



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 3 December 2019

Site visit made on 4 December 2019

by Philip J Asquith MA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B1605/W/18/3200395

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full and outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Hinton Properties (Grovefield Way) Ltd against the decision of Cheltenham Brough Council.
 - The application Ref. 16/02208/FUL, dated 8 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2017.
 - The development proposed is a hybrid application seeking detailed planning permission for 5,034 sqm of commercial office space (Use Class B1), 502 sqm day nursery (Use Class D1), 1,742 sqm Aldi food retail unit (Use Class A1), a 204 sqm Costa Coffee retail unit and drive-thru (Use Classes A1 and A3), with associated parking, landscaping and infrastructure works. Outline planning permission sought for the erection of 8,034 sqm of commercial office space (Use Class B1), together with associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure works, with all matters reserved (except access).
 - This decision supersedes that issued on 27 February 2019. That decision on the appeal was quashed by order of the High Court.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal was one of two appeals relating to the same site considered at an Inquiry which opened on 8 January 2019 and which sat for five days. The Inspector determining the appeals dismissed that which is now the subject of this decision but allowed the second appeal¹. The allowed second appeal related to the same development proposals save that the principal difference was that an additional office unit replaced the proposed Costa Coffee retail unit and drive-thru.
3. The Appeal A decision – the present scheme – was quashed on the basis that the Inspector had failed to provide adequate reasons for rejecting the Appellant's secondary case², which was a principal important controversial issue. It was made clear within the Court's Consent Order that, for the avoidance of doubt, the Inspector's decision was quashed only insofar as it

¹ Referred to respectively as Appeal A (APP/B1605/W/18/3200395) and Appeal B (APP/B1605/W/18/3214761)

² This was that the 'tilted planning balance' of paragraph 11d) of the National Planning Policy Framework should have been considered

related to Appeal A; the decision to grant planning permission in respect of Appeal B remained unaffected and the permission is therefore extant.

4. Having been quashed, the previous decision on Appeal A has no legal status. Nonetheless, I have had regard to the previous Inspector's considerations in respect of that appeal as a material consideration. The extant permission in respect of Appeal B is clearly a principal material consideration.
5. In defining the main issues within his decision letter, the previous Inspector considered a common issue in both appeals was whether the balance between B1 office use and non-B1 uses including retail would be acceptable, having regard to the development plan. He concluded that both schemes would provide a substantial boost to employment within Cheltenham including a very significant number of potential B1 jobs; there would be no conflict with the employment aims of relevant development plan policies in this regard. I have no reason to come to a different conclusion.
6. In his decision to dismiss Appeal A, the previous Inspector concluded that the Costa drive-thru would define the site as being primarily retail seen from its only access and would seriously diminish the perception of the business park for its prime purpose. It would also appear cramped and would be out of keeping seen in the same context as the existing BMW building, thereby not meeting the design quality aims of relevant development plan policies.

Main Issue

7. In light of the above and having regards to all I have seen, read and heard, I consider the main issue in this case is the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

8. The development plan for the area comprises the overarching Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (JCS), adopted in December 2017, and saved policies of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan Second Review, adopted in June 2006 (LP).
9. The Cheltenham Plan 2011-2031 Submission Draft was submitted for examination in October 2018. Hearing sessions have been held and the Council published its main modifications which, at the time of the Hearing, were the subject of a period of public consultation. I have not been referred to any design policies of this emerging plan relevant to the main issue I have identified.
10. It was agreed at the Hearing that the two most relevant policies against which the proposal should be judged in terms of the defined main issue are JCS Policy SD4 and LP Policy CP7. These were the policies previously considered by the Inspector in looking at the proposal on the basis that the Council's relevant reason for refusal related to visual impact and the quality of the business environment.
11. JCS Policy SD4 sets out the design requirements for new development. These include considerations of: context, character and sense of place; legibility and identity; amenity and space; and public realm and landscape. LP Policy CP7 is permissive of development where it is of a high standard of architectural design, adequately reflects principles of urban design and complements and

