

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 16/04056/FULL1

Ward:
Kelsey And Eden Park

Address : 26 Manor Road, Beckenham BR3 5LE

OS Grid Ref: E: 537620 N: 169426

Applicant : Mr R Percy

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Elevational alterations, part one/two storey rear extension incorporating first floor balcony, rear dormer extension and conversion of building to 2 one bedroom and 2 two bedroom flats with 4 no. car parking spaces at front.

Key designations:

Areas of Archeological Significance
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 12

Proposal

The application site lies on the southern side of Manor Road. The street is residential and is characterised by substantial period properties, many of which have been converted into flats. The host dwelling is more modern in appearance, and is a post-war detached building which comprises 2 three bedroom flats. The host building has a large single storey rear extension.

The site has a reasonably generous rear garden of a depth commensurate with the neighbouring period dwellings, although it has been divided along its length to provide separate gardens for the ground and first floor flats.

To the west of the application site lies No. 24 Manor Road and to the east lies No. 28. No 24 occupies a footprint that projects rearwards of the application building, although this footprint includes a substantial single storey rear extension. The main first floor rear elevation of the dwelling broadly aligns with the host building. The boundary of the application site immediately abuts the flank elevation of No. 24.

To the rear, the application site adjoins the rearmost sections of the rear gardens of No. 1 Bevington Road and No. 2 Manor Grove.

It is proposed to erect a part one/two storey rear extension and a rear dormer roof extension. The proposed rear extension would project from the main rear elevation by 6.85m at ground floor level. The first floor element above would be 3m deep adjacent to the boundary with No. 28 and 5m deep towards the boundary with No. 24. A first floor terrace with glazed balustrade is proposed at the rear of the deeper part of the first floor extension.

The rear extension would be white-rendered. An obscure glazed first floor window is proposed which would face towards the side of No. 24 and which would serve a

combined kitchen/living/dining room. A further flank facing window is proposed on the ground floor. The rear extension would incorporate a flat roof and would be of contemporary design albeit finished in traditional materials including slate and render. The submitted plans show no access to the flat roof of the first floor extension from the dormer, nor from the recessed first floor element to the flat roof above the ground floor element.

The rear dormer extension would be set back from the main roof eaves and would be set in slightly from either gabled flank elevation. The dormer would be clad in slate tiles to match the replacement slate roof.

In terms of the elevational alterations that are proposed, the existing ground floor door and first floor window in the main western flank elevation would be replaced by a first floor obscure glazed window and a ground floor window. The front elevation would be rendered in white alongside the provision of stone quoins on the front/side corners. New fenestration is proposed to the front elevation, including the provision of ground and first floor windows on either side of a proposed centrally positioned entrance door. The entrance door would be set back from the main front elevation to provide a covered entrance and separation between the doorway and the parking area.

The resultant building would be converted into a total of 4 flats. On the ground floor 2 one bedroom units are proposed to be provided, with a GIA of 52m² for each flat. On the first and second floors 2 further flats are proposed, set over two storeys. One flat would comprise a one bedroom unit with a GIA of 71m² and the other a two bedroom flat with a GIA of 79m².

4 no. car parking spaces are proposed to be provided in front of the main entrance to the property, perpendicular to the adjacent pavement/highway. At the rear, the ground floor flats would lead onto a timber decked area and private garden. The larger first floor flat would have private amenity space in the form of a shallow terrace. The first/second floor flats would have access from the side passageway to a communal garden area beyond the private gardens for Flats 1 and 2.

