

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 16/00410/FULL1

Ward:
**Bromley Common And
Keston**

Address : Ravensbourne Westerham Road Keston
BR2 6HE

OS Grid Ref: E: 541907 N: 164625

Applicant :

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Erection of two pairs of semi detached houses with green landscaped courtyard on land to the south-east of Ravensbourne House. Reconfiguration of parking layout in front of main building to allow additional landscaping, provision of basement parking area to be accessed via car lift and associated landscaping work.

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Bromley Hayes And Keston Commons

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area

Green Belt

London City Airport Safeguarding

Sites of Interest for Nat. Conservation

Smoke Control SCA 22

Sites of Special Scientific Interest

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of 2 pairs of semi-detached dwellings on land to the side of the main locally listed building.

The applicant has submitted a transport statement, a statement of community involvement, an energy strategy, a drainage planning strategy, a tree survey report and a design and access statement to support the application.

The proposed dwellings would be arranged in two distinct facing pairs, with Units A and B comprising 3 bedroom dwellings and Units C and D comprising 4 bedroom dwellings. The pairs of houses would face each other, approx. 18m apart across a landscaped central courtyard. Units A and B would back onto the north eastern boundary of the site with Nos. 7 and 9 Hassock Wood, with a separation between the single storey element and the boundary of approx. 7m and a first floor separation to the boundary of approx. 10m. The flank elevation of Unit B would face towards the south eastern boundary with the rear garden of No. 2 Rolinsden Way, with a separation of approx. 10.4m retained.

Units C and D would be positioned parallel with the main building, and would face into the central courtyard, backing onto the sloping grounds leading to the lake. The flank elevation of Unit D would face the southern boundary of the site with the rear gardens of No. 4 Rolinsden Way and the side/rear garden of this unit would separate the proposed dwelling from the rear gardens of No 4. Rolinsden Way and Nos 2, 4 and 6 Swires Shaw.

A separation of approx. 9m would be retained between the north western flank elevation of Unit C and the main building. The ground levels at the rear of Unit D begin to slope steeply towards the lower level communal grounds and the lake beyond. The raised rear terrace of Unit D would be sited a minimum of 6.4m from and at an angle to the boundary with No. 4 Swires Shaw. In terms of the massing of the building, the single storey element of the proposal (which would have a height in relation to the falling ground level below of approx. 5.5m) would be sited a minimum of 10m from the angled boundary, with the first floor southern corner of the building a minimum of 11.8m from the boundary.

The dwellings would be of contemporary design with materials intended to match the main building and the recently permitted extension, including slate roofs, flint and brick finish to the external walls and framed aluminium glazing.

The pairs of semi-detached dwellings would be of similar height, with a height to ridgeline of approx. 7.8m and a minimum eaves height of approx. 4.5m, set beneath a dual pitched slate roof which would incorporate projecting glazed and metal clad dormers facing into the central courtyard.

Accommodation would be provided over three storeys, including a basement area lit by lightwells and by large glazed elements above. The design of the dwellings would address the sloping topography of the site, which slopes up from the rear towards the north-eastern boundary, and again towards the private driveway/site entrance.

In the case of Units A and B two bedrooms and a utility room would be provided at lower ground floor level, with front access into the communal basement car park and lightwells to the rear. At ground floor level a large combined kitchen/living/dining space would be provided, with level access to private rear gardens and a terrace area adjacent to the lower ground floor lightwells. A side facing window to Unit B would provide additional light to the dining room. At first floor level the rear facing windows would serve a third bedroom and mezzanine study area, with the latter lit by rooflights. The front facing windows would lead to a balcony looking over the landscaped central courtyard and would serve a living room.

Units C and D (4 bedrooms) would similarly incorporate bedrooms and a utility area at lower ground floor level and access to the communal basement car parking, with the addition of a further reception/4th bedroom. At ground floor level a study would face into the central courtyard, and a combined kitchen/living/dining room would lead onto a raised terrace addressing the sloping ground level at this part of the site. At first floor level a master bedroom suite would be provided with an enclosed balcony facing into the grounds at the rear.