- respects neighbouring development and the character of the locality. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which states that the creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.
12. The extant planning permission establishes the principle of a large mixed-use scheme comprising office and retail development on this 4.15ha site, some 4.4km west of the centre of Cheltenham. A central spine road, Corinthian Way, running westwards from Grovefield Way, provides access, with office development being concentrated towards the western end of the site. An Aldi retail outlet and a day nursery building within the 'detailed' full component of the application would be to the eastern end closer to Grovefield Way. As such, the Aldi and day nursery elements are established.
 13. As noted above, the principal difference between the extant permission and the proposal currently under consideration is the replacement of an office block by a Costa coffee shop and drive-thru at the entrance to the site close to its junction with Grovefield Way. In his consideration of the current proposal it was the siting and appearance that was of concern to the previous Inspector and it is to these that I turn.
 14. I agree with the previous Inspector's assessment that, as seen from the A40, the character would be that of a business park and that the Aldi, Costa and day nursery would not be prominent features. The desired purpose of being a gateway development for motorists entering Cheltenham by this principal route would be served. An existing modern, four-storey BMW showroom building situated between Corinthian Way and the A40 is a prominent and dominating structure, particularly when viewed from Grovefield Way. The intention would be to carry across some design characteristics and materials to the present scheme in order to provide the whole area with a consistent appearance.
 15. From the evidence before me it is clear that the appellant spent a considerable time in negotiating the design of the scheme with the Council, against a background of there being no specific design guidance for the site. This resulted in a bespoke proposal for the Costa that would reflect and complement the existing BMW premises, which it would face, by the use of a similar architectural language, palette of materials and colours. Indeed, the proposal carried an officer recommendation of approval.
 16. The addition of the drive-thru Costa coupled with the Aldi and the BMW buildings would result in an essentially retail character of the part of the site close to Grovefield Way. The previous Inspector considered that this would send a confusing message as to the purpose of the development and would lack legibility. Whilst I agree with this view to some degree, I don't accept that the legibility of the whole business park would be significantly harmed. Legibility in a design sense implies an ability to readily find one's way around and understand the nature and purpose of a development.
 17. The presence of coffee shops and other fast food outlets are common features at the entrance to commercial business parks. I am not convinced that in this case the presence of the Costa building, in combination with the Aldi store and the day nursery building, would significantly undermine or diminish the functioning or perception of the business park. No doubt appropriate signage close to the entrance off Grovefield Way is likely to be established and this

- would enable visitors to readily navigate to the locations they wished, with the landmark building of the BMW showrooms providing a pointer.
18. Business parks tend to be destinations in their own right not reliant on passing visitations where greater degrees of legibility might be more relevant to assist navigation. Overall, I do not consider the functioning of the business park as a prime employment site, and one which has through the previous grant of permission been recognised as a mixed-use site, would be unduly undermined by the presence of the Costa building rather than another office building. I have no doubt that the presence of the Costa would assist in making the business park a more desirable location for business needs given the readily accessible complementary ancillary service it would provide for workers employed there in terms of food and beverage provision and informal meeting space.
 19. I am not persuaded that the proposed Costa with its perimeter access road serving the drive-thru element would appear unduly cramped in relation to the site. Outside seating areas to its eastern and southern sides would separate the building from the drive-thru access. There would be elements of landscaping separating these from the adjacent pedestrian footway and from Corinthian Way and Grovefield Way. Whilst these would be relatively narrow, I see no reason why a suitable landscaping scheme would not serve to appropriately complement the setting of the building and provide screening of the proposed bin store and plant. Careful choice and siting of landscaping coupled with its continued management could ensure its ongoing contribution. Suitable imposed conditions could control these. Taken together with the position of the Aldi store, car parking areas, the differing levels and the amount of potential landscaping, this eastern section of the overall site would have a relatively open ambience.
 20. The BMW building occupies a large and spacious plot, but its built form has a low, single-storey, horizontally-emphasised flat-roofed section which projects close to Corinthian Way facing the proposed Costa building. Through choice of external materials and its built form the Costa building would provide something of a complementary element to this at the entrance off Grovefield Way.
 21. There is a change of levels across the site with the land falling gently away from Grovefield Way. The Costa building would be lower and have a lesser presence than the Appeal B office building, which now has extant permission and which the previous Inspector considered would sufficiently define the business park entrance through its bulk and height. As already noted, the Costa is a bespoke design. It has a lantern feature that would assist in increasing its height and marking its presence. Furthermore, the dominating presence of the BMW building directly opposite already provides a marked gateway feature at the entrance to what would be the mixed-use business park such that the lower and more modest presence of the Costa would not need to compete in creating a sense of place.
 22. The adoption of a palette of contemporary materials and a common architectural approach would provide a unifying element to the scheme. The detailed design of the Costa building in conjunction with that of the approved Aldi and day nursery, and the BMW building would be appropriate for what would be a modern business park. Both the siting and design of the Costa

would complement and respect its neighbouring buildings, both existing and proposed. Overall, I consider the proposal would be respectful of, and not conflict with, the aims of JCS Policy SD4 and LP Policy CP7.