Consultations

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

- o While the depth of the first floor extension has been reduced, in the overall context of the proposal it does not materially change the overbearing nature of the proposal and its impact
- o The first floor windows and balcony would still overlook the garden of No. 28 and be intrusive
- o It is not clear how the building could be constructed without significant impact to boundary structures at the neighbouring property and encroachment over the boundary
- o The plans include a daylight and sunlight study but the study was undertaken without access to the neighbouring property and the pictures are misleading. Two main windows in the kitchen/dining area are not shown on

- the report and would look directly onto a two storey wall close by and there would be a strong sense of enclosure
- o There has been flooding in the past
 - o The plans do not seem to be consistent with conserving the look and feel of the surrounding properties
 - o The parking provision would seem inadequate
 - o The extensions are large and boxy and do not accord with the neighbouring Victorian properties
 - o The proposed parking at the front does not specify a permeable surface, increasing the risk of flooding and overloading of the existing storm drains
 - o Impact on traffic and parking
 - o There is an oversupply of small flats in Beckenham and the existing maisonettes could be refurbished to provide family accommodation
 - o The recycling bins are inadequate and at the moment with only 2 flats there is rubbish, cans and paper flying down Manor Road. It would need at least large wheelie bins for each type of recycled item and refuse bins
 - o Concern regarding a loss of privacy

Highways Technical comments

From a technical highways perspective it is noted that the A222 Manor Road is a classified road and a Local Distributor Route. The site is located in an area with a PTAL rate of 4. The parking layout still looks tight in drawing 4152-PD-02 for 4 parking bays and bay 2 is close to the entrance. Also refuse and cycle storage has not been shown. However as the size of the proposed units has been decreased to 3 x 1 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom flats it is not considered likely that all the occupiers of the 1 bedroom units will own a car and there are not therefore technical Highways objections to the proposal subject to conditions should permission be granted.

Planning Considerations

The National Planning Policy Framework

In Section 1, 'Core Planning Principles', the NPPF sets out 12 core land-use planning principles that should underpin planning decisions. Included within the 12 principles, at section 17, are that a high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings should always be secured.

With regards to the requirement for good design Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states: "The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to make places better for people."

Paragraph 60 states that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. Paragraph 61 refers to the fact that although visual appearance and architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.

Paragraph 64 of the NPPF adds that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

The London Plan

Policy 7.4 of the London Plan concerns 'Local Character'. This states that development should have regard to the form, function and structure of an area, place or street and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings. It should improve an area's visual or physical connection with natural features. In areas of poor or ill-defined character, development should build on the positive elements that can contribute to establishing an enhanced character for the future function of an area.

Section B of Policy 7.4 states that buildings, streets and open spaces should provide a high quality design response that fulfils five criteria:

- o it should have regard to the pattern and grain of existing spaces and streets in orientation, scale, proportion and mass;
- o it should contribute positively between the urban structure and the natural landform;
- o it should be human in scale and ensure that buildings have a positive relationship with street level activity and that people feel comfortable with their surroundings;
- o existing buildings and structures should make a positive contribution to the character of the place to influence the future character of the area;
- o development should be informed by the surrounding historic environment.

The written statement to the London Plan states at paragraph 7.13 that based on an understanding of the character of a place, new development should help residents and visitors understand where a place has come from, where it is now and where it is going.

Paragraph 7.14 states that the physical character of the place can help reinforce a sense of meaning and civility - through the layout of buildings and streets for example.

Unitary Development Plan

The London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan contains specific objectives and policies for the improvement and protection of the quality of the built environment and the encouragement of a high standard of design and the promotion of sustainable environmental quality. It is explained (in paragraph 6.6 of the UDP) that even small developments can have a substantial impact within a locality and over a period of time the cumulative effect of many small changes could alter the overall character of large parts of the borough.

BE1 - Design of New Development.

This requires new development to be of a high standard of design and layout and ensure there is a satisfactory relationship between buildings. It further states that

new proposals should not detract from the street scene generally and the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties should be respected.

In paragraph 6.10 the UDP justifies the policy by requiring that the design of new development should safeguard public amenity and improve the quality of life in the borough with new development relating well to the character of its surroundings.

Policy H7 - Housing Density and Design requires inter alia that the site layout, buildings and space about buildings are designed to a high quality and recognise as well as complement the qualities of the surrounding areas. In addition, that the layout is designed to give priority to pedestrians and cyclists over the movement and parking of vehicles.

