

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 15/00508/FULL1

Ward:
Darwin

Address : Land Adjacent 2 (demolished) Main
Road Biggin Hill

OS Grid Ref: E: 541204 N: 160889

Applicant : Taylor Wimpey South West Thames

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Erection of 16 dwellings (4 x 2 bed flats, 3 x 3 bed houses and 9 x 4 bed houses) with access from Moxey Close and Barwell Crescent together with 43 car parking spaces, cycle storage and landscaping, to include the stopping up of an existing access onto the A223.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Noise Contours
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
Green Belt
London City Airport Safeguarding
London Distributor Roads
Major Development Sites
Smoke Control SCA 24
Technical Sites BH

Update

The application was deferred from plans sub-committee 2 on 30th July 2015, without prejudice to any future consideration, for the Applicant to consider gaining access to the site from Main Road. This was following concerns raised by local residents and Members over the appropriateness of the proposed access through Barwell Crescent and Moxey Close.

On 28th August the applicant submitted an Access Appraisal carried out by Ardent Consulting Engineers assessing alternative options for a vehicular access to the site from Main Road. As part of the appraisal, speed surveys were carried out at either end of the site on Main Road to record the average speeds of vehicles, to enable the determination of appropriate visibility splays for an access on to Main Road.

The report concludes the following points:

- While an alternative access onto Main Road was previously explored prior to submission of the formal application, it was deemed inappropriate due to it

conflicting with the requirements of Policy T11 of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) which states that for a London Distributor Road "limited access will be permitted only where there is no alternative".

- Suitable visibility splays are not able to be achieved from a potential access directly onto Main Road, taking into account sufficient junction spacing from the Vincent Square access.
- Forward visibility was also considered for a stationary vehicle waiting to turn right into the site and oncoming vehicles travelling on the bend of the carriageway could significantly obscure visibility.
- Vehicle trip generation has also been considered with an additional vehicle movement forecast every 4 - 5 minutes during the peak periods, which would result in a negligible impact on Moxey Close.
- Suitable width carriageways are proposed to accommodate the additional vehicle movements.
- Access from Vincent Square was also considered, however, as this is privately owned land the applicant has no permitted rights of access over it and, in addition, it would not be considered suitable on highways safety grounds.
- Access via Barwell Crescent and Moxey Close, as proposed, is acceptable in highways safety terms.

The Council's Highway Development Engineer has assessed the Access Appraisal and their comments are summarised as follows:

- Main Road is a London Distributor Road and if a new or amended access was proposed it would be contrary to Policy T11 as there is an alternative, Moxey Close;
- The report shows a proposed site access from Main Road in which the sightline requirement to the left is not met and consequently would be unacceptable from a Highways perspective;
- There may be other locations along Main Road where it would be satisfied but these may require works to the traffic islands and bus stop and there is also the proximity of Vincent Square to consider. It is also likely to require a lot of trees / bushes etc removed from the frontage;
- It may be possible to get a right turning pocket in which would potentially help the other issue identified with the forward visibility but Officers would need to see a detailed design and a satisfactory Road Safety Audit;
- In highway terms, Officers have no objection to the access, as proposed, via Moxey Close.

To summarise, the applicants have explored the provision of an alternative access to the development from Main Road and their report concludes that such an access would be unacceptable on highways safety grounds. Officers concur with the findings of the report and furthermore consider that the creation of a new access onto Main Road would be contrary to Policy T11 of the UDP as there is a

suitable alternative available via a lower category road. The previous committee report is repeated below. Changes to the original report are shown in italics.

Proposal

- 16 residential units comprising four x 2 bed flats, three x 3 bed houses and nine x 4 bed houses
- units are two storey in height and include detached and semi-detached dwellings with the four flats being located within a two storey detached block
- the development is laid out in a cul-de-sac arrangement with access from Moxey Close to the north
- the existing access from Main Road A233 will be stopped up apart from to provide pedestrian/cycle access
- 6 affordable units will be provided as follows:
 - plots 5 and 16: three bed houses;
 - plots 6, 7, 8 and 9: two bed flats (all are indicated as 'shared ownership')
- Two wheelchair units are provided at ground floor within the apartment building
- Buildings will be traditional in appearance predominantly with gable ended roof designs
- Landscaping includes the retention of some existing trees, particularly along the southern edge of the site fronting Main Road and a small open green area towards the centre of the site taking into account two mature trees which are to be retained
- Parking for a total of 43 vehicles including 3 visitor spaces, 8 communal spaces (including 2 disabled) and 10 spaces within attached and detached garages
- Each unit has an allocated bin storage area.

A revised package of plans and documents was received on 1st June 2015. The main alterations made to the scheme can be summarised as follows:

- The number of units on the site has been reduced from 18 to 16 dwellings
- Increase in separation of development in the north-east corner of the site to Main Road frontage
- Garages previously abutting the western boundary moved away to provide a green buffer
- Increase in separation of development to No's 18 and 19 Barwell Crescent
- Minor re-configuration of parking layout

The applicant has submitted the following documents and, in some cases, subsequent addendums to support the application:

- Ecology appraisal and Protected Species Survey
- This concludes that the site has a low value for local wildlife with some minor potential for roosting bats and protected nesting birds and recommends impact avoidance measures and mitigation planting for an area of grassland containing pyramidal orchid. Overall it anticipates no significant ecological impacts on the site or on the adjacent SSSI as a result of the development

- Arboricultural report including tree survey and impact assessment
It considers that removal of lesser quality trees is required while better quality trees will be retained and the planting of new trees mitigates the loss of trees, whilst adding to the sustainability, species diversity and biodiversity, etc within the site. A total of 14 trees will be removed. Construction management will include schemes of protection for the retained trees.

- Energy statement
The document examines five methods of bringing the developments energy target in line with London Plan requirements however the developer confirms that their preference is for enhanced fabric plus photovoltaics in order to achieve the 35% reduction on carbon dioxide emissions.

- Code for Sustainable Homes, pre-assessment report
This considers that the development can achieve an overall code level of 4.

- Flood risk assessment
This concludes that as the site is located within flood zone 1 which is defined as having a low risk of flooding, residential development is appropriate and does not require further mitigation measures.

- Transport statement
This assesses the proposed access to the development, parking provision, internal layout and anticipated vehicular trips and concludes that no significant highways or transport issues would arise as a result of the development and that the parking standards accord with UDP requirements

- Noise impact assessment
The assessment concludes that subject to glazing specification and use of appropriate ventilation, internal noise levels at the development would be acceptable.

- Phase I desk study, site reconnaissance & phase II site investigation report
This study concludes that there is evidence of ground contamination and anticipates that remedial measures will be required within areas of domestic gardens and landscaping.

- Statement of community involvement
This summarises the public consultation which took place prior to the submission of the planning application.

