
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 28 July 2015

Site visit made on 28 July 2015

by Jonathan Manning BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 August 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/15/3003774

HG Wells Centre, St Marks Road, Bromley, London, BR2 9HG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Cobalt Bromley South Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/13/03345/FULL1, dated 3 October 2013, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2015.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing building and erection of a part 7, part 11, part 17 storey mixed use building comprising 256 sqm community uses (use Class D1/D2), 1,467 sqm office use (Use Class B1) and 52 residential flats with associated landscaping and public realm works, new pedestrian links, refuse and cycle storage, plant room and 3 disabled car parking spaces.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing building and erection of a part 7, part 11, part 17 storey mixed use building comprising 256 sqm community uses (use Class D1/D2), 1,467 sqm office use (Use Class B1) and 52 residential flats with associated landscaping and public realm works, new pedestrian links, refuse and cycle storage, plant room and 3 disabled car parking spaces, at HG Wells Centre, St Marks Road, Bromley, London, BR2 9HG, in accordance with the terms of application ref: DC/13/03345/FULL1, dated 3 October 2013, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Application for costs

2. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by Cobalt Bromley South Ltd against the London Borough of Bromley Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. Shortly before the Hearing the appellant submitted two revised drawings, A10 Rev PL3a and A11 Rev PL3a. These addressed some identified inaccuracies to the other plans and do not alter the proposal. For this reason, the plans were accepted and I consider that no parties have been prejudiced as a result. The Council set out at the Hearing that they share this view.
4. The development description set out in the application form and the appeal form differ. I consider that the latter most accurately reflects the proposal and has therefore been included in the banner above.

Main Issues

5. The main issues of the appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties; and the effect of the proposal on highway and pedestrian safety, with regard to service provision.

Reasons

6. The Government is seeking to significantly boost the supply of housing, as set out in Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Further to this, the Framework at Paragraph 14 identifies that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Character and appearance

7. The appeal site is accessed off St Mark's Road and currently accommodates a relatively modest building known as the HG Wells Centre, which is currently used as a Labour social club. The appeal site lies within the southern edge of Bromley Town Centre. The site is surrounded by the five storey Metropolitan Police Station to the west, Waitrose supermarket and its associated car park to the north and east, with Bromley South Railway Station beyond to the north, and a terrace of five properties to the south, featuring retail/commercial units at ground floor with residential units above on Masons Hill. The existing HG Wells centre building is not designated as a heritage asset and I concur with the Council that the building makes little contribution to the character of the wider area.
8. The Framework requires good design and advises that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment and that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.
9. Policy BE17 of the Bromley Unitary Development Plan (2006) (the UDP) addresses the delivery of high buildings and the skyline. This identifies that buildings which significantly exceed the general height of buildings in the area, will be expected to be: of outstanding architectural quality; provide a complete and well-designed setting, including hard and soft landscaping, so that development will interact and contribute positively to its surroundings at street level; has mixed use at effective densities; and has good access to public transport nodes and routes.
10. Policy 7.7 of the London Plan provides more guidance on tall and large buildings and identifies that (in summary) these should: only be considered in areas whose character would not be affected adversely by the scale, mass or bulk of the building; relate well to the form, proportion, composition, scale and character of surrounding buildings, urban grain and public realm; enhance the skyline; incorporate the highest standards of architecture and materials; have ground floor activities that provide a positive relationship to surrounding streets; and contribute to the permeability of the site.
11. The Bromley Town Centre Area Action Plan (2010) (the AAP) at Policy BTC19 'Building Height' sets out that there is potential for the development of taller buildings in locations identified on the key diagram, subject to design and environmental considerations. Whilst the appeal site does not form one of the

identified sites on the key diagram, the AAP makes clear at Paragraph 4.2.7 that the identification of the opportunity sites does not preclude other sites from coming forward. Further, it is clear from the AAP key diagram that two of the identified sites for tall buildings are located in close proximity to the appeal site. The appeal site is in a highly sustainable location, with good accessibility to public transport and is within the Town Centre. I acknowledge that the proposal does not follow the plan led approach of the AAP and is a windfall opportunity, however, given the above, this should not go against the proposal, which as with all development should be considered on its individual merits.