In addition to the semi-detached dwellings, it is proposed to erect a single storey flat roofed building to house the turntable car lift. This building would be sited approx. 2m to the north-west of the flank elevation of Unit A, and a minimum of 7.7m from the boundary of the site with No. 9 Hassock Wood. A communal refuse store is also proposed to be sited approx. 1m from this boundary.

A total of 14 car parking spaces are proposed to be provided in the basement car parking area. A further 8 car parking spaces are shown to be provided within the existing car parking area in front of the main building. The Design and Access statement submitted with the application states that it is intended that the car park would provide car parking both for the new build houses as well as the permitted 7 flats in the main building. It is proposed that metal gates be located at the site entrance with access controls, and a drop off point located immediately outside the main entrance to Ravensbourne House. The existing car park which served the office use of the main house provided a total of 48 car parking spaces within an extensive tarmac forecourt. The transport statement submitted with the application includes an analysis of trip generation statistics for both the proposed residential use (incorporating the flatted development within the main building) as well as the former office use.

Location

The application site comprises an area of land to the south east of a substantial detached locally listed building set within mature and spacious landscaped grounds. The site is accessed via a single track road leading from the western side of Westerham Road. The site area is 0.39ha.

The site is bounded to the east, south and southeast by residential dwellings fronting Rolinsden Way, Hassock Wood and Swires Shaw. To the west, the redline application site is bounded by the mature landscaped grounds of Ravensbourne House, which lead to an area of woodland known as Padmall Wood and Ravensbourne Open Space, accessed via a gate on the boundary.

The site comprises a distinct subsection of the Bromley, Hayes and Keston Commons Conservation Area, and lies adjacent to the Green Belt, a SINC and a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

The main building within the site, which was formerly a single residence, was used from the 1940s as a business centre providing B1 office use. The site as a whole has an extensive planning history which is summarised in the Planning History section of this report, but most recently planning permission was granted for the subdivision and conversion of the main building into 7 residential flats with external landscaping to the front.

This application relates to land to the side of the main building, in respect of which planning permission was granted in 2001 for the erection of 2 detached dwellinghouses. That permission was subsequently renewed on several occasions, and recently details have been submitted to discharge the pre-commencement conditions, in addition to an application to remove a condition on that permission

which required development to commence only after the conversion of the main building into 2 dwellings had been substantially completed.

The redline site plan submitted with the application excludes the main locally listed building, but there is some linkage between the current proposal and the previously permitted scheme for the redevelopment of Ravensbourne House in terms of a shared parking element and the provision within this current application for access from the proposed dwellings to the grounds at the rear of Ravensbourne and a basement level, from the main building into the communal car park. Furthermore, this current application proposes communal access to the grounds at the rear of the main building, which are not included in the site plan (although it is understood that the Ravensbourne site in its entirety is under the same ownership). While elements are linked, the two schemes (that permitted for the main house and this current application for the detached dwellings) are capable of implementation independent of each other.

Consultations

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

- o Concern regarding the potential noise level of the proposed car-lift and how reliable and quiet the lift would be
- o Concern regarding the proximity of car parking spaces in relation to the boundary with No. 9 Hassock Wood
- o Increase in traffic which would not be confined to office hours as is currently the case with Ravensbourne being in office use
- o Objection to the bin store position
- o Impact of the proposed roof terrace upon privacy
- o The proposed dwellings would be an eyesore with no architectural merit in contrast to the main building
- o The threat to the SSSI is immense
- o The original position of the permitted dwellings would have had a lesser impact on residential amenity
- o While care appears to have gone into retaining screening landscaping in the eastern corner of Ravensbourne and that area bordering nos. 7 and 9 Hassock Wood, it is appropriate that where trees have been left as a screen they should be preserved by way of a TPO (with regards to T10, T20, T25, T26, T27, T28 and T29) and that the need to fell T31 and T22 be examined
- o Every care should be taken to ensure that the underground car parking does not result in subsidence.