The application is also accompanied by a Planning Statement and Design and Access Statement and subsequent addendums to the above, in which the applicant submits the following summary points in support of the application:

- Principle of development on the site has been established with the approval of the heritage centre application (ref.04/02334)
- The site is designated as a Major Developed Site where redevelopment in the Green Belt will be permitted
- Proposed density is appropriate for Green Belt location

- The affordable housing for the amended proposal will all be shared equity and equates to 37.5% affordable on a habitable room basis
- The layout allows for landscape features to be respected and allows good space about dwellings for landscaping and development will appear open when viewed from Main Road
- the scheme will offer much needed housing, including affordable in-line with current planning policy
- meets required design standards including lifetime homes and incorporates wheelchair accessible dwellings
- fits in with existing development to the north and existing landscaping to provide an attractive living environment.

The applicant has also submitted a supporting statement in relation to the proposed access through the Leavesden estate via Moxey Close in which the following points are made:-

- Moxey Close was designed to provide an ideal vehicular access to the proposal site if it was ever brought forward for residential development
- While the approved heritage centre proposal utilised the existing access from Main Road, sufficient visibility splays are no longer achievable due to the subsequent construction of the residential units on Barwell Crescent and fence on the frontage with Main Road
- Moxey Close is wide enough to allow two cars and a car and an HGV to pass
- as part of the Transport Statement, the anticipated vehicular trip generation from the development was determined and would equate to one additional vehicular movement every 4-5 minutes during peak times which would not have a discernable impact on the local highway or local residents.

Location

- The site measures 0.71 hectares (gross site area)
- The site is designated as Green Belt and also as a major developed site within the UDP
- the site forms part of the Former RAF Biggin Hill Married Quarters (Area 2 of the major developed site at Biggin Hill) which contained a number of buildings that have now been demolished
- it is in close proximity to the Saltbox Hill Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)
- the site still contains various areas of hardstanding associated with the earlier development, although it is otherwise devoid of any development and is generally characterised by various trees and shrubbery
- it is subject to a blanket Tree Preservation Order (No.1204)
- the site is predominantly flat with a gentle slope from east to west
- the western site boundary adjoins Vincent Square which forms part of the RAF Biggin Hill Conservation Area with most houses along that road having been Statutory Listed
- to the north is located the Leavesden Estate, including Barwell Crescent and Moxey Close from which access is proposed to the development

- to the south lies the A233 Main Road with part of the historic RAF Biggin Hill quarters fronting the opposite side of Main Road, also containing a number of Statutory Listed buildings
- the site is within a low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) area of 1b/2.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- Object to further development which will increase traffic, noise and pollution
- Not prepared to add to problems caused by social housing tenants
- Entrance should be from Main Road as was intended for the Heritage Centre
- Leavesden residents have spent time and money looking after and maintaining private development
- Object to use of private road and entrance gates
- Increased traffic to small and narrow roads in Leavesden estate
- Object to proposed number of houses
- Properties will be built overlooking No.18 Barwell Crescent
- Loss of property value
- Parking is already restricted
- Object to more people using private green
- Object to Leavesden being used as a cut-through access route
- Moxey Close is very narrow and has no pavements as was designed for light vehicle use
- Safety issues with up to 34 vehicles regularly driving through the Close
- Rubbish lorries and other large vehicles cannot currently use the close as it is narrow
- Emergency vehicles wouldn't be able to enter site due to width restrictions
- Would have headlights in front room at night
- Constant pedestrian and cycle traffic through close
- Crime
- Development should be kept separate from Leavesden Estate
- Has drainage/sewerage been considered
- Have school places been considered
- Land should be used for something for the community not more houses
- New residents will park in existing roads
- Use of entrance onto Leavesden Estate for works vehicles is unacceptable
- Heritage Centre would have been a valuable asset to whole area
- Proposed dwelling at plot 18 is too close to boundary fence and will invade privacy of 24, 25 and 26 Vincent Square
- Loss of privacy - overlooking into back windows and rear garden of No.17 Barwell Crescent
- Trees currently give privacy to boundary with No.17 Barwell Crescent, this will be lost
- More trees should be retained or planted
- Proposal reduced current level of site security due to allowing access for cars, pedestrians and cyclists

- Proposed site plan offers no pavement for families/children wishing to use the main green on the existing Leavesden Estate
- New plan only offers to visitor spaces which is unrealistic
- Insufficient visitor parking spaces
- Residents should be refunded for Heritage Centre not going ahead
- Do not give permission for layout to be opened out
- Want 2 large trees removed as shed leaves and dangerous in storms
- Pollution from Airport and Main Road is affecting Asthma, more cars will make it worse
- People climb fence from Leavesden to Vincent Square to cut through
- Plot 18 squeezed into a very small piece of land which would spoil appearance of the site
- Rapid increase in population is exceeding our public services
- Drainage, sewerage, rubbish
- Overlooking and loss of privacy into 17 Barwell Crescent by plots 1, 2, 3 and 5
- Object to affordable housing
- Higher density than surrounding area
- Other houses adjacent to rear of Vincent Square should have no first floor rear windows
- Residents will climb over boundary fences
- Plans do not give priority to pedestrians as there are no pavements
- At only 5m wide Moxey Close would serve as a bottle neck to access the site
- Insufficient visitor parking.

Petitions have also been received objecting to the development on the grounds of the proposed vehicular access to the development through Barwell Crescent/Moxey Close putting pressure on on-street parking and effecting private security gates. Objections also relate to the proposed social housing.

In addition, Orpington field Club commented that the development should be conditional based on the recommendations from the Ecological Appraisal and Protected Species Documents which accompanies the application. In addition, planting should include more native planting and Prunus laurocerasus should not be included especially so close to Salt Box hill SSSI. Furthermore, a check should be done for native birds before any tree work or scrub removal.

Comments from Consultees

The Council's Highway Development Engineer: There are 4 existing properties in Moxey Close and the proposal is for an additional 16 dwellings. The Council's design standards would allow up to 25 properties to be served from a 4.8m wide shared surface road. The existing Close is 4.8m wide and the proposed extension of the access is slightly wider so it would accord with the Council's standards. The existing access from Barwell Crescent onto Main road does not have an accident record. In addition, the proposed garages are a good size and parking provision is above UDP standards; Consequently there are no objections to the proposed arrangements, subject to conditions.

The roads on the estate are private and so the developer would need a private right of way over Moxey Close and Barwell Crescent (the applicant has confirmed that Barwell Crescent and Moxey Close are registered in the name of Taylor Wimpey Developments Limited).

With regard to whether or not the existing access from Main Road could be utilised, there is no indication that the necessary sightline requirements could be met from an access directly onto Main Road and Highways Officers would be in favour of stopping up the existing access to Main Road due to safety concerns of its permanent use. Furthermore, it is desirable for the development to be served from the lowest category road available instead of a small residential development being accessed directly onto the A233 which is a strategic route.

If access was proposed from Main Road the following factors would need to be taken into account: speed of traffic, location of the access in relation to the bend and site levels. Speed surveys would also be required as vehicles may be travelling in excess of the 30mph speed limit.