12. The proposal would be 17 storeys at its greatest height, with smaller elements at 11 storeys and 7 storeys. It is evident that the design of the proposal seeks to break down the bulk and mass of the building. I consider that the 7 storey element of the proposal would complement the height of the neighbouring Police Station and therefore it is clear that the buildings form has sought to tie in with the neighbouring buildings. Due to the height of the other elements of the building there is little doubt that the proposal would be highly visible and would result in a landmark building.
13. Due to the topography of the area, the appeal site and the immediate surrounding area is set at a lower ground level than development to the north, which I consider aids the appeal site's ability to accommodate a tall building. The Council has set out that the proposal would be a singular form of overbearing and dominant development that would be discordant with the skyline. However, as set out above, I consider that the design of the proposal has evolved to relate to the surrounding development and has sought to reduce the mass and bulk of the building at the higher levels. Notwithstanding this, I am mindful that permission has been granted for a tall building of 19 storeys known as the Bromley South Central development, a short distance to the west of the appeal site. It was evident from my site visit that construction was underway and therefore there is no reason to believe that it won't be delivered. This will significantly alter the skyline and in my view further adds to the ability of the appeal site to accommodate a tall building and would to some degree cluster tall buildings together, as preferred by the AAP. It is also clear that CABE and the Greater London Authority (GLA) supported the principle of a tall building on the appeal site.
14. The Council has raised particular concern with regard to the eastern elevation of the proposal. The Council are of the view that it has a 'slab like' appearance and does not provide an attractive gateway into the town centre from this direction along Masons Hill. The Council maintain that this is demonstrated by the proposed eastern elevation shown on Page 83 of the Design and Access Statement, however, this is a black and white illustration and does not demonstrate the use of materials to separate and distinguish the differing elements of the buildings. Appendix 4 of the appellant's appeal evidence relating to architectural design provides the same view but in colour. Whilst, there is a horizontal line at the top of the building on the skyline, the drawing shows that the different elements and heights of the building are clearly visible, which adds a significant level of visual interest and positively contributes to breaking down the mass and bulk of the building.
15. I acknowledge that the proposed building largely fills its plot as a result of its relatively small size, however, this ignores the wider areas of space around the site, such as the Waitrose car park, the relatively wide St Mark's Road cul-de-

- sac and the access road that separates the appeal site from the Police Station. I consider that these areas would help to integrate the proposal into the area.
16. The residential entrance is located behind a small parking bay that is used to park police vehicles, which I agree is not ideal. However, the appeal site is heavily constrained and in general terms I consider that proposal relates positively to the neighbouring land uses and environments. Therefore, this matter in itself is not sufficient to withhold planning permission.
 17. Consequently, in terms of height, scale, mass, proportion and the proposal's relationship with its wider context, I consider that despite being of much greater height than the buildings in the immediate surroundings, the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and would provide a landmark building, which would positively contribute to the wider urban context.
 18. The architectural style of the building has also raised concern. I am mindful that such matters are subjective and despite the views of the Council and their design advisor, I consider that the varying heights of the building and the mixture of materials are positive attributes and add interest to the observer, whilst also achieving its intended purpose of reducing the apparent mass and bulk of the building. As part of the appellant's evidence, visualisations were provided that illustrate the proposal incorporating brickwork rather than cladding.
 19. It is evident from the visualisations that with brickwork the building becomes more bland and bulky in appearance. This would be particularly the case when viewed from the west, where in brick, the 11 storey aspect of the building would merge with the 17 storey element, which would lose the important contrast of the materials to break up the mass of the building. The appellant has set out that alucobond is a high quality material and I am mindful that samples can be secured and agreed by the Council through a suitable planning condition. This will ensure that the materials are of the highest quality. Therefore, having reviewed both of these options, I remain of the view that the mixture of materials is a positive attribute.
 20. The Council has acknowledged that a tall building of outstanding architectural quality could provide a signal that one is approaching the town centre and so contribute positively to the wider urban context of the town centre as a whole. For all of the above reasons, I consider that the proposal fulfils this role. Further, CABA's pre-application letter of 22 March 2013 states that '*We commend the considered architectural approach that helps to create an elegant building that celebrates its verticality and provides interest from many viewpoints*'. The GLA and the Council has taken a contrary view to CABA, which demonstrates the subjective nature of this matter. However, given my findings above, I agree with the views of CABA.
 21. In terms of the public realm, the proposal provides a modest level of public space given the constraints and small nature of the appeal site. However, I consider it to be functional, with some opportunities for landscaping, which given its wider context and spacing from neighbouring buildings would offer a suitably attractive environment, albeit a modest one. Further, the proposal at ground floor level would have active frontages, which whilst set back from the street scenes of St Mark's Road and Masons Hill would nonetheless be clearly visible from St Mark's Road and its junction with Mason's Hill.

