

PLANNING AND BUILDING (JERSEY) LAW 2002 (AS AMENDED)

Appeal under Article 108 (2) (b) against a refusal to grant planning permission

Report to the Minister

By Sue Bell MSc., BSc, FCIEEM, CEng, CWEM,
An Inspector appointed under Article 107

Appellant: Chris Le Marquand

Planning Permission reference number: P/2023/1023

Date of decision notice: 27 March 2024

Location: Handois Farm, La Rue du Bel au Vent, St. Lawrence, JE3 1NT

Description of development: Demolish the existing eastern dower and conservatory. Construct single storey extension to South elevation. Construct enlarged basement garage, bicycle store, bin store, wine store, gym (including sauna and changing facilities), and the swimming pool's plant room to the South of the site.

Appeal procedure and date: site inspection and hearing.

Site visit procedure and date: accompanied 30 July 2024.

Hearing: 31 July 2024

Date of Report: 30 August 2024

Introduction and relevant planning history

1. This appeal concerns refusal to grant permission for development at Handois Farm in St. Lawrence.
2. The application was refused by the Infrastructure and Environment Department ('the Department') using delegated powers for the following six reasons:
 1. The proposed eastern extension is not subservient to the existing dwelling and will dominate views from the east when approaching the historic farm complex, detracting from the significance of the listed buildings in the vicinity of the site. The proposals therefore fail to satisfy policies SP4, PL5, H9 and HE1 of the adopted Bridging Island Plan (2022).
 2. Due to the site's topography and the scale of the proposed single-storey extension, swimming pool and associated hardstanding it detrimentally dominates the southern side of the main dwelling and detracts from its character and contribution to the setting of the adjacent Grade 3 listed Handois Manor, contrary to policies SP4, PL5, H9 and HE1 of the adopted Bridging Island Plan (2022), the Landscape & Seascape Character SPG (2023) and the Housing outside the built-up area SPG (2023).
 3. The proposed development results in a disproportionate increase in the size of the dwelling in terms of floorspace, footprint and fails to be subservient to the main

dwelling. The eastern gable fenestration, rooflights and roof level balcony are non-complementary design features. As a result, the proposals are considered to have an unacceptable visual impact and fail to protect or improve the built environment and landscape character of the area, contrary to Policies SP3, SP4, PL5, NE3, H9 and GD6 of the adopted Bridging Island Plan (2023), the Landscape & Seascape Character SPG (2023) and the Housing outside the built-up area SPG (2023).

4. The application fails to provide sufficient information to demonstrate the likely environmental or sustainability, aesthetic or practical benefits of the demolition of the existing eastern extension, contrary to Policy GD5 of the Bridging Island Plan (2022).

5. The application provides insufficient information to adequately assess the impact of the proposals on biodiversity, specifically birds and bats, and is therefore contrary to Policies SP5 and NE1 of the adopted Bridging Island Plan (2022).

6. The application provides insufficient information to adequately assess if the additional discharge of sewage can connect to the mains public foul sewer, contrary to Policy WER 7 of the Bridging Island Plan (2022).

The appeal site and proposed development

3. The appeal site comprises a large plot located to the south of La Rue du Bel au Vent towards its western end. The dwelling lies close to the road but is separated from it by a granite wall. The dwelling comprises a substantial 2½-storey 5 bay granite farmhouse which has previously been extended to the east and west. The eastern extension comprises a 2-storey rendered dower wing, set back from the rear elevation and at a lower level than the host dwelling. The larger, western extension is faced with granite. It is set back from both the roadside and rear elevations. Its ridge height is below that of the host building, but higher than the eastern extension.
4. Levels change along the road, sloping from east to west. There are two vehicle access points from La Rue du Bel au Vent - one to the east of the property and one to the west. The western access serves a double garage at lower ground level.
5. There are extensive garden grounds to the south of the dwelling with fields bordering the land to the south and east. Further dwellings are present to the east beyond the field. To the west lies Handois Manor, which is a listed building (Grade 3). To the north of La Rue du Bel au Vent is a large warehouse. The eastern, western and southern boundaries of the site are defined by mature trees and planting.