If suitable sightlines can be achieved from the access to the site from Main Road that is proposed to be stopped up then it may be appropriate to use that for construction traffic so the vehicles do not have to go through the estate.

The Council's Drainage Engineer: the proposal to provide soakaways, permeable paving and infiltration trench to attenuate surface water run-off on site for all events including the 1 in 100 plus 30% climate change is acceptable.

The Council's Occupational Therapist: at this stage is satisfied that the two wheelchair units comply with South East London Housing Partnership standards.

The Metropolitan Designing Out Crime Adviser: no objections subject to recommended conditions.

Transport for London (TFL): the development trip generation would be unlikely to have a significant impact on the local highway and public transport networks; the level of parking proposed is acceptable; the current design of cycle parking lacks detail and is not satisfactory - 32 long-stay cycle spaces are required and a condition is recommended to secure this.

Greater London Authority (GLA): a stage 1 report has been received in respect of the original proposal for 18 units, in which it considered it did not comply with the London Plan by reason of insufficient evidence to demonstrate that it does not impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Furthermore, with regard to the affordable housing provision, the GLA suggested that the Council try and secure a 3 - 4 bedroom family housing unit.

The GLA were re-consulted on the amended scheme and have raised no further objections in respect of the impact on the Green Belt. However, they do not consider that the amended proposal sufficiently addresses the concerns relating to family housing provision within the affordable element of the provision to ensure that the mix will meet local needs.

The Environment Agency: no objections subject to relevant conditions including an investigation into site contamination being carried out.

Thames Water: no objections subject to recommended informatives.

Natural England have raised no objections in principle to the impact on the nearby SSSI and have directed the local authority to their standing advice with regard to protected species.

Historic England: the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance and on the basis of the Council's specialist conservation advice.

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

BE1 Design of New Development
BE7 Railings, Boundary Walls and Other Means of Enclosure
BE8 Statutory Listed Buildings
BE13 Development Adjacent to a Conservation Area
BH2 New Development
BH5 Former RAF Married Quarters (Area 2)
BH8 Noise-Sensitive Development
ER7 Contaminated Land
ER10 Light Pollution
G1 The Green Belt
H1 Housing Supply
H2 and H3 Affordable Housing
H7 Housing Density and Design
H9 Side Space
NE1 Development and SSSIs
NE3 Nature Conservation and Development
NE5 Protected Species
NE7 Development and Trees
T1 Transport Demand
T2 Assessment of Transport Effects
T3 Parking
T7 Cyclists
T8 Other Road Users
T9 and T10 Public Transport
T11 New Accesses
T12 Residential Roads
T15 Traffic Management
T16 Traffic Management and Sensitive Environments
T18 Road safety

Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1: General Design Principles

Supplementary Planning Guidance 2: Residential Design Guidance

A consultation on draft Local Plan policies was undertaken early in 2014 and is a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

The most relevant draft Local Plan policies include:

- 5.1 Housing Supply
- 5.3 Housing Design
- 5.4 Provision of Affordable Housing
- 7.1 Parking
- 8.1 General Design of Development
- 8.2 Development and SSSI
- 8.6 Protected Species
- 8.7 Development and Trees
- 8.14 The Green Belt
- 8.33 Statutory Listed Buildings
- 8.37 Development Adjacent to a Conservation Area
- 11.1 Delivery and implementation of the Local Plan

In strategic terms, the application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the London Plan (March 2015):

- 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- 3.4 Optimising housing potential
- 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
- 3.6 Children and young people's play and informal recreation
- 3.7 Large residential developments
- 3.8 Housing choice
- 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
- 3.10 Definition of affordable housing
- 3.11 Affordable housing targets
- 3.12 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes
- 3.13 Affordable housing thresholds
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.7 Renewable energy
- 5.9 Overheating and cooling
- 5.10 Urban greening
- 5.11 Green Roofs and Development Site Environs
- 5.12 Flood risk assessment
- 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
- 5.14 Water quality and wastewater infrastructure
- 5.15 Water use and supplies
- 5.21 Contaminated land
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling

6.10 Walking
6.13 Parking
7.1 Lifetime neighbourhoods
7.2 An inclusive environment
7.3 Designing out crime
7.4 Local character
7.5 Public Realm
7.6 Architecture
7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
7.13 Safety, security and resilience to emergency
7.14 Improving Air Quality
7.15 Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes
7.16 Green Belt
7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature
7.21 Trees and woodlands
8.2 Planning obligations
8.3 Community infrastructure levy

Mayor's SPG: "Housing" (2012)

Mayor's SPG: "Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment" (2014)

Mayor's SPG: "Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation" (2012)

On 11 May 2015 the Mayor of London published for six weeks public consultation two sets of Minor Alterations to the London Plan - on Housing Standards and on Parking Standards. The most relevant changes to policies include:

3.5 Quality and Design of Housing Development
3.8 Housing Choice
5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
6.13 Parking

Relevant policies and guidance in the form of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) must also be taken into account. The most relevant paragraphs of the NPPF include:

14: achieving sustainable development
17: principles of planning
47-50: housing supply
56 to 66: design of development
79, 80, 87-89: Green Belt
109 -111, 118, 120 - 121, 121: nature conservation and biodiversity
128 -137: heritage assets

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

Planning History

The first phase of the development, known as the "Leavesden Estate" and located to the north of the application site was granted outline planning permission (subject to legal agreement) under ref.04/02322

Under ref.04/02334 outline permission was granted for the demolition of existing dwellings at 2, 4, 6 & 8 Main Road and 37, 38, 39 & 40 Vincent Square; erection of building for use as Heritage Centre with associated car and coach parking and associated landscaping and upgrading of existing access.

The applicant has stated that the site is no longer required for the Heritage Centre as it is now proposed to be located on the airport opposite, leaving this area of land redundant (Design and Access Statement). A subsequent application has now been approved for the Heritage Centre at an alternative location at RAF Station on the opposite side of Main Road by the RAF chapel under ref.14/02136.

The s106 legal agreement in respect of applications 04/02322 and 04/02334 anticipated a residential development of the current application site in the circumstances that the Heritage Centre is provided elsewhere, subject to a financial contribution for the Heritage Centre.

The main issues to be considered in respect of the current proposal are

- o Acceptability of the proposal in terms of the Green Belt designation of the site
- o Density
- o Impact on the Planned Heritage Centre
- o Impact on Heritage Assets adjoining the site
- o Acceptability in terms of design and layout
- o Housing Issues
- o Impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of outlook, daylight, sunlight and privacy
- o Highways impacts
- o Impact on trees and ecology
- o Planning Obligations including Heritage Centre contribution
- o Screening Opinion for an Environmental Impact Assessment

Conclusions

Impact on the Green Belt and openness and purpose for including the site in the Green Belt

The site is designated as Green Belt, albeit one designated as a major developed site (area 2) within the UDP, where limited infilling or redevelopment is not seen as inappropriate.

The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

Green Belt serves five purposes:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land.