22. The proposal would also provide public meeting space in the form of a café associated with the office uses, although this would also be open to the public. Whilst acknowledging the concerns of the Council, I see no reason why members of the public would not feel welcome and utilise this space, despite the relationship with the proposed office use. The existing community use of the HG Wells Centre would be incorporated into the proposal, but would provide enhanced more flexible facilities.
23. The Council has raised concern that some of the promoted public realm works and landscaping are outside of the site boundary. However, at the Hearing it was acknowledged that this was unregistered land maintainable by the Council and is unlikely to prohibit the delivery of such provisions. I accept that a small strip of proposed planting and high black railings falls on an area of land where the land ownership is unknown. However, this forms a very small part of the overall works and is not fundamental. I also acknowledge that there are some inaccuracies on the landscape proposal, when considered against the site plan. However, these can be overcome by a suitable planning condition that would require a landscaping scheme to be agreed with the Council.
24. Turning to permeability, the proposal includes a footpath link on its eastern boundary to the Waitrose car park to the north. This will deliver a north to south route for pedestrians through the site, which I consider to be a significant benefit of the scheme. I accept that the footpath link as proposed to the Waitrose car park requires agreement from Waitrose and that at the current time no formal agreement has been reached and therefore there is some question over its deliverability. However, at the Hearing it was clear that an alternative footpath link that falls within the site boundary could nonetheless be delivered, which would also enhance the permeability of the appeal site with the surrounding area.
25. The Council are of the view that the proposal represents overdevelopment. I accept that the proposal is of very high density and this is above the levels indicated with the London Plan and the UDP. However, this is a reflection of the nature of the proposal being a tall building and as acknowledged by the Council density calculations are not always an indication of over development. Given my findings above, and the acceptability of the proposal in terms of living conditions and servicing arrangements as set out below, I consider that the proposal does not represent overdevelopment.
26. In conclusion, the proposal is of outstanding architectural quality and constitutes good design. The proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and would deliver a landmark building for the town centre. The proposal also provides suitable public open space and would provide clear social benefits in terms of public meeting space and enhanced community uses. Further, the proposal would deliver a new footpath link through the site significantly increasing its permeability and integration with the wider area, as required by the Framework. For these reasons, I consider that the proposal complies with Policies BE1 and BE17 of the UDP, Policy BCT19 of the AAP and Policy 7.7 of the London Plan. I also consider that the proposal complies with the Framework and the CABE / English Heritage Guidance on Tall Building.