23. I accept that the views above are not fully consonant with those of the previous Inspector and my overall conclusion on this issue differs. Nevertheless, design issues and consideration of impact on character and appearance are to a degree subjective. My judgement is based on the evidence before me, my assessment of it and my visits to the site.

Other Matters

24. In light of the evidence produced, I identified at the Hearing that at that stage a second main issue for consideration was whether the most important policies for determining the appeal are out-of-date and therefore whether the 'tilted balance' of paragraph 11 d)³ of the Framework is engaged. However, on the basis of the conclusion reached above that the proposal would not conflict with the most relevant development plan policies, I do not need to make a finding in this regard and have not considered it further.
25. A signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking (UU) made under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended) was submitted with the application. This sets out the functional and aesthetic objectives of the landscape scheme and how landscaping, car parking and planting would be maintained. Following discussion at the Hearing, the appellant submitted a further UU. This duplicated the originally-submitted version together with an additional obligation relating to the restriction of use of the land subject to the outline element of the application to B1 use. Having regards to this latter obligation the terms of the application are clear in that outline permission is sought for commercial office space (Use Class B1). Also, as noted below, a condition is considered to be necessary which would impose control over possible change from B1 use. Therefore, the control which the UU seeks in this regard is achieved, the obligation is unnecessary and I have not given it any weight.
26. In terms of the Street and Car Park Management and Maintenance Plan and the Landscape Management Plan, the UU refers to the Council approving these plans, which the previous Inspector indicated a UU is unable to assure. These plans are therefore also made subject of a condition, as referred to below. With that proviso, these obligations are directly related to the proposed development, are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and would be necessary to make it acceptable. The tests set out in paragraph 56 of the Framework and Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 are met, and I give the obligations significant weight.

Conditions

27. Conditions were discussed at the Hearing with the parties agreeing that, with certain exceptions and modifications, those which were attached to the extant permission would be appropriate for inclusion in the event of the appeal being allowed. The appellant indicated agreement to pre-commencement conditions. These are necessary in respect of: a construction management plan, in the interests of local amenity; the provision of a pedestrian road crossing, in the

³ Where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole

- interests of pedestrian safety; the provision of fire hydrants, details of all fixed plant and equipment for reasons of the control of noise emissions; foul and surface water drainage; external and roofing materials, landscaping and external lighting, in the interests of the appearance and character of the development; and phasing, in light of the hybrid nature of the scheme.
28. There was discussion as to whether this latter condition should include the requirement that the office buildings should be capable of occupation before the retail element comes into operation. This was included in condition No. 24 of the Appeal B permission to ensure that the prime purpose of the business park is achieved. At the time of the Hearing the Council had before it for determination an application from the appellant seeking the removal of this condition. This was on the basis that the condition was preventing early delivery of the scheme and limiting its attractiveness to future office occupiers, thereby having the opposite effect of bringing forward a prime business park.
 29. Evidence at the Hearing indicated that such a condition would require the developer of the business park to firmly secure office occupiers at the same time all with the same occupational requirements to be available prior to the retail elements. Practical constructional and occupational problems were being created whilst imposing a severe financial burden on the applicant. This was on the basis that the office buildings would have to be built on an unrealistic speculative basis, which would be a high risk in the present economic climate. As such, the requirement of the condition would place an obstacle in the way of progressing and delivering the development. I consider there to be force in this argument and that to impose a condition in relation to suggested phasing would be unreasonable in the circumstances.
 30. The measures required in the Construction Method Statement include the need to prevent flooding of Elm Farm and North Road West. The Street and Car Park Management and Maintenance Plan and the Landscape Management Plan are to be approved before any occupation takes place. This is to ensure that common areas are maintained in the long term.
 31. Advanced arrangements need to be made to deal with contamination that may be present on the site. Having regards to policies of the development plan, other conditions are necessary at this stage to control the hours that the retail uses are open to customers, to secure ecological enhancement, completion of carriageways and the provision of a delivery management plan for the A1 Aldi store and Costa coffee shop.
 32. A Travel Plan is required to encourage, incentivise and monitor the use of public transport. A BREEAM rating of at least 'very good' is required in the interests of sustainable construction and energy conservation. A restriction is placed on the use of the food store as a food supermarket operator because of the highways implications of including other purposes such as a pharmacy or post office. A restriction is necessary on permitted development for the office buildings to prevent them becoming used for purposes other than offices (B1a and B1b). This is in recognition of the primary purpose of the development for office employment in accordance with the longstanding aim of the development plan. Finally, a design code is to be submitted and agreed with the aim of ensuring a high-quality development.