Guidance on major developed sites has not been duplicated within the 2012 NPPF and instead reference is made to "previously developed sites" within paragraph 89 of the NPPF. In relation to the development proposal, the NPPF states that the following is an exception to inappropriate development in the Green Belt:

limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings) which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

The definition of previously developed land is given in annexe 2 of the NPPF. In this instance, given that the land was (prior to demolition) previously occupied by a number of permanent structures and hard surfaces, the site is considered to be "previously developed".

The issue of whether the development proposed would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including the site in the Green Belt than the previous development must next be addressed. Policy BH5 of the UDP sets out what is acceptable in Area 2 and states that proposals should retain and enhance the shared landscaped areas and have less visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt than existing development.

All previous buildings on the site were demolished some years ago, however, from plans submitted showing the previous site layout and historic maps it can be seen that 3 very large buildings associated with the former RAF use existed along the southern portion of the site, along with 3 dwellings and 2 smaller ancillary buildings in the northern portion. An area of tarmac car park occupied the central region of the site with tarmac roads interspersed between buildings. There was also extensive greenery, including a large grassed area containing trees to the west of the site adjoining properties in Vincent Square, and a green buffer along the Main Road frontage.

The massing of the proposed buildings is broken up from large single buildings covering a large part of the site to numerous two storey buildings spread across the site. A central estate road is proposed with a communal grassed area

containing two mature trees which are to be retained at the heart of the site. The applicant has changed the extent of the scheme by reducing the number of units from 18 to 16, as well as increasing the separation distance of development in the north-east corner of the site to the Main Road frontage, increasing separation distances to 18 and 19 Barwell Crescent and moving built form (previously two single storey garages) away from the western site boundary. This results in a green buffer along the western edge of the site, adjacent to properties in Vincent Square and a green wedge retained on the southern edge of the site adjoining Main Road. In addition, a comprehensive scheme of landscaping is proposed which would minimise the visual impact of the development, particularly when viewed from the Main Road frontage. Furthermore, the dwellings will all incorporate reasonably sized gardens and the layout proposes shared landscaped areas.

The housing density of the development would equate to 22.5 units per hectare and 125 habitable rooms per hectare which is below both the density guidelines set out in the UDP and the London Plan (see below). This is considered appropriate in this sensitive location given that development should not result in a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Overall, it may therefore be considered that the proposed development will not significantly detract from the openness of this part of the Green Belt by comparison with the previous development.

Furthermore, given the site's surroundings which include the residential development to the north of approximately 140 houses, granted under application ref.04/02322, and the statutory listed dwellings in Vincent Square to the west, it is considered that the development does not conflict with the purposes of including the site in the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted urban sprawl, given that it would be situated within the confines of existing residential development.

It is also important to recognise that this is a previously developed site on which planning permission has already been granted for the erection of a heritage centre and therefore the principle of built development has been established.

In summary it is considered that the proposed development is not inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

Density

Policy 3.4 in the London Plan seeks to ensure that development proposals achieve the optimum housing density compatible with local context, the design principles in Chapter 7 and with public transport capacity. Table 3.2 (Sustainable residential quality) identifies appropriate residential density ranges related to a site's setting (assessed in terms of its location, existing building form and massing) and public transport accessibility (PTAL). This site is considered to be in a 'suburban' setting and has a PTAL rating of 1b/2 giving an indicative density range of 50 - 75 dwellings per hectare / 150 - 200 habitable rooms per hectare (dependent on the unit size mix). The London Plan states that residential density figures should be based on net residential area, which includes internal roads and ancillary open spaces. UDP Policy H7 also includes a density/location matrix which supports a density of 150 - 200 habitable rooms / 30 - 50 dwellings per hectare for locations

such as this provided the site is well designed, providing a high quality living environment for future occupiers whilst respecting the spatial characteristics of the surrounding area.

Development should comply with the density ranges set out in table 4.2 of the UDP and table 3.2 of the London Plan and in the interests of creating mixed and balanced communities development should provide a mix of housing types and sizes. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance No1 - General Design and No.2 - Residential Design Guidance have similar design objectives to these policies and the NPPF. Policies 3.3 and 3.4 of the London Plan seek to increase the supply of housing and optimise the potential of sites, whilst policy 3.5 seeks to protect and enhance the quality of London's residential environment.

As set out above, the housing density of the development would equate to 22.5 units per hectare and 125 habitable rooms per hectare which is below both the density guidelines set out in the UDP and the London Plan.

Impact on the Planned Heritage Centre

As discussed above, this proposal is connected to a first phase of development, known as the "Leavesden Estate" located to the north of the application site which was granted outline planning permission (subject to legal agreement) under ref.04/02322

Under ref.04/02334 outline permission was granted for the demolition of existing dwellings at 2, 4, 6 & 8 Main Road and 37, 38, 39 & 40 Vincent Square; erection of building for use as Heritage Centre with associated car and coach parking and associated landscaping and upgrading of existing access.

A Heritage Centre has not been built on this part of the site and an alternative location has been identified on the airport site opposite, leaving this area of land redundant. A subsequent application has now been approved for the Heritage Centre at an alternative location at RAF Station on the opposite side of Main Road under ref.14/02136. Consequently the Council are of the opinion that this site is no longer required for the Heritage Centre.

The s106 agreement attached to 04/02322 and 04/02334 seeks to secure the provision of a Heritage Centre on this site by securing the land as a location (transferring the land to the Council) and a financial contribution towards the provision of a Heritage Centre. The financial contribution would be put towards other funds (to be secured by the Council) to cover the costs of building the Heritage Centre. Furthermore, the 04/02322 and 04/02334 s106 agreement includes a clause whereby if the Council secure an alternative location for the Heritage Centre and therefore do not require this particular site for that purpose the Developer is entitled to make a planning application for redevelopment of the site for residential purposes.

In the instance of an alternative planning permission being granted for redevelopment of this site for residential purposes the Developer is required to pay

a further financial contribution to the Council for the purposes of facilitating the erection of a Heritage Centre in the alternative location.

The Council has secured an alternative location and in the event that planning permission is granted for this development it is entirely appropriate that the Developer pay a further Heritage Centre Contribution to the Council towards provision of the facility elsewhere in the Borough. The Heritage Centre Contribution is £967,788.

Impact on Heritage Assets adjoining the site

The site is bounded to the west by Vincent Square which forms part of the RAF Biggin Hill Conservation Area with most houses along that road having been Grade 2 statutory listed.

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the NPPF states, at paragraph 132, that "great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.... Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting...Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional". Furthermore, "Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably" (Para.137).

The amended site layout shows a green buffer retained along the western edge of the site adjacent to the cottages in Vincent Square and, given the scale of the proposed dwellings, along with the separation distances proposed, no significant harm on the setting of these listed buildings or on the conservation area is anticipated. Where a substantial RAF building previously stood immediately adjacent to the entrance to Vincent Square, this would be occupied by two dwellings with their rear gardens and landscaping adjoining the site boundary, providing some enhancement to the setting of the listed buildings. However, no details have been provided with regards to boundary treatments and these will need to be carefully considered with regards to their impact on the adjacent conservation area and setting of the listed buildings. A condition is therefore recommended, should Members be minded to grant permission, requesting details of boundary treatments for the development.