Living conditions

27. Directly to the south of the appeal site lies a terrace of properties on Masons Hill that accommodates residential units above ground floor commercial/retail uses. From my site visit it appears that the majority of the rear facing windows of these residential units serve bathrooms and bedrooms. It was generally accepted at the Hearing that the closest habitable windows to the proposal are at a distance of some 25 metres.
28. The appellant has set out that this distance is in excess of the typical facing window distances in London of between 18 to 21 metres. I acknowledge the Council's view that such indicative distances normally relate to developments of similar scale, however, given the context of the appeal site and the nature of the residential units themselves, which are not family homes and do not appear to have the principle living space such as the living room or dining room at the rear, I consider that such a relationship and separation distance in this particular case is adequate to ensure that there would be no unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy or any perception of such harm.
29. The proposal would result in a notable alteration to the outlook of the properties on Masons Hill, however, the proposed building has been designed to be stepped back from these properties, with the closest part of the building being 7 stories in height. Further, due to their orientation, the majority of these properties would also maintain their principle outlook towards the Police Station and its curtilage. Consequently, I do not consider that the outlook from these properties would be materially harmed and the proposed building would not create a sense of enclosure, particularly having regard to the separation distances between the properties and the appeal site. Whilst not decisive, it is also noteworthy that none of the occupiers of the terrace properties on Masons Hill have raised any concerns with regard to these matters.
30. The Council has also raised concern that the proposal would appear overbearing to the residential properties to the east at Prospect Place and Langdon Wood and would give an unacceptable perception of being overlooked and a loss of privacy. The Council are of the view that the relationship between the proposal and the properties at Prospect Place and Langdon Wood is similar to that of a comparable scheme at Elmfield Road¹. In that case the Inspector found that at a distance of some 120 metres from residential properties, the proposed 16 storey building would be unacceptably damaging to the living conditions of the affected residents.
31. It is evident that there are, however, differences from this proposal to that of the Elmfield Road scheme. Firstly, at the Hearing the appellant provided a map with a 120 metre radius area, which demonstrates that the Elmfield Road scheme was much closer to residential properties to the east. Further, the proposal would be separated from the properties on Prospect Place and Langdon Wood by Waitrose, which is not an insignificant building. Lastly, it was clear from my site visit that the appeal site sits at a lower ground level than the Elmfield Road scheme, which would also help to reduce any perception of overlooking or overbearing effect.
32. At the Hearing a resident of one of the properties closest to the appeal site within Prospect Place initially raised concern about the effect of the proposal.

¹ APP/G5180/A/13/2210460, dated 24 July 2014.

However, after having the opportunity to listen to the discussion and observing the 3D model of the area provided by the appellant, very honestly set out that there would be no significant effect on his living conditions. For all of the above reasons, I share this view and I consider that the proposal would not result in any unacceptable perception from 'eyes in the sky' of overlooking or loss of privacy. Further, I consider that the proposal would not appear overbearing to the residents of Prospect Place and Langdon Wood.

33. In conclusion, the proposal would not be overbearing and would not cause any unacceptable overlooking or subsequent loss of privacy and would therefore not harm the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties. The proposal therefore complies with Policy BE1 of the UDP and Policy 7.7 of the London Plan. These policies seek to ensure that: new development respects the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and that their environments are not harmed by (amongst others) inadequate privacy; and tall buildings do not affect their surroundings adversely.

Highway and pedestrian safety

34. The proposal would be accessed from St Mark's Road, which is a cul-de-sac and therefore has no through traffic. It was evident from my site visit that St Mark's Road currently provides access to the service entrance of Waitrose, the appeal site and to the rears of No 35 and No 37 Masons Hill. St Mark's Road is subject to a single yellow line waiting restriction along the full extent of the carriageway and permits loading/unloading of vehicles at any time.
35. At the Hearing, the appellant set out that due to landownership issues the small strip of land adjacent to the south eastern boundary of the appeal site cannot be used for servicing and the turning of vehicles and therefore the only servicing and turning area would be the roughly triangular piece of land in front of the proposed disabled parking spaces. This area of land has been identified as unregistered land and is maintainable by the Council. The Council set out at the Hearing that subject to a suitable Section 278 agreement, this would not affect the delivery of the proposal or the lands use for servicing purposes.
36. The proposed servicing area would be located close to the proposed community use and would also be utilised by the vehicles accessing the disabled parking bays and the rears of No 35 and No 37 Masons Hill. I therefore agree with the Council that there is potential for some conflict between pedestrians and between the vehicles themselves that would utilise the servicing area.
37. The appellant has provided swept path analysis drawings that demonstrate that large vehicles such as refuse collection vehicles can suitably turn within the proposed servicing area. Further, it has been demonstrated that a reasonable distance of 2.7 metres between the large turning vehicles and the disabled parking bays would be maintained to allow for pedestrian flow from the proposed building. The appellant has also provided TRICS data that identifies that the number of HGV trips generated by the proposal for all of the proposed uses would be limited and infrequent. I am also mindful that vehicles would be travelling at low speed whilst utilising the service area and that such vehicles have audible reversing warnings. The trips generated from the disabled parking spaces and from No 35 and No 37 Masons Hill would also be very limited. Finally, I am also mindful that a Delivery and Servicing Plan could be secured by a planning condition, which would include details of the expected number and time of delivery and servicing trips to the site for all commercial