Case for the appellant

6. The appellant has stated seven grounds of appeal:
 - Insufficient regard has been given to the preamble to Policy H9 (Housing outside the Built-up Area) which states that it would be unreasonable to resist all forms of development to improve people's homes where they lie outside the built-up area. The plan makes provision for the sub-division and/or extension of existing dwellings, including to provide for personal support and care.
 - The eastern extension is suitably subservient to the existing dwelling and would not dominate the view from the east when approaching the historic farm complex and would not detract from the significance of the listed buildings in the vicinity of the site.

- The scale of the proposed single-storey extension, swimming pool and associated hardstanding would not dominate the southern side of the main dwelling and would not detract from its character and contribution to the setting of the adjacent Grade 3 Handois Manor.
- The proposed development would not result in a disproportionate increase in the size of the dwelling in terms of floorspace and footprint and would be subservient to the main dwelling. The proposed rooflights, and the inset balcony formed within the existing roof's profile, are considered to be appropriate in terms of design and visual appearance.
- The eastern extension, including the conservatory which is in a state of disrepair, forms only a small part of the existing building which would be mostly retained, and its replacement with an improved extension will result in living accommodation meeting modern standards and expectations. It would also result in a more sustainable construction over an extended period of time than the existing extension. Also, all the materials arising from the demolition would be re-used on site.
- The requirement to submit additional ecological information could have been made conditional on the permit prior to the commencement of any development. Nonetheless, the additional surveys required to be carried out are likely to have been completed, and approved by the Natural Environment Team, prior to the later stages of the appeal process.
- The information from Dfl (Drainage) was pending when the application was refused.

Case for the Infrastructure & Environment Department ('the Department')

7. The reasons for refusal of the application were stated above. The Department's response to the grounds for appeal can be summarised as:
 - The whole preamble and policy wording for Policy H9 needs to be considered in the round in the context of the Island Plan as a whole. The second paragraph of the preamble to Policy H9 sets out the different factors to take into account for an extension to a dwelling.
 - The eastern extension would replace a much smaller existing extension. It would add an extra top floor and be wider than the existing. It would not be a polite subservient addition to the existing house.
 - The topography means that the southern extension would stand out in views from the east negatively impacting on the setting of the adjacent listed building.
 - The development would dominate and not be suitably subservient to the existing house. The proposed window openings, balcony and rooflights would be discordant features that would be out of keeping with the character of the area and with the traditional character of the existing house.
 - Insufficient information was provided to justify the demolition of the eastern dower extension.
 - Ecological information should have been submitted with the application. The appellant should have contacted Land Resource Management to determine what information needed to be submitted.
 - Information about drainage should have been discussed with the Drainage department and resolved before the application was submitted.

Consultations

8. The **Natural Environment Team** (9 November 2023) requested further information including surveys and submission of a species protection plan prior to determination of the application.
9. The initial response from the **Department for Infrastructure - Operational Services - Drainage** (10 November 2023) sought further information in relation to any increase in foul flows / loads or occupancy as a result of the proposals. Its second response (1 March 2024) noted confirmation of occupancy figures but still required information from a Drainage Impact Assessment.
10. The **Historic Environment Team** objected to the proposals owing to effects on the adjacent Grade 3 listed Handois manor (15 December 2023).

Representations

11. Two representations were received. One of these queried whether Handois Farm should be listed, given its proximity to Handois Manor. The other representation raised concerns about possible overlooking of the private space of the neighbour to the west from the proposed first floor terrace.