A letter raising no objection was received from a resident in Rollinsden Way.

The Keston Village Residents' Association raised no objections to the proposal.

The Orpington Field Club has submitted a letter expressing concern at the loss of trees within the site, stating that 5 species of bats are known to forage in the SSSI.

Technical Comments

Drainage

From a technical drainage perspective, the scheme submitted in Drainage Planning Strategy Report is considered acceptable in principle. The site is within an area within which the Environment Agency requires restrictions on the rate of surface water discharge. The site appears to be suitable for an assessment to be made of its potential for a sustainable drainage scheme.

Natural England

Natural England had no comments on the application.

Environment Agency

The Environment Agency had no comments to make on the planning application as it falls outside its remit as a statutory planning consultee.

Environmental Health

Environmental Health comments were submitted, with particular reference to standards of natural lighting and ventilation, which are available on the planning file.

Thames Water

Thames Water commented that the applicant should incorporate within their proposal protection to the property to avoid the risk of backflow on the assumption that the sewerage network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions. The developer will be expected to demonstrate what measures will be undertaken to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. No technical objections are raised with regards to water and sewerage infrastructure capacities.

APCA

The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas raised no objections to the design principle of the scheme, but expressed concerns regarding the loss of the important TPO tree which contributes to the appearance and historic character of the site.

Highways

From a technical highways perspective, it was noted that the site currently has poor public transport accessibility with a PTAL rating of 1b. In this application the parking layout has been reconfigured in front of the main building to allow additional landscaping and some parking is provided in the basement to be accessed via car lift. As per the transport statement the parking and access arrangements will be reconfigured to provide 22 car parking spaces for the 11 homes (taking into account the seven apartments in the main building and 4

proposed semi-detached houses). The statement suggests that 8 car parking spaces would be provided at ground level and 14 car parking spaces at basement level. Details of refuse storage and cycle parking would be required.

Trees and Landscaping

With regards to the impact of the proposal on trees, it is noted that the previous scheme permits the loss of a mature pine tree. This scheme would still require the loss of the tree. In terms of the layout, the current scheme is more appropriate and presents more opportunity with regards to soft landscaping. If permission is granted it is recommended that a full landscaping scheme be required by way of condition, in addition to protective fencing around the trees to be retained upon the site.

Planning Considerations

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

- BE1 Design of New Development
- BE7 Railings, Boundary Walls and Other Means of Enclosure
- BE10 Locally Listed Buildings
- BE11 Conservation Areas
- BE14 Trees in Conservation Areas
- BE16 Ancient Monuments and Archaeology
- H1 Housing Supply
- H7 Housing Density and Design
- NE1 Development and SSSIs
- NE2 Development and Nature Conservation Site
- NE 5 Protected species
- NE7 Development and Trees
- NE8 Conservation and Management of Trees and Woodland]
- G6 Land adjoining Green Belt or MOL
- ER10 Light pollution
- T3 Parking
- T7 Cyclists
- T18 Road Safety

The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) documents are also a consideration in the determination of planning applications. These are:

- SPG No.1 - General Design Principles
- SPG No.2 - Residential Design Guidance

Bromley, Hayes and Keston Commons Conservation Area SPG.

London Plan (July 2015)

- Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply.
- Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential

Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
Policy 3.8 Housing choice
Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling
Policy 5.10 Urban greening
Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
Policy 5.14 Water quality and wastewater Infrastructure
Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies
Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and Access to Nature
Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

Housing: Supplementary Planning Guidance.

National Planning Policy Framework

Planning History

The site has an extensive and complex planning history which is summarised below:

Outline planning permission was granted subject to a legal agreement under reference 99/00926 a single storey side extension for a garage and the change of use of the building to 2 dwellings and the erection in the grounds of 2 detached houses, 3 detached garages and access drives.

The details pursuant to the permission were approved in part under reference 02/01552.