In the light of the above it is considered that the current scheme is acceptable from a heritage point of view.

Design, Layout and Scale

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. At the same time the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. New development should reflect the identity of local surroundings and add to the overall quality of an area, whilst not discouraging appropriate innovation. The NPPF also encourages the effective use of land and states developments should optimise the potential of the site to accommodate

development. Consistent with this, policies H7 and BE1 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) require new developments to complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent dwellings. Development should not detract from the existing street scene and the space about buildings should provide opportunities to create attractive settings.

Layout:

The amended layout, overall, provides adequate separation between proposed dwellings and existing neighbouring development, providing good opportunities for soft and hard landscaping and retaining existing mature landscaping on and around the site. At the southern edge of the site, adjacent to Main Road, a substantial green buffer would be provided with trees and landscaping resulting in an acceptable visual impact from Main Road. At the western side of the site, the double garage previously abutting the site boundary has been re-positioned and a minimum 4.4m (approx.) separation would be provided between built development and the boundary with properties in Vincent Close.

While the buildings at plots 4 and 12 do not appear to retain the minimum 1m side space to the side boundaries of their respective plots, given that the side boundaries of these units are adjacent to the proposed road, the resulting visual impact would not appear unduly cramped.

Design and Scale:

The proposed dwellings will all be two storeys with the flats being located within a two storey block. The adjacent Leavesden estate and properties in Vincent Square are predominantly two storey and the applicant has taken references for the massing, scale, materials directly from the first phase of development, incorporating traditional features such as gable ended roofs and entrance canopies and utilising traditional materials of brick and render on the walls and concrete roof tiles. The architectural approach is appropriate for this location and design quality will be secured by way of a condition to control the materials.

Overall, the development would complement the scale, layout and form of adjacent development.

Housing Issues

Unit Size Mix:

London Plan policy requires new housing development to offer a range of housing choices in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types taking into account the housing requirements of different groups. Policies within the Bromley UDP do not set a prescriptive breakdown in terms of unit sizes. Each application should be assessed on its merits in this respect. The proposal provides a mix of 2 bedroom flats and houses and larger 3 and 4 bedroom houses, therefore providing a good mix of housing types and unit sizes.

Tenure:

The development is considered liable for the provision of affordable housing on site as set out in the Policy H2 and contributions by way of planning obligations under Policy IMP1. Policy H2 requires 35% affordable housing (on a habitable room basis) to be provided.

The affordable housing offered for the amended proposal includes 4 x two bed apartments (including 2 wheelchair accessible flats) and 2 x three bed houses. This represents 37.5% by unit numbers and 28.48% by proposed habitable room. All units would be shared equity (intermediate) housing. The Council normally requires a split of 70% social-rented housing and 30% intermediate provision unless it can be demonstrated that the 70:30 split would not create mixed and balanced communities whereas London Plan policies require a 60/40 split.

In this instance, given the relatively small scale of the development and the need for the scheme to provide planning obligations in respect of education, health and the heritage centre Members may consider that the 100% intermediate provision of affordable housing is acceptable. Furthermore, the applicant states there would be no discernible difference in appearance between the private and affordable part of the development.

Standard of Residential Accommodation:

The Mayor's Housing SPG sets out guidance in respect of the standard required for all new residential accommodation to supplement London Plan policies. Part 2 of the Housing SPG deals with the quality of residential accommodation setting out baseline and good practice standards for dwelling size, room layouts and circulation space, storage facilities, floor to ceiling heights, outlook, daylight and sunlight, external amenity space (including cycle storage facilities) as well as core and access arrangements.

Table 3.3 of the London Plan and Standard 4.1.1 of the SPG sets out minimum space standards for new development with which the proposal complies. All units must benefit from private amenity space which must comply with the requirements set out in the Mayor's Housing SPG. Private gardens are proposed for each single occupancy units and a shared garden for the flats, as well as a communal grassed area centrally positioned within the site. Based on the expected child occupancy of the development, the London Plan requires a minimum 4.2 square metres of communal play space for the flatted part of the scheme which the proposed communal amenity area far exceeds at over 200 square metres. The proposal would therefore provide adequate amenity space for occupiers of the development and would reflect the general layout characteristics of existing development granted in the first phase.

London Plan Policy 3.8 requires all housing units to be built to Lifetime Homes standards and 10% should be designed to be wheelchair accessible. In the submitted Design and Access Statement the applicant has advised that all units are designed to Lifetime Homes standards and two units are designed as wheelchair accessible and are situated on the ground floor of the apartment block.

Overall the proposal would provide a good mix of dwellings designed to afford a high standard of amenity for future occupiers.

Site wide energy requirements

London Plan Policies 5.1 - 5.7 refer to energy requirements to achieve climate change mitigation including reduction in carbon emissions and renewable energy. The applicant has submitted a Sustainable Energy report setting out options to meet these requirements. The report recommends the use of photovoltaic cells located on the roof of the apartment block to provide renewable energy which it states are able to meet London Plan energy requirements of a 35% reduction in carbon emissions above that of the 2013 Building Regulations. A condition is recommended to ensure this reduction is achieved. Furthermore, the photovoltaics would appear unobtrusive and are considered acceptable from a visual perspective.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

Policy BE1 of the UDP seeks to protect existing residential occupiers from inappropriate development. Issues to consider are the impact of a development proposal upon neighbouring properties by way of overshadowing, loss of light, overbearing impact, overlooking, loss of privacy and general noise and disturbance.

As set out above, the revised layout would provide reasonable separation between the development and neighbouring residential properties. However, concerns have been raised from occupiers of adjacent dwellings in Vincent Square regarding the proximity of the new development along the western side of the site which they consider would result in a loss of privacy, outlook and light. The minimum separation distance between the house at plot 15 and the rear of number 28 Vincent Square equates to around 15 metres, which is considered a reasonable separation and commensurate with separation distances in the adjacent Leavesden Estate. Furthermore, the house at plot 15 is set at an angle so as not to provide opportunities for direct overlooking.

The relationship of the house at plot 16 with No.25 Vincent Square would appear more over-bearing in comparison, given its 12 metre separation distance to the rear No.25 and its width in relation to the neighbouring garden. However, it is noted that the applicant has designed this house to be slightly lower in height than other units, at approx.7.3 metres and with a hipped roof to lessen the visual impact. Furthermore, no first floor windows are proposed at the rear. On balance, Members may therefore consider the impact on neighbouring amenities is acceptable. In addition, a condition is recommended to provide additional planting at the rear of plot 16 to screen the development from adjacent properties.