uses, with the aim of reducing the impact of such servicing activity. Taking all of these matters into account, I consider that the proposal would not lead to any unacceptable harm to highway or pedestrian safety conflicts.

38. Notwithstanding this, the Council set out at the Hearing that should permission be granted then a Road Safety Audit should be undertaken and the appellant did not raise any objections to such a requirement. Given my findings above, I consider that it is reasonable to secure such a requirement by a suitable planning condition and this will ensure that there are no unacceptable safety concerns.
39. The Council has raised concern that the Transport Assessment in support of the proposal does not include an assessment of the servicing vehicle movements of the adjoining Waitrose store. The Council has not provided any evidence to support their view that this may lead to parking or queuing on St Mark's Road resulting in the access and turning space being blocked. Further, given the relatively small and infrequent likely vehicle movements associated with the proposal, I consider that the proposal would not cause any harm in this regard.
40. To conclude, given my findings above, I consider that the proposal would not cause harm to highway or pedestrian safety and therefore complies with Policy T17 of the UDP and Policy BTC29 of the AAP.
41. On a related matter, the appeal site is in a sustainable location within a high (6a) PTAL location. Consequently, it is likely that future occupants and users of the offices would not require a private motor vehicle. Further, the provided legal agreement makes provision for the delivery of a Car Club Scheme parking space. Therefore, I consider that the absence of on-site parking other than 3 disabled spaces would not result in any harm to highway safety.

Other matters

42. Concern has been raised that the proposal would impact upon the setting of the Grade II listed former St Marks Primary School to the south of the appeal site. The appeal site is separated by buildings on Mason's Hill and it is evident that the road running directly in front of the former St Marks Primary School is busy and traffic dominates the setting to the front of the property. I acknowledge that the proposal would be much greater in height and scale than the existing building on the appeal site, but it was evident from my site visit that there are other large scale buildings in close proximity. It was also clear that the area has and is undergoing significant redevelopment, which has to a large degree already significantly altered the setting of the former St Marks Primary School. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would preserve the setting² of the former St Marks Primary School and would not cause any harm to its significance.
43. The proposal is supported by a daylight, sunlight and overshadowing report, which concludes that there will not be any significant harm in this regard. There is no evidence before me to suggest that I should not accept the report's conclusions. There is no evidence to suggest that there is not a need for additional office space, that the scheme is unnecessary given the other developments nearby or that the proposal would place unacceptable additional pressure on local schools, as suggested by interested parties.

² Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

44. Concern has been raised that the residential units would not be affordable for younger people. However, the proposal makes provision for affordable housing, which is suitably secured by the Unilateral Undertaking provided by the appellant. The Council has accepted the level of provision and its mix and I see no reason to take a different view.
45. Concern has been raised that there may be access issues during the construction of the development. I consider that this matter can be suitably addressed by a planning condition requiring a Construction Management Plan to be agreed with the Council, to ensure that there are no unacceptable impacts.
46. The integrity of the culverts and structures on and around the appeal site has raised concern from local residents. However, there is no substantive evidence before me to suggest that the proposal is unacceptable in this regard. Further, I consider that this matter can be overcome through the imposition of a planning condition requiring a structural survey of the retaining wall within the vicinity of the culverted watercourse and a proposal to replace the existing wall if found not fit for purpose.
47. The matter of precedence has been raised, however, I am mindful that each proposal should be considered on its own merits and any other similar development would require planning permission where its merits would be fully considered.