Under reference 02/03898, the scheme permitted under 01/03836 was revised, and permission was granted for 2 detached five bedroom houses each with lower ground floor and detached garages. This permission was renewed in 2005 under ref. 05/02148, again in 2010 (10/01047) and again in 2013 (13/00535).

In 2005 permission was again granted under ref. 05/02149 for elevational alterations, extensions and the change of use of the main building to 2 dwellings. This followed the refusal of permission under reference 05/01297 for the renewal of the permission for 2 detached 5 bedroom houses (02/03898) on the basis that in

the interim the main building had been re-fitted for office use and as such the parking to the front of the building would have been required.

In 2010, the permission granted under reference 05/02149 was renewed (10/01005).

In 2013, the time limit for the implementation of 10/01047 and 10/01005 was extended under references 13/00535 and 13/00532 respectively.

Under reference 15/02655 prior approval was granted for the permitted change of use of the building from Class B1 offices to a total of 8 flats under Class O, Part 3 of the GPDO.

Subsequent applications for planning permission under references 15/03521 and 15/04359 were granted. Permission 15/03521 related to external elevational alterations to supplement the prior approval, including recladding of the modern extension to the side, extensions and alterations to the main building and the provision of integral garaging and terraces to the proposed flats. Permission 15/04359 sought to convert the host building into 7 flats, and included terraces and the demolition and reconstruction of the flat-roofed two storey extension to the side of the building. It was proposed that the replacement extension would be constructed with external materials including pre-fabricated stone panels, flint and brick elements. It is permission ref. 15/04359 that is referred to in the design and access statement accompanying this application in terms of communal parking and the relationship in design between the current proposal and the permitted extension.

Details pursuant to the pre-commencement conditions imposed on permission 02/03898 have been submitted. An additional application ref: 16/00905 has been submitted which seeks the removal of condition 15 of the renewal permission (05/02148), which required: "The development to which this permission relates must not be begun until the office use of Ravensbourne has ceased and works to implement the conversion of Ravensbourne to 2 semi-detached houses have been substantially completed."

Conclusions

The main issues in the determination of this application are the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the conservation area, the setting of the locally listed building and the visual amenities of the area in general, the impact on trees, landscaping and protected species, the impact on residential amenity for existing neighbouring residents and in terms of the future occupants of the dwellings and the extent to which the proposal is acceptable from a technical highways perspective.

Of particular relevance, in addition to the planning policies listed above, is the planning history of the site which includes the granting of planning permission for the erection of 2 detached dwellings to the south east of the main building. It is necessary to frame the consideration of the current proposal with reference to and in the light of the extant permission, assessing whether the current proposal would

have an appreciably greater impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, the existing trees and landscaping on the site, and upon residential amenity, than that which was originally permitted under reference 02/03898 (and subsequently renewed with the addition of condition 15 relating to commencement following cessation of the office use and substantial completion of the residential conversion of the main building).

With regards to the level of parking proposed to serve the 4 semi-detached dwellings and the 7 flats permitted under reference 15/04359, a total of 22 spaces would be provided. This level of parking provision is considered acceptable in view of the low public transport accessibility level.

The design of the development is different to that which was permitted in terms of the appearance of the dwellings and the configuration of the residential units, in providing 4 dwellings in total, arranged as semi-detached pairs. While it is acknowledged that semi-detached dwellings are not a common feature in the locality, the layout of the development in terms of the footprint of the buildings and the retention of space about the buildings would not be visually discordant or undermining of the prevailing pattern of development. In view of the built form of the dwellings and their siting off a private road and physically and functionally separate from the frontages of other residential dwellings bordering the site, the provision of semi-detached rather than detached dwellings is considered acceptable in principle.

As a result of the distinctiveness of the site and its secluded siting, the layout of the development would not tend to inform or set a precedent for development in neighbouring residential streets. It is not considered that the proposal would set an undesirable precedent which would result in a lowering of spatial standards in the locality.