Policy H9 relates to side space, and states that the Council considers that the retention of side space "is necessary to protect the high spatial standards and level of visual amenity which characterise many of the Borough's residential areas". It states that where higher standards of special separation already existing, proposals will be expected to provide more generous side space than the minimum 1m referred to in H9(i).

Policy H11 relates to residential conversions and states that the conversion of a single dwelling into two or more self-contained residential units will be permitted where the amenities of neighbouring dwellings are not harmed, accommodation is of a satisfactory standard, parking is provided and the proposal would not lead to the shortage of medium or small sized family dwellings in the area.

In support of its policies the Council has produced Supplementary Planning Guidance. SPG1 refers to 'General Design Principles and SPG2 provides residential design guidance. These SPG documents were the subject of a public consultation exercise that commenced in June 2003 and the Council adopted the final documents on 12th January 2004.

SPG1 emphasises that good urban design should have a positive impact on the appearance of new and extended buildings and their relationship with existing buildings and the places and spaces around them. It highlights the UDP's requirement for any new development to result in built form that is in scale with its neighbours; with landscaped spaces and trees retained wherever possible; and the importance of continuity of built form and street frontages, as well as continuity of natural features such as trees and soft landscaping.

SPG 2 states that the starting point for all new development should be a respect for the character and appearance of the site, its immediate neighbours and the wider street scene. Section 3 sets out guidance in respect of new buildings in established areas and emphasises that local context is of particular importance when adding new buildings to established areas. The advice states that building lines, space between buildings, means of enclosure and the use and location of garden or amenity space should all respect the character of the locality.

Paragraphs 1.4 and 3.1 of SPG2 stress that new development should enhance local distinctiveness rather than harm it.

Planning History

Under reference 02/00737 planning permission was refused for the formation of a third floor to form a three bedroom flat, along with a single storey rear extension.

Planning permission was refused under reference 14/04420 for a three storey rear extension, two front dormer windows and the conversion of the building to form 5 flats.

Under reference 15/03084 planning permission was refused for elevational alterations and a part one/two storey rear extension with balconies, a rear dormer extension and the conversion of the building from 2 three bedroom flats to 2 one bedroom and 2 two bedroom flats (4 no. flats in total). The grounds for refusal of planning permission were:

- 1. The proposal, by reason of its height, design and excessive depth, would appear as an overly bulky addition which would fail to respect the scale and appearance of the host building which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the locality, thereby contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.*
- 2. The proposal, by reason of its height, scale, proximity to the boundary and excessive depth of rearward projection would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings, resulting in loss of outlook and visual impact, thereby contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.*

A subsequent appeal against the Council's refusal of planning permission was dismissed. The Inspector identified the main issues as being the impact of the scheme on the character and appearance of the host building and the locality and the effect of the scheme on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings with particular regard to visual impact and privacy.

The Inspector considered that the existing building and the site as a whole has a negative impact on the character and appearance of the locality. The introduction of roof slates was welcomed, but the use of render was considered on balance to result in the frontage of the altered dwelling having a neutral rather than positive impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. At the rear, the depth, materials and curved lines of the proposed upper floor element of the extension was considered to result in development that would be unduly bulky and which would have failed to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The depth, height and appearance was considered prominent within the rear garden environment and would have appeared as a discordant feature in longer views from Manor Grove and Bevington Road.

The Inspector concluded on this point that the identity of the resultant building would be confused and visually incongruous, materially detracting from the character and appearance of the existing building, the street scene and the rear garden environment. The harm was considered to outweigh the contribution that the two additional flats would make in providing housing to meet the housing targets.

With regards to living conditions, the Inspector stated that the first floor element of the rear extension together with the vertical louvres which were intended to screen the balconies, would have resulted in a dominant visual impact when viewed from the adjacent windows at No. 28 which serve a kitchen and dining room. The rear extension was considered to appear visually hard and incongruous, resulting in a strong sense of enclosure in the outlook from these rooms and it was also considered that there would be an associated loss of daylight and sunlight caused by the extension.