Inspector's assessment

12. Article 19 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 as amended states "In general planning permission shall be granted if the development proposed in the application is in accordance with the Island Plan". Planning permission may also be granted for proposals that are inconsistent with the Island Plan if there is sufficient justification for doing so. In reaching a decision, all material considerations should be taken into account.
13. The current Island Plan is the Bridging Island Plan, March 2022 ('the Island Plan'). Having regard to the policies within that plan, the reasons for refusal and the grounds for appeal, and points raised in representations, I conclude that the determining issues in this appeal are:
 - The principle of extensions at this location.
 - Acceptability of principle of demolition of existing extension.
 - The scale and design of the proposed extensions.
 - The effect of the proposals on neighbouring amenity.
 - The effect of the proposals on listed buildings.
 - The effect of the proposals on biodiversity.
 - The acceptability of drainage arrangements.

The principle of extensions at this location

14. The appeal site lies within the Green Zone. The spatial strategy of the Island Plan (Policy SP2) identifies that development within the countryside may be supported where it involves the conversion, extension and/or subdivision of existing buildings. Similar provisions are included within Policy PL5 - Countryside, coast and marine environment, which seeks that development proposals should protect or improve the character or distinctiveness of the countryside. Development of new homes involving the conversion, extension and/or sub-division of existing buildings may be supported in limited circumstances. Policy H9 - Housing outside the built-up area provides further guidance as to what these are. Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 'Housing outside the built-up area' also provides advice on this matter. Whilst the SPG is helpful in interpreting policy, it is subordinate to the Island Plan. I conclude

that the Island Plan provides support for the principle of extensions to dwellings within the Green Zone in some circumstances and subject to them according with the Island Plan as a whole. I have considered these circumstances further as part of my analysis of the scale and design of the proposals.

Acceptability of principle of demolition of existing extension.

15. The proposal would require the demolition of the existing eastern extension and conservatory and its replacement with a new extension. Policy GD5 - Demolition and replacement of buildings states that the demolition and replacement of a building or part of a building will only be supported where it is not appropriate in sustainability terms and/or economically viable to repair or refurbish it; the proposed replacement represents a more sustainable use of land; or there is a demonstrable aesthetic and practical benefit to replace over refurbishment. Applicants are required to provide sufficient information which demonstrates these benefits. Guidance on what this should contain is set out in the supporting text for the policy, which suggests that proposals should be accompanied by a sustainability statement.
16. The appellant suggests only one of the criteria need to be satisfied. The appellant considers that the proposal would be a more sustainable construction but has not provided any supporting evidence. Nor has he provided evidence that it would not be appropriate in sustainability terms and/or economically viable to repair or refurbish the extension. There is no suggestion that the proposal would represent a more sustainable use of land. I accept that there may be some limited aesthetic benefits to the proposals, but I have not been provided with any information to explain why these could not be achieved through repair/refurbishment. The appellant considers there is a clear benefit in providing a suitable living space for a family member who requires additional support and that this would also release the family member's current home to the market. However, I am not satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the practical benefits of the proposal outweigh the retention and refurbishment of the existing extension. I therefore conclude that the proposals do not accord with the provisions of Policy GD5 of the Island Plan.

The scale and design of the proposed extensions

17. Policy H9 - Housing outside the built-up area, sets out the circumstances where residential development outside the built-up area will be supported. Those parts which are most relevant to the current proposal are the first and second paragraphs which relate respectively to extensions to existing dwellings; and sub-division of a dwelling that would lead to the creation of separate households.
18. Paragraph 1 provides support for extensions for existing dwellings where "it remains, individually and cumulatively, having regard to the planning history of the site, subservient to the existing dwelling and does not disproportionately increase the size of the dwelling, and does not disproportionately increase the size of the dwelling in terms of gross floorspace, building footprint or visual impact.
19. Policy H9 and SPG Housing outside the built-up area both advise that the cumulative effect of extensions must be considered. This requires a consideration of the planning history of a site and any previous extensions, in addition to new proposals.