Conclusion

33. For the reasons set out above and having taken account of all other matters raised the appeal is allowed.

Philip J Asquith

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Gary Grant, of Counsel	instructed by Cheryl Lester, Solicitor for the Council
Wilf Tomaney BA(Hons) DipUD MRTPI	
Philip Staddon BSc DTP MBA MRTPI	PJS Development Solutions Ltd
John Rowley	Planning Policy Team Leader, Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC)
Lucy White	Senior Planning Officer, CBC
Cheryl Lester	Solicitor, CBC

FOR THE APPELLANT

Killian Garvey, of Counsel	instructed by Ridge and Partners
James Griffin MA MRTPI	DPP Design Ltd
James Hinton BSc(Hons) MRICS	Hinton Group Ltd
Paul Fong BA(Hons) MRTPI	Ridge and Partners LLP
Philip Pratt BA(Hons) MRICS	Alder King LLP
Ben Blackwell BA(Hons) MA MRICS	Franck Steier Price Ltd
Stephen Tucker BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI	Barton Wilmore LLP

DOCUMENTS (handed in at the Hearing)

1. Copy of closing submissions on behalf of the appellant at the original Inquiry in January 2019
2. Confirmation of the newspaper publication and date of publication of the advertisement of the Hearing
3. Updated list of plans relating to the proposal
4. Copy of plan ref. 178-41 Rev C (Proposed Office 2 Floor Plans)

DOCUMENTS (post-Hearing)

- A. Agreed note between the appellant and Council in respect of s.106 and condition on phasing
- B. S.106 Unilateral Undertaking, dated 17 December 2019

Schedule of conditions

1. Any development comprising the full application (5,034 sqm B1 office space, 502 sqm D1 day nursery, 1,742 sqm A1 food retail unit, a 204 sqm A1 and A3 retail unit and drive-thru and associated works) shall commence no later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. Applications for approval of the reserved matters relating to the outline part of the application shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.
3. Prior to the commencement of any development associated with the outline application (8,034 sqm B1 office and associated works) details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale ('the reserved matters') must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development associated with the outline application shall be carried out as approved.
4. The non-B1 class uses hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the following hours:
 - A1 retail food store Monday to Saturday: 0800 – 2200 hours
For no more than six continuous hours between 1000 – 1800 on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
 - D1 nursery Monday to Friday: 0700 – 1900 hours
 - A1 and A3 coffee shop Monday to Sunday: 0630 – 2200
5. The food store hereby permitted shall only be used by a food supermarket operator and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class A1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended by the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Order 2005, (or in any provisions equivalent to that class in any statutory instrument revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification). The following services shall not be open for customers at the food supermarket:
 - Banking facilities (excluding ATM)
 - Dispensing Pharmacy
 - Dry cleaning or Post Office service
 - Photographic shop or booth
 - Café /restaurant
 - Sales of cigarettes or tobacco
6. Prior to the commencement of development, a Construction Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details throughout the construction period. The Statement shall contain:

- i. details of the on-site parking arrangements for contractors, other operatives and visitors;
 - ii. proposals to minimise harm and disruption to the adjacent local area due to ground works, construction noise and site traffic; and protection North Road West and Elm Farm from flooding during construction;
 - iii. details of routes that delivery and muck-away vehicles serving the development will take and how they will be loaded and unloaded;
 - iv. details of measures to avoid dust and discharges into watercourses or ditches;
 - v. details of the arrangements for the loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - vi. details of the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - vii. details of the provision for wheel washing facilities to control the emission of dirt or dust; and
 - viii. complaints and complaints response procedures.
7. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design, implementation, maintenance and management of a foul and surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority in writing. The submitted details shall be in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water Management Plan issue 5 ref. 16-6953, dated September 2018, and shall provide:
 - i. information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water;
 - ii. details of a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development;
 - iii. a timetable for the provision of the surface water drainage scheme; and
 - iv. the means by which the drainage systems are to be effectively cleaned.

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

8. If, during the course of development, contamination 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 the developer has submitted to and obtained written approval from the Local

Planning Authority a remediation strategy detailing how the contamination shall be dealt with including a timetable. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

9. Prior to commencement of the development, a scheme for a pedestrian road crossing of Grovefield Way shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme before any occupation takes place.
10. Prior to the first occupation of any building, the carriageway(s) (including surface water drainage/disposal, vehicular turning(s) and street lighting) providing access from the nearest public highway to that building shall be fully completed.
11. Prior to occupation of the A1 uses, Delivery Management Plans for the A1 food retail use and for the A1 coffee shop shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All deliveries pertaining to the A1 food retail unit and the A1 coffee shop shall then be managed in accordance with the respective approved Delivery Management Plans.
12. Prior to the occupation of any part of the development a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants (served by mains water) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The proposed scheme shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the relevant part of the development is occupied.
13. Prior to commencement of the development, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, setting out the following:
 - i. objectives and targets for promoting sustainable travel;
 - ii. appointment and funding of a Travel Plan coordinator;
 - iii. details of an annual monitoring and review process;
 - iv. means of funding of the Travel Plan; and
 - v. an implementation timetable including the responsible body for each action.

The approved Travel Plan and any associated site/use-specific Travel Plans shall then be implemented in accordance with the details and timetable therein.

14. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the recommendations and requirements of the Ecological Survey Report, dated March 2018 (ref: 4087.EcoAss.vf2), submitted with the planning application.
15. Prior to commencement of the development, full details of all fixed plant and equipment on site, including details to demonstrate that noise levels will be at least five decibels below the existing background noise level when measured from the nearest receptor, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment must be carried out by a suitably qualified acoustic consultant/engineer

and be in accordance with BS 4142:2014 – Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound.

16. The office and retail elements of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed to achieve not less than BREEAM 'Very Good' in accordance with the relevant Building Research Establishment standards (or the equivalent standard in such measure of sustainability for non-residential building design which may replace that scheme). The developer shall within six months of occupation of the office and retail floorspace submit final certification to the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that not less than 'Very Good' has been achieved.
17. Prior to commencement of the development, full details of both hard and soft landscape proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include, as appropriate:

Hard Landscaping

- Earthwork sections, ground, finished and slab levels
- Means of enclosure
- Car parking layouts, surface materials and kerbs
- Finished heights of retaining walls (including gaps or breaks in retaining walls to facilitate pedestrian access)
- Step and ramp details including surface materials
- Other pedestrian access and circulation areas to facilitate safe and direct means of access to each building from within and adjacent to the site
- Hard surfacing materials of footpaths, cycleways and the public realm areas including how inspection covers are to be incorporated
- Refuse or other storage units, signs and lighting

Soft Landscaping

- Planting plans
- Written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment)
- Schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate
- Implementation timetables
- Tree, hedge(s) or hedgerow(s) heights (including any breaks in hedges/hedgerows to facilitate pedestrian accesses)

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

18. Prior to commencement of the development, details pertaining to the following elements of the scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
- Windows and external doors (including details of materials, colour, finish, cill, reveal, opening mechanism and glazing)
 - Roof overhang/coping details

- Roof plant, lift overrun and other enclosures
- Roof plant louvres
- Covered and secure refuse and cycle stores