The development previously granted planning permission comprised 2 large detached dwellings each with their own driveway and detached garage buildings. As a consequence, while the garages were reasonably small, the amount of the site taken up by buildings and hardsurfaces diminished the capacity within this part of the site to provide a high quality landscaping scheme. The current proposal would, taken alongside the residential conversion of the main building, result in a reduced tarmacked area to the front and side of the host locally listed building and an increased opportunity for landscaping to improve the setting of the host. The proposed green courtyard between the pairs of dwellings would soften the appearance of the development and represents an improvement over the previously permitted scheme in this respect.

It is acknowledged that the design of the buildings is contemporary in appearance, but Members will be aware that planning permission was granted under reference 15/04359 for the demolition of the existing extension to the main building and its replacement by a more contemporary extension. The materials and design of the proposed dwellings would complement more fully that extension than the dwellings originally permitted and it is considered that the palette of materials would complement, as in the extension scheme, the host building. The use of a varied

palette of materials including flint, brick and slate would complement the materials used in the external elevations of the host building.

When compared with the previously permitted scheme, the overall impact of the bulk and massing of the buildings would not be greater in terms of the impact of the proposal on the conservation area and the setting of the locally listed building. It is considered that the more contemporary design avoids pastiche and has the potential to improve the overall relationship between the old and new building on the site by clearly defining the modern in relation to the historic. The appearance and setting of the proposed dwellings would sit more comfortably with the host building and the mature landscaped setting of the building than was the case with the previously permitted scheme.

In terms of landscaping and the impact of the development on trees, the current application would provide an appreciably more generous landscaping as a consequence of the green courtyard and the provision of parking within the basement area rather than as surface parking. The proposal would result in the loss of the mature tree (T12) adjacent to the main building, as well as certain other trees within the site. The concerns raised regarding this loss in terms of impact on visual and residential amenity as well as nature conservation are noted. However Members are advised that the scheme granted permission under reference 02/03898 would also have resulted in the loss of T12 and it is not therefore considered reasonable to refuse permission for the current development on that basis. If permission is granted it would be appropriate that it be subject to conditions seeking the retention and protection of trees and screening hedging shown to be retained.

The concerns raised regarding the impact of the development on bats are noted, and it is considered that an appropriately worded informative could serve to draw the developer's attention to responsibilities regarding development and protected species, and a condition could also be imposed seeking the submission of details of a lighting scheme for the access/car park to ensure that light pollution does not present a risk to wildlife protection as well as to safeguard the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

With regards to the impact of the proposals on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties, the main issues relate to potential loss of privacy and overlooking, visual impact associated with the bulk and massing of the proposed dwellings and noise and disturbance associated with the use of the dwellings, the refuse storage and the proposed car lift.

In respect of the latter issue, the applicant has stated that the normal readings for noise levels associated with the type of car lift proposed are between 45 - 52 dBA, measured 1m from the source of the noise. The applicant states: "To put this range into context, a 50dBA level relates to the noise level of an average home and 40dBA relates to the level of a quiet library. However, as our lift motor room is located in the basement car park, and surrounded by blockwork walls and concrete slab, the actual noise level heard above ground will be significantly quieter than the 45 - 52dBA range quoted, and therefore the noise disturbance minimal." On the basis of this information, it is considered that a condition could be imposed to

ensure that the system installed matches the system referred to by the applicant, in order to ensure that the car lift noise levels would be within an appropriate range and would have no significant adverse impact in terms of noise and disturbance to neighbouring properties.

The proposed surface parking bays towards the boundary with No. 9 Hassock Wood replace one of the previously permitted detached garages and are broadly located within the extent of the existing large tarmac parking area associated with the office use of the main building. It is considered that the retention of hedging adjacent to the boundary which is shown to be retained on the submitted Tree Protection Plan would adequately safeguard the amenities of the neighbouring property, and in view of the existing use of the site and that which was previously permitted, the current proposal would not have a significantly greater impact in terms of noise and disturbance.