Similar concerns have been raised by nearby residents in Barwell Crescent, in particular with regard to overlooking and loss of privacy. However, the layout proposed provides good separation to these neighbouring properties and, as such, no undue overlooking is expected. While the house at plot 1 is in close proximity to

No.1 Moxey Close, the angle at which the two properties are positioned would also not lead to any significant overlooking.

The majority of local opposition in relation to the development is related to the proposed access to the development via Moxey Close and Barwell Crescent and utilisation of the private access gates belonging to local residents. The applicants have submitted a supporting statement in which they explain that Moxey Close, to the south of the Leavesden estate, was designed to provide an ideal vehicular access to the proposal site if it was ever brought forward for residential development. Indeed, the clause in the legal agreement attached to the 04/02322 and 04/02334 applications allowed the site to be brought forward for residential development should an alternative location for the heritage centre be secured. Furthermore, Barwell Crescent and Moxey Close are registered under title number SGL668019 in the name of Taylor Wimpey Developments Limited. The gates are therefore situated on the Developer's land. In any case, Members will appreciate that land ownership and impact on property values are not matters which can be considered under the planning regime.

The previously approved Heritage centre proposed an access directly onto Main Road with the access located towards the apex of the bend. However, the applicant's states that while visibility splays were achievable at that time, during the design of the residential scheme it was identified that the subsequent construction of the first phase of development had resulted in sub-standard visibility splays now being achievable directly from Main Road. From a technical highways perspective, the stopping up of the existing access to vehicles would be favourable due to safety concerns with its permanent use. It is noted that the existing access is not in the same place as that proposed for the Heritage Centre according to plan V480-005. Furthermore, pedestrian and cycle access to the proposed development will still be provided direct to Main Road from the existing access.

In addition to the above, *policy T11 of the UDP precludes access onto London Distributor Roads where there is an alternative access and, from a highways safety perspective*, it is desirable for the development to be served from the lowest category road available instead of being directly accessed from Main Road. The 4.8m wide existing carriageway (Moxey Close) and 5.09m carriageway proposed would accord with the Council's design standards to serve the needs of this particular development as well as the 4 existing dwellings in Moxey Close and is therefore considered acceptable from a technical highways perspective.

A judgement therefore needs to be made as to the level of disturbance to neighbouring residents which would result from the proposed access via Moxey Close. As part of the Transport Statement, the anticipated vehicular trip generation was determined and estimated 14 vehicular movements during the AM peak hour and 12 during the PM peak hour. While local residents have raised concerns over more vehicles entering and exiting the site, given the anticipated vehicular trip generation, on balance, the level of traffic and resulting noise and disturbance which is likely to arise from an additional 16 dwellings, would not be significantly harmful to neighbouring amenities.

Furthermore, it is unlikely to have a significant impact on road safety or the pedestrian environment in the vicinity.

There are also concerns in relation to over-spill parking from the new development into the Leavesden estate. However, the number of parking spaces proposed is above the maximum standards set out in the UDP and may therefore be considered sufficient to accommodate both residents and visitors to the development.

Overall, it is therefore considered that the proposed access via Moxey Close is acceptable given the road safety issues which would arise from an alternative access directly onto Main Road. Furthermore, pedestrian and cycle access would still be available from Main Road and the proposed access would accord with the Council's standards and would not have a significant impact on road safety or the safety of other road users. Also, the level of noise and disturbance resulting from traffic movements to and from the site is unlikely to lead to a significant loss of amenity for local residents.

Additional 'Highways' implications of the proposal are considered below.

On balance, the proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of overlooking/loss of privacy, visual impact, effect on daylight and sunlight and traffic and parking implications for neighbouring residents of the development.

Parking and cycling provision and Highways impacts

The NPPF recognises that transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people. It should be demonstrated that improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. The NPPF clearly states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

London Plan and UDP Policies encourage sustainable transport modes whilst recognising the need for appropriate parking provision. Car parking standards within the UDP should be used as a basis for assessment.

All private dwellings have a garage accessed off of a private driveway and 8 car parking spaces (including 2 disabled) are provided for the affordable units to the eastern side of the site in a communal court immediately in front of the building. The three bed affordable dwelling to the western side has 2 allocated parking spaces. There are an additional 3 visitor parking spaces dispersed around the site. The proposed level of parking is considered acceptable in terms of the highways and parking impact.

It is proposed to stop up the existing access from Main Road on completion of the development leaving a cycle/pedestrian access; however, the applicant states that temporary construction traffic will access the site via this existing access while construction takes place. This will be subject to suitable sightlines being achieved and will need to be agreed with the Council prior to works commencing. A condition is therefore recommended requiring the submission of a construction management plan. The design of the cycle/pedestrian access will also need to be agreed by the Council and substantially completed before development is occupied and a condition is recommended to that effect.

Stand-alone cycle storage has been indicated for the affordable units as well as a communal bin store, while all market dwellings benefit from individual bin stores and cycle parking available within the garages. Further details are required by way of condition to fully assess the refuse and cycle storage facilities.

Having regard to the above, the proposal is considered acceptable in that it would not have a significantly harmful impact on road safety or parking in the area.

Trees and Ecology

A comprehensive scheme of planting has been received as well as a tree protection plan and arboricultural report.

The removal of 18 trees from within the site is proposed of which several are mature, including 2 Poplar trees which are considered noteworthy. Both trees are located towards the northern half of the site measuring approximately 25m in height, and are visually very prominent, and can be seen from several locations when viewed from Barwell Close as well as Main Street. These trees as well as all of the remaining mature trees on site are the subjects of an area tree preservation order (TPO).

The arboricultural report describes these trees as category C on the grounds that they are beginning to come to the end of the safe useful life expectancy, and could only be safely retained after undertaking significant canopy reduction works. Officers have visited the site and concur with the report, raising no objections to their removal.

Trees shown to be removed also include a line of mature false cypress trees located along the main road elevation fronting onto Main Street. These trees are very visible however they have very little visual merit and no objections are raised subject to the implementation of satisfactory tree planting and a soft landscaping scheme to be submitted to and approved by the Council. The remaining trees within the removal program consist of lower category trees and, again, no objections are raised to their removal.

The scheme attempts to retain several of the existing tree stock, which on the whole, it does successfully. However trees T26 and T27 (sycamore) and (ash) respectively will be within close proximity of Plot 10, and there are some concerns regarding over-shadowing and post construction pressure to undertake tree

pruning and removal. However, Canopy management and maintenance is likely to resolve many of these issues and, on balance, the proposal is considered acceptable from a trees perspective.

From an ecological perspective, Natural England were consulted and consider that the proposal is unlikely to damage or destroy the interest features of the nearby SSSI, provided the application is carried out in strict accordance with the details as submitted. While Orpington Field Club have raised concerns over the planting of *Prunus laurocerasus*, given the anticipated impact on the SSI, there are no objections raised to the proposed planting scheme.

The ecological appraisal and protected species surveys submitted the proposal concludes that the site has a low value for local wildlife with some minor potential for roosting bats and protected nesting birds and recommends impact avoidance measures including removal of vegetation when nesting birds are least likely to be present and planting which includes species known of value for bird foraging and nesting. Subject to the implementation of the recommendations made within the report, the proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse effect on local ecology and protected species.