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

19. Prior to commencement of the development, details of the external facing and roofing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include a written specification of the materials. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
20. Prior to commencement of the development, a full external lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before occupation and maintained as such thereafter.
21. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) the four buildings proposed for office use as shown on drawings 178 – 96B and DLA.1755.L.09 D shall only be used for office use as defined by Use Classes B1a and B1b of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended).
22. As part of the reserved matters submitted pursuant to condition 3, a document setting out the design principles (hereafter referred to as a 'Design Code') for the development hereby approved shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval. The Design Code shall set out how the principles and objectives of the Design and Access Statement by Design Development Partnership shall be met by the development hereby approved and shall include the following matters:
 - i. the design, form and general arrangement of external architectural features of buildings including the walls, roofs and fenestration;
 - ii. the hierarchy for roads and public spaces;
 - iii. the colour, texture and quality of external materials and facings for the walls and roofing of buildings and structures;
 - iv. the design of the public realm to include the colour, texture and quality of surfacing of footpaths, streets, parking areas and other shared surfaces;
 - v. the design and layout of street furniture; and
 - vi. waste and refuse bin storage arrangements.

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

23. No occupation of the development hereby approved shall take place until a Street and Car Park Management and Maintenance Plan and a Landscape Management Plan have been submitted to and approved in

writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Street and Car Park Management and Maintenance Plan and the Landscape Management Plan shall be implemented thereafter.

24. Except where varied by other conditions above, the planning permission hereby granted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

178-70A Site Location Plan

1605-13 SK01A Revised Commercial Access Visibility

178-19E Revised Proposed Office 1 Floor Plans

178-20E Revised Proposed Office 1 Elevations

178-25H Revised Proposed Costa Coffee Elevations

178-26F Revised Proposed Happy Days Nursery Floor Plan

178-27J Revised Proposed Happy Days Nursery Elevations

178-32E Revised Proposed Costa Coffee Floor Plan

178-33D Revised Proposed Aldi Floor Plan

178-34F Revised Proposed Aldi Elevations

178-41C Office 2 Proposed Floor Plan

178-42C Revised Proposed Office 2 Elevations

178-64B Revised Proposed Costa Coffee Sections

178-65A Revised Proposed Aldi Sections

178-66C Revised Proposed Happy Days Sections

178-68 Revised Proposed Office 1 Sections

178-69 Revised Proposed Office 2 Sections

178-71A Revised Existing Site Plan

178-92A Revised Proposed Office 4 Elevations

178-93 Revised Proposed Office 4 Indicative Floor Plans

178-94 Revised Office 3 Indicative Proposed Floor Plans

178-95A Revised Office 3 Indicative Proposed Elevations

178-99 Proposed Site Section J-J

DLA 1755 L.14 Revised trench Detail – Car Park

DLA 1755 L.15 Revised Tree Trench Detail – Pedestrian Paving

DLA 1755 L.03 C Revised Hard Landscape Proposals (Sheet 1 of 3)

DLA 1755 L.04 C Revised Hard Landscape Proposals (Sheet 2 of 3)

DLA 1755 L.05 E Revised Hard Landscape Proposals (Sheet 3 of 3)
DLA 1755 L.06 D Revised Planting Proposals (Sheet 1 of 3)
DLA 1755 L.07 D Revised Planting Proposals (Sheet 2 of 3)
DLA 1755 L.08 C Revised Planting Proposals (Sheet 3 of 3)
DLA 1755 L.09 D Revised Illustrative Masterplan
DLA 1755 L.10 A Revised Landscape Sections
DLA 1755 L.11 A Revised Landscape Sections
DLA 1755 L.12 A Revised Landscape Sections
DLA 1755 L.13 A Revised Landscape Sections
DLA 1755 L.16 A Revised Tree Pit Detail
178-59 D Aldi HGV Vehicle Tracking
178-61 E Revised Costa Coffee Refuse Vehicle Tracking
178-62 D Revised Costa Coffee Drive-Thru Vehicle Tracking
178-63 F Revised Office Accommodation Refuse Vehicle Tracking
178-86 G Revised Proposed Site Sections A-A and B-B
178-88 B Revised Proposed Site Section C-C
178-89 B Revised Proposed Site Section D-D
178-90 B Revised Proposed Site Section E-E
178-91 B Revised Proposed Site Section F-F
178-96 B Revised Proposed Block Plan
178-97 A Revised Proposed Site Section G-G
178-98 A Revised Proposed Site Section H-H
MJA-P105-4392-G Revised External Lighting

(End of conditions schedule)