While it is noted that the existing office use of the main building appears to have been limited to normal office hours, there is no planning condition restricting the hours of use of the main building. It is acknowledged that the residential use of the site would tend to introduce a greater potential for evening and weekend noise and disturbance in comparison to the previous office use but in view of the separation between the buildings and the surrounding properties and in the light of the planning history of the site it is not considered that any additional noise and disturbance would have a significantly adverse impact on the neighbouring dwellings.

With regards to the visual impact of the proposed dwellings when viewed from neighbouring properties, it is considered that the scale and bulk of the dwellings would not be excessive or unacceptably prominent. While the rear gardens of Units A and B would be relatively short, the orientation of the proposed dwellings and of the existing dwellings in Hassock Wood would tend to limit the visual impact of the proposed houses when viewed from the rear of those dwellings. Similarly it is considered that adequate separation is maintained between the rear elevations of dwellings in Rolinsden Way and Swires Shaw and the flank elevations of Units B and D to limit the impact of the proposal on visual amenity.

The proposed dwellings are no higher than the detached dwellings previously granted planning permission and the provision of single storey elements nearest to the boundary with Hassock Wood limits the extent to which the proposed rear elevations of Units A and B would be clearly appreciable from neighbouring properties. With regards to Unit D, it is acknowledged that the flank elevation/southern corner of that dwelling would be siting closer to the boundary with Nos. 2 and 4 Swires Shaw, but in view of the orientation of the dwelling, separation and screening it is considered that the visual impact of the proposal would be acceptable in this respect.

With regards to privacy, the provision of the raised rear terrace to Unit D requires careful consideration in terms of potential for overlooking. It is noted that rear terrace is described in the Design and Access statement as being half submerged into the sloping landscape and that reference is made to the capacity for new tree planting scheme to mitigate any overlooking issues. The elevation of the terrace

responds to the topography of the site. In view of the proposed and retained landscaping screening to the boundary of the site it is considered that the use of the rear terrace would not have a significant impact on privacy to neighbouring properties. Similarly, the design and position of rear and flank facing windows in the proposed dwellings, and the siting of balconies facing into the central courtyard, is considered to satisfactorily limit the extent to which the proposed dwellings would result in overlooking and actual or perceived loss of privacy to neighbouring dwellings.

In terms of the amenity of prospective residents it is acknowledged that a significant proportion of the accommodation would be provided within a lower ground floor. On balance, it is considered that the provision of lightwells and glazed 'wintergarden' elements would serve to provide adequate levels of natural light. The outlook from the rooms served by lightwells would be restricted. In view of the accommodation in each dwelling as a whole, it is considered that while elements of the dwellings may be unconventional in terms of their outlook and the levels of natural light, as an overall dwelling, each property benefits from an acceptable level of amenity for prospective occupiers.

It is noted that the rear garden to Unit A is somewhat small in the context of the development and the general size of gardens neighbouring the site and that the rear garden of Unit D is set on a slope. The private gardens of Units A, B and D all include substantial retained hedging/trees which would tend to restrict the usable space within the gardens, and which it is desirable to retain in order to limit the visual and residential impact of the development. On balance, taking into account the communal access to the large gardens at the rear of the site, it is considered that the somewhat uncharacteristic garden sizes referred to above would not result in accommodation of an unsatisfactory standard such that would warrant the refusal of planning permission.

It is considered that the impact of the current proposal on residential amenities and the visual amenities, character and appearance of the conservation area would be acceptable and that subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

as amended by documents received on 23.03.2016

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to 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 Details of a scheme of landscaping, which shall include the materials of paved areas and other hard surfaces, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of the development hereby permitted. The approved scheme 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 similar size and species to those originally planted. A landmark tree will need to be incorporated into the scheme.

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

- 3 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.