20. The proposed eastern extension would be taller, wider and deeper than the existing. Based on the appellant's own figures, the proposals would double the area of the eastern extension from 78m² to 156m² and provide for an additional floor of accommodation. For the most part, the design and finishes would mirror the existing western extension. In my view, the extension would be read as subservient to the host dwelling by virtue of its lower ridge height and set back from the main elevations of the host building.
21. At the hearing, parties appeared to agree that a perpendicular extension to a 5-bay farmhouse could be an appropriate vernacular response. Nevertheless, the southern extension would introduce a long, new structure, at an elevated level parallel to the boundary. It would be an extension to what is already an extension of the principal building, rather than an extension of the original 5-bay farmhouse. I find that this would, in combination with the existing western extension, overpower and detract visually from the dominance of the principal building and not be subservient to it.
22. Parties have quoted different figures for the scale of increase in footprint and floor area. The Department's report refers to a 46% increase in gross floorspace and an 88% increase in footprint compared to the appellant's figures of a 31% increase in habitable floor space and a 51% increase in footprint. At the hearing, I clarified that the Department's figures are based on those provided by the appellant on the scheme drawings and that the source of these differences appears to be whether the basement areas have been included within the calculations.
23. The appellant excluded the basement areas from calculations based on its interpretation of advice in SPG Housing outside the Built-up Area. This states "Basement areas may be included in the gross floor area calculation where they create additional habitable space for the enjoyment of the dwelling and where they have full floor to ceiling heights and ready access from within the dwelling or where they feature windows or an external door where, for example, the dwelling is built upon sloping ground." The appellant does not consider that the basement provides habitable space as it is accessed via a garage and the windows would be below the water level of the swimming pool. The Department disagrees.
24. A review of the plans shows that some of the below-ground space would be occupied by the gym, sauna and changing area, which would have full floor to ceiling heights. Although I accept that access to these areas would be via an external door through the garage, their function is for the enjoyment of the dwelling. As such I consider them to be habitable space.
25. Even if I accept the appellant's figures, they still represent a substantial proportional increase in floorspace and footprint compared to what is there now. Given the size of the existing dwelling they also represent a large increase in absolute terms. The existing building already incorporates two substantial extensions which have been included within the 'baseline' figures provided by the appellant. Therefore, the proposals represent a significant increase in floorspace and footprint compared to that of the principal building. I conclude that the two proposed extensions would cumulatively result in a disproportionate increase over the size of the principal in the size of the building in terms of gross floorspace and building footprint and visual impact. These effects would be exacerbated through the cumulative impact with the existing western extension.
26. Paragraph 2 of Policy H9 allows for an extension where it involves sub-division of part of an existing dwelling that would lead to the creation of a separate household

where the accommodation is required to provide for someone who requires a high degree of care and/or support for their personal wellbeing; or it is capable of allowing the creation of additional households, where they meet the minimum internal and external space standards; and it does not facilitate a significant increase in potential occupancy; and where it is capable of re-integration into the main dwelling. I am aware of the personal circumstances that have led to the proposal for the eastern extension. Whilst the proposed east wing would meet these criteria to a degree, the southern extension would not.

27. The appellant has emphasised the supporting text for Policy H9, which notes that it would be unreasonable to resist all forms of development to improve people's homes. Whilst that is true, it is also clear that the policy seeks to limit the scale of development. In this case, I find that the overall scale of the proposed extensions would not be subservient to the principal dwelling - particularly given the context of the scale of previous extensions.
28. Policy GD6 - Design quality seeks a high quality of design that conserves, protects and contributes to the distinctiveness of the built environment, landscape and wider setting. It includes eight key principles for design. Two of these have some relevance to the appealed proposal. The first relates to the relationship of the development to existing buildings, settlement form and distinctive characteristics of a place, having regard to the layout, form and scale of the development. The second relates to the use of materials, details, colours, finishes, signs and illumination relative to the character and identity of the area and its landscape setting.
29. I have already commented on the location of the proposed southern extension, which would be an extension of a previous extension and hence not be subservient to the principal dwelling. The Department has directed me to the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment SPG, which recommends protection of the rural character of the Interior Agricultural Plateau - Southern Plateau area within which the development is proposed. The eastern elevation proposes inclusion of a large area of glazing. The appellant has provided examples of where this has been considered acceptable in rural settings. Nevertheless, each case must be considered on its own merits and I find that this would appear as an incongruous feature in this setting and out of character with the area, particularly in terms of light spill at night. I also concur with the Department that the inset balcony would appear out of character with the host building and its setting.
30. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposals would not be consistent with the provisions of Policies H9 and G6 of the Island Plan.