Despite the vertical louvres it was considered that the close proximity of the balcony serving the unit closest to No. 28, that the use of the balcony would have resulted in some loss of privacy. This in itself was not considered materially harmful to the living conditions of the occupier of No. 28, but added to the visually overbearing impact of the development.

The Inspector concluded on this point that the proposed scheme would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupier of No. 28 due to its overbearing visual impact.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties. In assessing the appeal against the refusal of permission under reference 15/03084, the Inspector considered the proposed parking adequate to serve the proposed flats and that the proposal would have been unlikely to have a material impact on congestion and highways safety.

It is helpful to consider the differences between the previous application and this current proposal.

In terms of the works to the front elevation, the current proposal is broadly similar, although 2 front rooflights are proposed. At the rear, the appearance of the development has been amended with the use of more traditional materials (rather than the metal cladding previously proposed) and the setting of the rear dormer element within the main roof slope rather than as a continuation of the first floor extension below.

The previous scheme proposed a ground floor extension at the rear with a projection of approx. 6.85m. The first floor extension had a depth of 5m for the full width of the extension, with vertical louvres with a depth of 1.8m adding to the overall bulk and depth of first floor projection, with the Inspector noting that the first floor element of the extension, together with the vertical louvres, would be over 5m high and would project approx. 5m beyond the main rear elevation of the dwelling at No. 28.

The current proposal again proposes a 6.85m ground floor projection. The first floor projection has been reduced in depth on the eastern side from 5m to 3m, with the 5m depth retained towards the boundary with No. 24. The substitution of glazed balustrades for the timber louvres previously proposed attempts to reduce

the overall bulk/visual impact of the extensions. In comparison, the first floor element of the current scheme projects by approx. 2.5m beyond the closest part of the stepped rear elevation of No. 28. The applicant has also submitted a daylight and sunlight survey which concludes that the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact in terms of daylight and sunlight on the surrounding properties.

Impact on residential amenities

In dismissing the appeal against the refusal of planning permission ref. 15/03084 the Inspector expressed particular concern regarding the dominant visual impact and effect on daylight and sunlight to No. 28. It is noted that the proposed extension lies immediately on the boundary between Nos. 26 and 28, following the line of the existing flank elevation of the host building and the existing single storey rear extension. The existing separation between host building and the flank elevation of No. 28 would be retained at 1.8m. It is noted that the host property has an existing single storey rear extension with a depth of 5.2m.

While the proposed ground floor depth of the extension remains at 6.85m (as previously proposed), the current scheme has reduced the depth of the extension at first floor level to 3m, approx. 2.5m beyond the nearest part of the rear elevation of No. 28. The submitted drawings indicate that the first floor projection would lie outside a 45 degree angle measured from the centre of the nearest windows at first floor level.

The proposed extensions would be appreciable from the neighbouring dwelling's rear facing windows and from the garden. However, it is considered that the reduction in the depth and bulk of the extension towards the eastern boundary of the site would mitigate the visual impact and that the loss of residential amenity would not be significant.

With regards to the impact of the proposal on the amenities of No. 24, it is not considered that the effect would be significant, taking into account that the views from the first floor rear facing windows at No. 26 would be oblique and that the flank elevation of the extension would be separated from the flank elevation of the neighbouring dwelling by approx. 3m. The proposed flat closest to the western boundary of the site incorporates a first floor terrace with a depth of 1.85m. The relationship between this terrace and the development at No. 24 could result in potential for overlooking to the side into the rear garden immediately to the back of the neighbouring property. However, if in all other respects the development is considered acceptable it may be appropriate to secure screening to this side of the terrace in order to prevent unacceptable loss of privacy to No. 24 although a light touch would be necessary to ensure that the screening would not add unacceptable bulk and prominence to the rear extension.

The separation between the balcony and the boundary with No. 28 is considered sufficient to limit the potential for undue overlooking associated with the use of the terrace although if permission is granted it would be appropriate to apply a condition to prevent the use of the flat roof adjacent to the terrace for sitting out/as amenity space.

Impact on visual amenities of the locality

The depth, materials and curved lines of the proposed upper floor of the rear extension was considered by the appeal Inspector to be unduly bulky and to fail to respect the character and appearance of the host building/surrounding area.