- 4 No demolition, site clearance or building works (including trenches, pipelines for services or drains) shall be undertaken until Chestnut Pale fencing not less than 1.2 metres in height has been erected around every tree or tree group on the site shown to be retained on the submitted drawings at the furthest extent of the spread of the canopy of any tree or tree group except where development is hereby permitted within this area. The fence shall be placed so as to exclude the site of the said development but otherwise as far as possible from the trees. The areas enclosed by fencing shall not be used for any purpose and no structures, machinery, equipment, materials or spoil shall be stored or positioned within these areas. Such fencing shall be retained during the course of the building work hereby permitted.

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

- 5 Details of a surface water drainage system (including storage facilities where necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development hereby permitted is commenced and the approved system shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the protection of the sewerage system and to comply with Policy 5.14 of the London Plan.

- 6 Details of a foul water drainage system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development hereby permitted is commenced and the approved system shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and permanently maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the protection of the sewerage system and to comply with Policy 5.14 of the London Plan.

7 No development shall take place until details of drainage works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and drainage works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to first use of any dwelling. Prior to the submission of those details, an assessment shall be carried out into the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage systems set out in Annex F of PPS25, and the results of the assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority. Where a sustainable drainage system scheme (SuDS) is to be implemented, the submitted details shall:

i) provide 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 waters;

ii) specify the responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SuDS scheme, together with a timetable for that implementation; and

iii) provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development, which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The scheme shall be implemented, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details

Reason: In the interests of the protection of the sewerage system and to comply with Policy 5.14 of the London Plan.

8 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 (England) 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.

9 Details of arrangements for storage of refuse and recyclable materials (including means of enclosure for the area concerned where necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development hereby permitted is commenced and the approved arrangements shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in order to provide adequate refuse storage facilities in a location which is acceptable from the residential and visual amenity aspects.

10 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 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 6.9 of the London Plan and in order to provide adequate bicycle parking facilities at the site in the interest of reducing reliance on private car transport.

11 Details of a scheme for the management of the car park shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development is first occupied and the car park shall be operated in accordance with the approved scheme at all times unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan and to avoid development of the site and the adjacent flatted development without adequate parking provision.

12 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.

13 Details of the proposed car lift including the technical specification, manufacturer, model and predicted noise levels associated with its use shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby granted planning permission.

Reason: In the interest of the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings and to accord with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

14 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 buildings, structures, alterations, walls or fences of any kind 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 interest of the visual amenities of the Conservation Area and the residential amenities of the area.

15 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the slab levels shown on the approved drawing(s).

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.

16 Prior to the erection of any external lighting on the site a lighting plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained for the lifetime of the development. The submitted scheme shall be designed to take into account the advice on lighting set out in the Bat Conservation Trust booklet Bats and Lighting in the UK.

Reason: To minimise disturbance to bats, a European Protected Species, and in the interest of the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential dwellings.

17 No development shall commence on site until a landscape management plan, including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas (other than small, privately owned, domestic gardens) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure the proper management of the landscaped areas in the interests of the visual amenities of the conservation area and the setting of the locally listed building, to accord with Policies BE11 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

You are further informed that :

1 You are advised that this application may 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 in Part2, para 4(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010))

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 this site and/or take action to recover the debt.

Further information about the Levy can be found on the attached information note and the Bromley website www.bromley.gov.uk/CIL.

2 The applicant is advised that bats are known to forage within the Keston and Hayes Common SSSI. All bat species are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Schedule 2 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) making all species of bat European Protected Species.

During development, including trees work, care should be taken in case roosting bats are present. If any bats are found, work should stop immediately and Natural England need to be informed.

Even if not bats are found during demolition, the installation of bat bricks in the new build should be considered.

- 3 A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures will be undertaken to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 35779483 or by emailing wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed online via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality.
- 4 It is recommended by Thames Water 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 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 contact on 0800 009 3921.
- 5 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 Water pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.
- 6 Thames Water recommend that all petrol/oil interceptor be fitted to 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.
Thames Water Developer Services can be contacted on 0800 009 3921.