The effect of the proposals on neighbouring amenity

31. Policy GD1 - Managing the health and wellbeing impact of new development safeguards the amenities of occupants and neighbouring uses. This includes an assessment as to whether a development would unreasonably affect the level of privacy to buildings and land that owners and occupiers might expect to enjoy.
32. During my site inspection I saw that the occupiers of the appeal property and of Handois Manor to the west benefit from a high level of privacy in their external amenity areas, in part owing to extensive mature boundary planting. The neighbours have expressed concern that the proposals would lead to over-looking from the proposed first floor terrace. I saw that there is an existing balcony in a similar location to that of the proposed terrace and that there are existing windows on the

southern elevation of the appeal property, which could allow for some overlooking of neighbouring amenity areas. The proposed terrace would adjoin a bedroom and I do not consider that it would significantly increase the potential for overlooking beyond that currently possible. The appellant has included a privacy screen on the proposed plans. I am therefore satisfied that the proposals would be consistent with Policy GD1.

The effect of the proposals on listed buildings

33. Policy support for the protection of listed buildings and their settings is provided through Policy SP4 - Protecting and promoting island identity and Policy HE1 - Protecting listed buildings and places, and their settings. Policy HE1 states that “proposals that could affect a listed building or place, or its setting, must protect its special interest.” The policy also notes that applications for proposals affecting listed buildings must be supported by sufficient information to enable an understanding and evaluation of impacts of the proposals. Whilst a Heritage Impact Statement was not submitted, the appellant has provided sufficient supporting information to enable an assessment of impacts.
34. The appeal building is not listed. Whilst there are several listed buildings in the vicinity of the proposal site, it is common ground that potential effects are limited to Handois Manor, which is located to the west of the proposal site. This has a non-statutory Grade 3 listing.
35. The Special Interest of Handois Manor is identified as architectural, archaeological and historical. Its significance is described as: “Manor house of late-medieval origin with principal phases of alteration and remodelling in the 17th and 18th century. Grounds include the ruins of c.1500 manorial chapel and an 18th century farm range. Associated with the fief of Handois, Les Saints Germain, Les Quatorze Quartiers et Garis.” The extent of listing includes the Manor House itself, the chapel, and a C18/19 outbuilding, which has been converted to domestic use.
36. The Schedule accompanying the listing makes no reference of the extent of the setting or how this contributes to the special interest of the listed building. However, I saw that the appeal site lies within the wider setting of Handois Manor. Although only limited views of side elevations of the listed building group are visible when travelling west along La Rue du Bel au Vent, the appeal building is prominent in these views, forming a boundary to the road and leading the eye onwards towards the group. I find that the proposed extensive area of glazing in the eastern face of the eastern extension would introduce a prominent feature into this aspect of the setting, which would dominate and distract from the views of the listed building group. These effects would be particularly apparent when the windows are illuminated.
37. Owing to the difference in ground levels, presence of solid boundary features and soft landscaping, there is some visual separation between the appeal site and the immediate setting of the listed Manor and chapel. Indeed, it is difficult to gain an appreciation of the chapel when viewed from the garden of the appeal site.
38. I accept that the open garden space of the appeal site, together with the adjacent fields, makes some contribution to an appreciation of the rural setting of the listed Manor House. However, I find that the extent of this is limited by topography and existing landscaping. Whilst, as noted above, I accept the concerns of the Historic Environment Team that the proposed southern extension would overwhelm the

southern side of the house to the detriment of its character, I am less convinced that this change to the wider setting would fail to protect the special interest of the listed building.