Conditions

48. I have considered the suggested conditions set out within the Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) against the tests set out within the Framework and the advice provided by the Government's Planning Practice Guidance and have amended them where required. In the interests of sound planning and for the avoidance of doubt, conditions are imposed that require the standard time commencement control, as well as for the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
49. To ensure the suitable appearance of the proposal, conditions are imposed that require: details and samples of all external materials, including details of the render; and details of a scheme of landscaping. To safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring residents and the amenity of other local businesses, conditions are necessary that require a Construction Management Plan and a Dust Management Plan to be agreed with the Council. With regard to the Construction Management Plan, this requires 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 to be agreed. The suggested condition as drafted sets out that construction 'shall not be limited to these'. However, I consider that this would render the condition unenforceable and would not meet the tests set out within the Framework. I have therefore deleted this from the condition.
50. In order to prevent crime, a condition is imposed that requires details of the measures to be implemented to minimise the risk of crime to be agreed with the Council. In the interest of the water environment and flood risk, conditions are necessary that require details of foul and surface water drainage systems to be agreed with the Council.

51. To ensure that there is no harm to highway or pedestrian safety, conditions are imposed that require: the parking and turning areas to be provided before the proposal is occupied and a Delivery and Service Plan to be provided. Further, given my findings above with regard to highway and pedestrian safety, a condition is necessary that requires a Road Safety Audit to be undertaken.
52. In order to ensure that there would be no harm caused to the culvert and that suitable access can be gained for maintenance, conditions are necessary that require: the edge of the building to be no closer than 2.2 metres from the edge of the culvert wall; a structural survey of the retaining wall within the vicinity of the culverted watercourse; details of any foundations and pilings works; and a piling method statement to be provided.
53. To promote sustainable modes of transport and sustainable development, conditions are imposed that require details of bicycle parking; details of the number and location of electric vehicle charging points; details of the proposed heat networks and Combined Heat and Power (CHP) system; a site-wide energy assessment and strategy for reducing carbon emissions; and details of proposals to provide dwellings capable of occupation by wheelchair users.
54. One of the suggested conditions in the SOCG makes reference to the dwellings being constructed to 'Lifetime Homes' standard. I acknowledge that the Council set out at the Hearing that this is following the advice of the GLA, however, such requirements have now been replaced by the new housing standards system as part of building regulations. I have therefore not imposed this aspect of the suggested condition.

Conclusion

55. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the proposal represents sustainable development, for which there is a presumption in favour. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

Jonathan Manning

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mark Gibney
Sascha Wardley
Fred London
Stephen Giles

BPTW Planning (Agent)
BPTW Planning
John Thompson & Partners
Gateway TSP

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Sue Rowlands

Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design (On behalf of the London Borough of Bromley Council)

Peter Wilson
Mike Hammond
Louisa Orchard

London Borough of Bromley Council
London Borough of Bromley Council
Work experience

INTERESTED PARTIES

Mr Fred Halligan

Local Resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

1. Signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking, submitted by the appellant.
2. Comparison of Elmfield Road tower and HG Wells proposal (Map), submitted by the appellant.
3. Former St Mark's School List Entry Summary, submitted by the Council.
4. Costs application rebuttal and associated correspondence, submitted by the Council.