It is proposed to attach tree, landscape and ecology conditions to any planning permission.

Planning Obligations

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that in dealing with planning applications, local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition. It further states that where obligations are being sought or revised, local planning authorities should take account of changes in market conditions over time and, wherever appropriate, be sufficiently flexible to prevent planned development being stalled. The NPPF also sets out that planning obligations should only be secured when they meet the following three tests:

- (a) Necessary to make the development acceptable
- (b) Directly related to the development; and
- (c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

Paragraph 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (April 2010) puts the above three tests on a statutory basis, making it illegal to secure a planning obligation unless it meets the three tests.

The site is subject to an existing s106 agreement that was completed when the 14/02322 and 04/02334 permissions were granted. Where relevant this has been referred to earlier in this report. It is proposed that there be a further s106 obligation related to the current proposal.

From April 2015 it is necessary for pooled contributions to take account of pooling regulations. In this instance the Council seek to secure the provision of affordable housing in compliance with Policy H2, health and education contributions.

Based on the proposed tenure mix of 6 affordable units (intermediate) (4 x 2 bed flats, 2 x 3 bed houses) and 10 market houses (9 x 4 bed, 1 x 3 bed), the calculations for health and education contributions are as follows:

Health: £28,032

Education: £122,157

Heritage Centre Contribution £967,788.

Therefore a legally binding planning obligation would be required to secure the above contributions plus the provision of the affordable housing.

The scheme would also be subject to Mayoral CIL.

Screening Opinion for an Environmental Impact Assessment

As part of the application process it is necessary for the Council to give a screening opinion as to whether an Environmental Impact Assessment is required.

The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 came into force on 6th April 2015; however, as the application was received before this date the 2011 Regulations still apply.

The proposal constitutes Schedule 2 development within the meaning of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011. After taking into account the selection criteria in Schedule 3 of the Regulations and the terms of the European Directive, it is considered that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of such factors as its nature, size and location. This opinion was expressed taking into account all relevant factors including information submitted with the application and the scale/characteristics of the existing and proposed development on the site.

Summary

The assessment above considers the impact of the development on the Green Belt, density, the setting of the adjacent listed buildings, amenity for future occupiers, the amenity of the occupants of nearby buildings, the local highway network and on trees and ecology.

It is concluded that the development would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, further, that it would not significantly detract from the openness of this part of the Green Belt compared to the previous development. The impact on trees, ecology and protected species has also been considered and the proposal is unlikely to have any significantly adverse impacts. Furthermore, the proposal would not harm the setting of the adjacent listed buildings.

It is clear that there will be an impact on adjacent properties as a result of this proposal and due consideration has been given to the comments made by residents during the consultation process. However, based on the above it is considered that on balance the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not have an unduly harmful impact on the outlook or amenities of local residents, nor would the highways proposals lead to significant road safety issues or undue noise and disturbance to occupiers of nearby dwellings.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file refs 04/02322, 04/02334, 14/02136 and 15/00508 set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information. as amended by documents received on 23.03.2015 01.06.2015 17.06.2015 28.08.2015

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION SUBJECT TO THE PRIOR COMPLETION OF A LEGAL AGREEMENT

and the following conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

REASON: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out otherwise that in complete accordance with the following plans unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:**

**Site wide plans/elevations/floor plans: 13.064.1001 Rev U;
13.064.1002 Rev J; 13.064.3001 Rev J; 13.064.7001 Rev H;
13.064.7002 Rev G; 13.064.7003 Rev F; 13.064.7004 Rev B;**

Wheelchair accessible units:13.064.7005 Rev F

**Landscaping and Trees: CSa/2214/102 Rev D; CSa/2214/101 Rev E;
8161/02 Rev B**

Drainage: V480-D01 Rev B

Noise Impact Assessment: REPORT REF. NO. V480-04

**Phase I Desk Study, Site Reconnaissance & Phase II Site Investigation
Report: LP00840**

Energy Strategy by Energist UK: Version 4 May 2015

REASON: In order to comply with Policies BE1, BE13, BH2, BH5, G1, H7 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the openness of the Green Belt, the impact on the adjacent conservation area and heritage assets and the visual and residential amenities of the area.

- 3** Details of the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the buildings and the visual amenities of the area

- 4** Details of the windows (including rooflights and dormers where appropriate) including their materials, method of opening and drawings showing sections through mullions, transoms and glazing bars and sills, arches, lintels and reveals (including dimension of any recess) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The windows shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the buildings and the visual and residential amenities of the area.

- 5** The development hereby permitted shall incorporate measures to minimise the risk of crime and to meet the specific needs of the application site and the development. Details of these measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted, and implemented in accordance with the approved details. The security measures to be implemented in compliance with this condition shall seek to achieve the "Secured by Design" accreditation awarded by the Metropolitan Police.

REASON: In the interest of security and crime prevention and to accord with Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan

- 6** Before commencement of the use of the land or building hereby permitted parking spaces and/or garages and turning space shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter shall be kept available for such use and no permitted development whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) or not shall be carried out on the land or garages indicated or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to the said land or garages.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan and to avoid development without adequate parking or garage provision, which is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and would be detrimental to amenities and prejudicial to road safety.

- 7 Details of a scheme to light the access drive and car parking areas hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby permitted is commenced. The approved scheme shall be self-certified to accord with BS 5489 - 1:2003 and be implemented before the development is first occupied and the lighting shall be permanently retained thereafter.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy T3 and Appendix II of the Unitary Development Plan in the interest of visual amenity and the safety of occupiers of and visitors to the development.

- 8 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include measures of how construction traffic can access the site safely and how potential traffic conflicts can be minimised; the route construction traffic shall follow for arriving at and leaving the site and the hours of operation, but shall not be limited to these. The Construction Management Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timescale and details.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy T5, T6, T7, T15, T16 & T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

- 9 The development permitted by this planning permission shall not commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the site based on sustainable drainage principles, and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage strategy should seek to implement a SUDS hierarchy that achieves reductions in surface water run-off rates to Greenfield rates in line with the Preferred Standard of the Mayor's London Plan.

REASON: To reduce the impact of flooding both to and from the proposed development and third parties and to accord with policy 5.12 of the London Plan.

- 10 Prior to the commencement of groundworks required as part of the development hereby permitted, the following components of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
- a) a site investigation scheme, based in the Phase 1 report, to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off-site;

b) the results of the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (a) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken; and

c) a verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (b) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the express consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

REASON: For the protection of controlled waters and to accord with Policy 5.21 of the London Plan as the site is located over a principal aquifer and may be affected by historic contamination.

11 If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the local planning authority for, a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved, verified and reported to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.

REASON: For the protection of controlled waters and to accord with Policy 5.21 of the London Plan as the site is located over a principal aquifer and may be affected by historic contamination.