39. In conclusion, I find the effects of the proposal in its entirety on Handois Manor listed building to be finely balanced. The proposals would result in some changes to the wider setting of the listed building, but these would be limited in terms of their nature and extent and mainly experienced when approaching from the west.

The effect of the proposals on biodiversity

40. Provision for protection of biodiversity features is made through Policy SP5 - Protecting and improving the natural environment and Policy NE1 - Protection and improvement of biodiversity and geodiversity. Policy NE1 notes that proposals must be accompanied by adequate information which demonstrates how biodiversity and geodiversity will be protected.
41. The proposals were refused, in part, owing to a lack of information about the effects on biodiversity. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Inspection (dated 31 August 2023) was submitted with the application. The appellant notes that a Species Protection Plan, which drew on additional survey work undertaken in September 2023 was also submitted, but not uploaded to the Public Register. This was dated 5 December 2023, which was after the date of the Natural Environment Team's response requesting this information (dated 9 November 2023). It is not clear why the Species Protection Plan was not made publicly available or whether it was submitted to the Natural Environment Team for comment at that time. However, I understand that the Natural Environment Team has had a chance to review it. At the hearing, the Department confirmed that, subject to inclusion of conditions in relation to biodiversity, the Natural Environment Team did not object to the proposals. I conclude that the proposals would be consistent with Policies SP5 and NE1 of the Island Plan.

The acceptability of drainage arrangements

42. A lack of information relating to sewage discharge was also cited as a reason for refusal. Further information, in the form of a Drainage Impact Assessment, has since been provided by the appellant and submitted to DFI-Drainage. This has concluded that connecting foul flows from Handois Farm into the existing foul sewer network would not cause any significant detriment during a 1 in 30-year return period event. DFI-Drainage is satisfied that the proposals are acceptable (email contained in Appendix 9 of the Appellant's statement of case). Therefore, I find the proposal is consistent with Policy WER 7 - Foul sewerage of the Island Plan.

Conditions

43. As the proposal was determined using delegated powers and was recommended for refusal, the Department's assessment report did not include any recommended conditions. Prior to the hearing I invited parties to circulate lists of any conditions that they would wish to see applied, without prejudice to the outcome of the appeal. The Department provided a list of six conditions (including two standard conditions). These were discussed at the hearing, together with a consideration of other points that arose during the hearing.

44. The Natural Environment Team has proposed two conditions. These relate to implementation of the measures in the Species Protection Plan and submission of an external lighting scheme for approval. I agree that these would be necessary and appropriate conditions and would be in accordance with the requirements of Policies SP5 and NE1 of the Island Plan.
45. A condition to limit the hours of construction is proposed, to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring uses. Given the proximity of neighbouring properties and the nature of the access road, I agree that this is necessary and appropriate to safeguard these interests in accordance with Policy GD1 of the Island Plan.
46. Production and approval of a Site Waste Management Plan prior to commencement of development is also proposed. I accept that this is necessary and appropriate in accordance with Policy WER1 of the Island Plan.
47. The appellant has offered to provide a privacy screen to the western side of the first-floor terrace to alleviate concerns of the neighbours concerning over-looking. For the reasons set out above, I do not consider that the proposed balcony would result in a loss of privacy to land or buildings that the neighbour might expect to enjoy. In any case, as the submitted plans include the privacy screen there is no need to duplicate this with a condition.
48. Archaeology forms part of the special interest of the neighbouring listed building. Given the proximity of that building, there may be archaeological remains within the appeal grounds. Therefore, I consider that an archaeological watching brief during any ground works is appropriate and necessary to safeguard features of historic interest, in line with Policies SP4 and HE1 of the Island Plan.
49. Landscaping would form an important element of integrating the proposals with the character of the wider area and in minimising any effects on the setting of the listed building. Therefore, I recommend that hard and soft landscaping plans should be submitted for approval prior to commencement of works.