The current proposals are generally more sympathetic. The curved and obtrusive design with the linked rear dormer and first floor extension has been replaced by a more appreciable visual distinction between the rear dormer and the first floor element. The rear dormer would be tile hung to match the proposed slate tiled roof over the whole building. The metal cladding to the first floor of the extension has been replaced by rendered side elevations and the bulky vertical louvres have been deleted which results in the perception of the depth of the extension being reduced.

The Inspector welcomed the provision of a slate tiled roof. While concern was expressed at the white rendering of the building in terms of the relationship between the property and the surrounding houses which are predominantly finished in brick, it was considered that the proposed elevational alterations to the front elevation resulted in a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The property does not lie within a conservation area and the existing building has a negative impact on the character and appearance of the locality. On this basis, taking into account the reduction in overall bulk of the extension, the use of more sympathetic materials and the provision of a visual break between the first floor extension and the rear dormer, it is not considered that strong grounds exist to refuse planning permission on the basis of the impact of the proposals on the visual amenities of the area.

Other matters

It is noted that concern has been expressed regarding the means of providing foundations without encroachment over the boundary and flooding. Concerns along these lines were also expressed regarding the previous proposals. Drainage/flooding is a matter that could be dealt with under other legislation and the site does not lie within a designated flood risk area. Land ownership and encroachment is a private legal matter and the means of construction of the proposed extensions and the conversion works within the existing building shell would fall under the Building Regulations.

It has been recommended by the Highways engineer that details be sought by way of planning condition regarding satisfactory refuse storage provision, along with other technical issues to serve the future occupants of the proposed flats.

The proposal would result in 2 two and 2 one bedroom flats in comparison with the existing 2 three bedroom flats. The proposal would provide 2 additional (albeit smaller) residential units. A recent appeal decision has indicated that the Council does not currently have a five year housing supply. The provision of the additional residential units would weigh in favour of the development, although in any case the proposals are considered on balance to overcome the previous grounds for refusal and dismissing of the appeal against that refusal.

Summary

Having had regard to the above it is considered that the siting, size and design of the proposed extensions is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents nor impact detrimentally on the character of the area. The proposal represents an improvement over the previous scheme, dismissed at appeal. On balance it is considered that the reduction in the depth of first floor projection in relation to No. 28, the removal of the bulky and visually obtrusive vertical louvres and the provision of a less visually incongruous and discordant design for the rear extensions would overcome the previous grounds for refusal of permission, taking into account the Inspector's reasoning in the appeal decision notice. The parking provision is considered adequate to serve the needs of the proposed flats and further details regarding refuse and cycle storage and with regards to a means for screening the remaining proposed rear balcony are capable of being secured by way of condition.

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 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the plans approved under this planning permission unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area and to accord with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 3 The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building shall be as set out in the planning application forms and / or drawings unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

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

- 4 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.

- 5** No loose materials shall be used for surfacing of the parking/turning area hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interest of pedestrian and highway safety and to accord with Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 6** No windows or doors additional to those shown on the permitted drawing(s) shall at any time be inserted in the flank elevation(s) of the extensions hereby permitted, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

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

- 7** The flat roof area above the ground floor and first floor extensions shall not be used as a balcony or sitting out area and there shall be no access to the roof areas.

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

- 8** Details of the means of privacy screening for the balcony shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and permanently retained as such.

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

- 9** 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.

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

- 10 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.

- 11 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: to secure a satisfactory means of surface water drainage.

- 12 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.

- 13 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.

- 14** 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.

- 15** Surface water from private land shall not discharge on to the highway. Details of the drainage system for surface water drainage to prevent the discharge of surface water from private land on to the highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of works. Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the drainage system shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained permanently thereafter.

Reason: To secure a satisfactory means of surface water drainage.

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 under Part 2, 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 the site and/or take action to recover the debt. Further information about Community Infrastructure Levy can be found on attached information note and the Bromley website www.bromley.gov.uk/CIL