12 Before any works on site are commenced, a site-wide energy assessment and strategy for reducing carbon emissions shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The results of this strategy shall be incorporated into the final design of the buildings prior to first occupation. The strategy shall include measures to allow the development to achieve a reduction in carbon emissions of 35% above that required by the 2013 building regulations. The development should also achieve a reduction in carbon emissions of at least 20% from on-site renewable energy generation. The final designs, including the energy generation shall be retained thereafter in operational working order, and shall include details of schemes to provide noise insulation and silencing for and filtration and purification to control odour, fumes and soot emissions of any equipment as appropriate.

REASON: In order to seek to achieve compliance with the Mayor of London's Energy Strategy and to comply with Policies 5.2 and 5.7 of The London Plan.

- 13 Prior to occupation of the development, a verification report demonstrating completion of the works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a "long-term monitoring and maintenance plan") for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan, if appropriate, and for the reporting of this to the local planning authority. Any long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.

REASON: For the protection of controlled waters and to accord with Policy 5.21 of the London Plan as the site is located over a principal aquifer and may be affected by historic contamination.

- 14 Prior to occupation of the development, details of a scheme of 'screening' tree planting and soft landscaping adjacent to the western site boundary at the rear of plot 16 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in conjunction with the approved landscaping scheme and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the substantial completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species to those originally planted.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development

- 15 The landscaping scheme as shown on the submitted drawings shall be implemented in the first planting season following the first occupation of the buildings or the substantial completion of the development whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the substantial completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species to those originally planted.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development.

16 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the trees hereby approved as part of the landscaping scheme shall be of standard nursery stock size in accordance with British Standard 3936:1980 (Nursery Stock art 1:Specification for Trees and Shrubs), and of native broad-leaved species where appropriate.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy NE8 of the Unitary Development Plan and to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development.

17 While the development hereby permitted is being carried out a suitable hardstanding shall be provided with wash-down facilities for cleaning the wheels of vehicles and any accidental accumulation of mud of the highway caused by such vehicles shall be removed without delay and in no circumstances be left behind at the end of the working day.

REASON: In the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety and in order to comply with Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

18 The existing access shall be stopped up at the back edge of the highway before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied in accordance with details of an enclosure to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved enclosure shall be permanently retained as such.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy T11 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety.

19 Details of the new footpath link to Main Road and the reinstatement of the verge and footway shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority and these arrangements shall be substantially completed before the development hereby permitted is first occupied.

REASON: In the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety and in order to comply with Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

20 Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied boundary enclosures of a height and type to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be erected in such positions along the boundaries of the site(s) as shall be approved and shall be permanently retained thereafter.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of visual amenity and the amenities of adjacent properties.

21 Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, bicycle parking (including covered storage facilities where appropriate) shall be provided at the site in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the bicycle parking/storage facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy T7 and of the Unitary Development Plan and policy 6.9 of the London Plan in order to provide adequate bicycle parking facilities at the site in the interest of reducing reliance on private car transport.

22 Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied electric car charging points shall be provided to a minimum of 20% of car parking spaces with passive provision of electric charging capacity provided to an additional 20% of spaces.

REASON: In order to minimise the effect of the development on local air quality within an Air Quality Management Area in line with Policies 6.13 and 7.14 of the London Plan

23 Whilst the principles and installation of sustainable drainage schemes are to be encouraged, no infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted without the prior approval in writing by the local planning authority. Approval may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters.

REASON: For the protection of controlled waters and to accord with Policy 5.21 of the London Plan as the site is located over a principal aquifer and may be affected by historic contamination.

24 Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted without the prior approval in writing by the local planning authority. Approval may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. Where soil contamination is present, a risk assessment should be carried out in accordance with Environment Agency guidance 'Piling into Contaminated Sites'. Piling activities will not be permitted on parts of a site where an unacceptable risk is posed to controlled waters.

REASON: For the protection of groundwater and to accord with Policy 5.21 of the London Plan

25 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the survey, mitigation and biodiversity enhancement recommendations outlined in the Ecological Appraisal document accompanying the application. Any deviation from these

recommendations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy NE5 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of any protected species present at the site.

26 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) no building, structure or alteration permitted by Class A, B, C, or E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the 2015 Order (as amended), shall be erected or made within the curtilage(s) of the dwelling(s) hereby permitted without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of the amenities of the area and to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan

27 Details of the proposed slab levels of the building(s) and the existing site levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before work commences and the development shall be completed strictly in accordance with the approved levels.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

28 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the arboricultural impact assessment, tree protection plan and method statement accompanying the application (updated 1st June 2015) and the tree protection methods agreed shall be maintained to the Local Planning Authority's reasonable satisfaction until the completion of the development.

REASON: To ensure that all existing trees to be retained are adequately protected and to comply with Policy NE7 of the Unitary Development Plan

You are further informed that :

1 We have reviewed the document 'Phase I Desk Study, Site Reconnaissance & Phase II Site Investigation Report' by LEAP (reference LP00840 dated 18/12/2014). The site is located over a principal aquifer and within an outer Source Protection Zone (SPZIII) for the public drinking water supply. The executive summary of the report incorrectly states that the site is

not within SPZ, but this is correctly identified in the main text of the report. Given the history of the site, the report concludes that an intrusive investigation is required. Although the report title indicates such an investigation is included, this has not been reported.

- 2 With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0800 009 3921. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.
- 3 There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval should be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building or an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of, a public sewer. Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new buildings, but approval may be granted in some cases for extensions to existing buildings. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0800 009 3921 to discuss the options available at this site.
- 4 Thames Water would recommend that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol / oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses.
- 5 Where a developer proposes to discharge groundwater into a public sewer, a groundwater discharge permit will be required. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Groundwater permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 8507 4890 or by emailing wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may

result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991.

- 6 Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.**
- 7 You should consult Street Naming and Numbering/Address Management at the Civic Centre on 020 8313 4742, email address.management@bromley.gov.uk regarding Street Naming and Numbering.**
- 8 You should contact extension 4621 (020 8313 4621 direct line) at the Environmental Services Department at the Civic Centre with regard to the laying out of the crossover(s) and/or reinstatement of the existing crossover(s) as footway. A fee is payable for the estimate for the work which is refundable when the crossover (or other work) is carried out. A form to apply for an estimate for the work can be obtained by telephoning the Highways Customer Services Desk on the above number**
- 9 You are advised that this application is considered to be liable for the payment of the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) and the Planning Act 2008. The London Borough of Bromley is the Collecting Authority for the Mayor and this Levy is payable on the commencement of development (defined in Part 2, para 7 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)). It is the responsibility of the owner and /or person(s) who have a material interest in the relevant land to pay the Levy (defined under Part 2, para 4(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)). The Levy will appear as a Land Charge on the relevant land with immediate effect.**

If you fail to follow the payment procedure, the collecting authority may impose surcharges on this liability, take enforcement action, serve a stop notice to prohibit further development on the site and/or take action to recover the debt.