Conclusions

50. Whilst the principle of an extension to an existing dwelling within the countryside can be acceptable, for the reasons set out above, I find that the cumulative effect of the proposals would represent a disproportionate increase in the size of floorspace and footprint of the proposed dwelling. The cumulative effect of extensions would not be subservient to the principal dwelling. The proposals also include design elements that would be out of character with the host building and its rural setting and which would detract from the setting of the adjacent listed building. In addition, insufficient information has been provided to justify demolition and replacement of the eastern extension, rather than refurbishment.

Recommendations

51. I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed, and that planning permission should be refused. If the Minister does not accord with my recommendation, I have supplied a list of recommended conditions, which should be appended to any that is granted.

Sue Bell

Inspector 30 August 2024

Suggested conditions

1. The development shall commence within three years of the decision date.

Reason: The development to which this permission relates will need to be reconsidered in light of any material change in circumstance.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out entirely in accordance with the plans, drawings, written details and documents which form part of this permission.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out and completed in accordance with the details approved.

3. The measures outlined in the approved Species Protection Plan (ref: NE/ES/HF.03), dated 5 December 2023, shall be implemented prior to commencement of the development, continued throughout (where applicable) and thereafter retained and maintained as such. Any variations that may be required as a result of findings on site are to be agreed in writing by the Chief Officer prior to works being undertaken.

Reason: To ensure the protection of all protected species in accordance with the requirements of policies SP5 and NE1 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

4. Prior to the installation of any external lighting (other than temporary construction lighting) an external lighting scheme, designed according to the recommendations contained within the Species Protection Plan (ref: NE/ES/HF.03), dated 5 December 2023, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Chief Officer. Lighting shall be installed and retained in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure the protection of all protected species in accordance with the requirements of policies SP5 and NE1 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

5. No demolition or construction work, including the operation of mobile plant and machinery, in connection with this permission shall take place except between the hours of:
8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Friday and
8.00am to 1.00pm Saturday
There shall be no working on Sundays or Bank/Public Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring uses in accordance with policy GD1 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

6. Prior to the commencement of development, details of the methods to reduce, recycle and re-use construction and demolition waste, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Chief Officer. The details shall be set out in a Site Waste Management Plan which shall assess, quantify and propose a method for each material identified. It will also include any proposed temporary stockpiling, the location of disposal sites, details of waste transfer vehicle sites, frequency and timing of trips and routes to and from disposal sites. Thereafter, the Site Waste Management Plan shall be maintained as a living document and waste management shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved Waste Management Strategy. Any variations shall be agreed to in writing by the Chief Officer prior to the commencement of such works.

Reason: To ensure that waste construction and demolition materials are minimised wherever possible, and where they do arise, that they are re-used and recycled, so that

the amount of waste to be transported is minimised, in accordance with policy WER1 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

7. Prior to commencement of the development, a Project Design for a phased programme of archaeological oversight during construction works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Chief Officer. This should include measures to be taken to protect and preserve any features of archaeological interest identified. The Project Design once approved, shall be implemented at the applicant's expense. In the event that any significant archaeological finds are made, work shall cease and the Chief Officer shall be notified immediately to allow for proper evaluation of such finds and further mitigation.

Reason: To ensure that special regard is paid to the interests of protecting the historic environment in accordance with policies SP4 and HE1 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

8. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed scheme of soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Chief Officer. Details shall include
 - i) The location of all landscaping to be retained.
 - ii) The position of all new planting, this must include the species of plant(s)/tree(s) to be planted, their size, number and spacing.
 - iii) Seeding / turfing specifications.
 - iv) Topsoil specifications and the depth afforded to each planting zone.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory that soft landscaping is maintained or enhanced in the interests of visual amenity, privacy and to safeguard the setting of the neighbouring listed building in accordance with policies SP3, SP4, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE2, NE3.

9. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed scheme of hard landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Chief Officer. Details shall include:
 - i) all existing landscaping features to be retained and any servicing required.
 - ii) paving, external surface finishes, step and kerb specifications.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory landscaping of the site in the interests of visual amenity and to safeguard the setting of the neighbouring listed building in accordance with policies SP3, SP4, GD6, HE1.