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - S01 Rev PL2 (Site Location Plan)
 - S02 Rev PL2 (Existing Site Survey)
 - S10 Rev PL3 (Site Plan)
 - A10 Rev PL3a (Floor Plans – Lower Ground)
 - A11 Rev PL3a (Floor Plans – Upper Ground)
 - A12 Rev PL3 (Floor Plans – Levels 2 & 3)
 - A13 Rev PL3 (Floor Plans – Levels 4 & 5)
 - A14 Rev PL3 (Floor Plans – Levels 6 & 7)
 - A15 Rev PL3 (Floor Plans – Levels 8 & 9)
 - A16 Rev PL3 (Floor Plans – Levels 10 & 11)
 - A17 Rev PL3 (Floor Plans – Levels 12 & 13)
 - A18 Rev PL3 (Floor Plans – Levels 14 & 15)
 - A19 Rev PL3 (Floor Plans – Levels 16 & Roof)
 - A20 Rev PL3 (South Elevation)
 - A21 Rev PL2 (East Elevation)
 - A22 Rev PL3 (North Elevation)
 - A23 Rev PL3 (West Elevation)
 - A24 Rev PL3 (Coloured Elevations – South)
 - A25 Rev PL2 (Coloured Elevations – East)
 - A26 Rev PL3 (Coloured Elevations – North)
 - A27 Rev PL3 (Coloured Elevations – West)
 - A28 Rev PL2 (Section)
 - D0203_001_A (Landscape Proposal)
- 3) Notwithstanding condition No 2, no development shall take place until details and samples of all external materials, including roof cladding, wall facing materials and cladding, window glass, door and window frames, balcony screening, decorative features, rainwater goods, paving and access road surfacing where appropriate, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include a schedule for applying the proposed render, including the type of render, manufacturer and the procedure for application. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 4) 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.
- 5) 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. This 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. The Construction Management Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timescales and details.
- 6) Demolition works shall not begin until a Dust Management Plan for protecting nearby residents and commercial occupiers from dust and other environmental effects has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall include details of all dust suppression measures and the methods to monitor emissions of dust arising from the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 7) No development shall take place until details of the measures to be implemented to minimise the risk of crime and to meet the specific needs of the application site and the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. 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. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
- 8) Details of a foul water drainage system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the development hereby permitted is commenced. The approved system shall be completed as agreed before any part of the development is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.
- 9) No development shall take place until details of drainage works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include an assessment into the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage systems. 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.

Development shall be implemented, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details.

- 10) Before commencement of the use of the land and building hereby permitted parking spaces and turning space shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter shall be kept available for such purposes. 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 indicated for these purposes or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to the said land.
- 11) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a Delivery and Servicing Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan should include details of the expected number and time of delivery and servicing trips to the site for all commercial uses, with the aim of reducing the impact of servicing activity. The approved Delivery and Servicing Plan shall be permanently implemented in full accordance with the approved details from the first occupation of the development.
- 12) No development shall take place until a Road Safety Audit has been undertaken and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 13) The edge of the building shall be no closer than 2.2 metres from the edge of the culvert wall as indicated by submitted drawing 0022/032/13SKC01 and the letter from Guy Laister (Ref: 13116/GL) dated 24 July 2014.
- 14) No development shall take place until a structural survey of the retaining wall within the vicinity of the culverted watercourse and a proposal to replace the existing wall if found not fit for purpose, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 15) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the details of any foundations and pilings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 16) No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by

the local planning authority, in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

- 17) No development shall take place until details of bicycle parking (including covered storage facilities where appropriate) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The bicycle parking shall be provided at the site in accordance with the agreed details before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied. The bicycle parking/storage facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.
- 18) No development shall take place until details of the number and location of electric vehicle charging points to be provided and a programme for their installation and maintenance has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The electric vehicle charging points shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the development and shall be permanently maintained as such.
- 19) Prior to the commencement of above ground works, details of the proposed heat networks and Combined Heat and Power (CHP) system set out in the applicant's Energy Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include the commissioning of the networks and CHP system and details of the catalytic converter if required. The networks and systems shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the first occupation of the development and permanently maintained thereafter.
- 20) No development shall take place until details of proposals to provide dwellings capable of occupation by wheelchair users (including related car parking spaces) in accordance with the criteria set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance to the London Plan "Housing" Nov 2012) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
- 21) 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 building prior to first occupation. The strategy shall include measures to allow the development to achieve a reduction in carbon emissions of 40% above that required by building regulations.