the details thus approved. The use of the roof as a terrace shall not commence until the screen, as shown on the approved drawings, has been constructed. The screen shall be permanently retained thereafter.

- 5) A 1.4 metre high screen, details of which shall have been first submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, shall be erected on the east side of the proposed rear terrace prior to commencement of use of the roof terrace and shall be permanently retained and maintained thereafter.
- 6) The development hereby approved shall achieve a maximum internal water use of 105litres/person/day, allowing 5 litres/person/day for external water use. Prior to occupation, evidence demonstrating that this has been achieved shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- 7) The development hereby approved shall incorporate sustainable design principles and climate change adaptation measures into the design and construction of the development in accordance with the approved sustainability statement (Envision Sustainability- Sustainability Statement 23/04/16). Prior to occupation, evidence demonstrating that the approved measures have been implemented shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 8) The development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the approved energy statement (Envision Sustainability- Sustainability Statement 23/04/16) to achieve a 21.6% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions beyond Part L 2013 Building Regulations in line with the energy hierarchy.
- 9) Prior to first occupation of the building, detailed plans showing the location and extent of photovoltaic cells to be installed on the building shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The measures shall include the installation of a meter to monitor the energy output from the approved renewable energy

systems. The cells shall be installed in full accordance with the details approved by the Local Planning Authority and permanently retained and maintained thereafter.

- 10) Prior to first occupation of the building, a plan showing the re-location of the kitchen rooflight shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The rooflight shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.
- 11) 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:
 - i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - iv) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - v) delivery, demolition and construction working hours.

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