

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 17/00382/FULL1

Ward:
Hayes And Coney Hall

Address : 55 Kechill Gardens, Hayes, Bromley
BR2 7NB

OS Grid Ref: E: 540392 N: 167133

Applicant : Mr M Ross

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Proposed 2 storey three bedroom end of terrace dwellinghouse (attached to No. 55)

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
River Centre Line
Smoke Control SCA 51

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of an end-of-terrace dwelling which would be attached to the host dwelling. The host dwelling comprises at present a semi-detached house although planning permission was granted under reference 16/01129 for the erection of a two storey three bedroom end-of-terrace dwelling to be attached to that house.

The host/donor dwelling lies to the south of the bungalow at No. 57 and projects forwards of that property towards the road as a consequence of the turning head siting of the semi-detached bungalows. To the south lies the adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No. 53 which lies within a wider plot with a width of approx. 18, compared with the 15m plot width of the donor property. The pair of semi-detached dwellings occupy wide sites and each semi-detached dwelling has been the subject of planning permission for the substantial extension of the host dwellings to the side.

The surrounding area is characterised by semi-detached bungalows and two storey dwellings. There are generous spaces between dwellings, combined with the set back of houses behind garden frontages and/or driveways, which contribute to the character and appearance of the street scene.

The application site has been formed from the entirety of the side space between the flank wall of the dwelling at No. 55 and the boundary of the site with the bungalow at No. 57. It is proposed to erect an attached two storey three bedroom dwelling house which would adjoin the existing dwelling and which would be set 3m from the northern boundary of the site with No. 57.

The dwelling would be 5.8m wide (the dwelling to which it would be attached has a width of approx. 6.6m) and would be accessed by a door set into the side elevation which would lead directly into the kitchen/breakfast room. The footprint of the proposed dwelling would project by 3.2m to the rear of the host/donor dwelling at ground floor level, with the southern flank wall of this projection forming a party wall between the existing and proposed dwellings. A first floor rear projection would be separated from the boundary with the existing dwelling by approx. 2m.

At first floor level three bedrooms would be provided - 2 small single bedrooms at the front of the dwelling and a larger double bedroom at the rear.

The roof of the dwelling would link to the roof of the host dwelling, incorporating a pitched roof with a ridgeline set at lower level than the main ridge of the host dwelling and its semi-detached pair (No. 53). Similarly, the first floor front elevation would be set back from the main front elevation of the host dwelling.

The applicant has submitted a plan showing the provision of 2 car parking spaces to serve the proposed dwelling. The existing dwelling would have parking to the front.

Consultations

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

- The proposal would result in a solid brick expanse of 4 terraced houses rather than the pair of semi-detached dwellings as existing, which would be out of character with the road and immediate vicinity
- The front gardens of the semi-detached dwellings would be replaced by a paved parking area, increasing pressure on local drains
- Crossovers would be required for each dwelling which would impact considerably on the road and existing residents as parking in the cul-de-sac is already problematic
- The submitted drawings are based on the outlines of building shown as they were when the estate was first built, not as they currently are
- Impact on privacy to rear gardens and visual impact
- Impact on the bungalow would be unacceptable as the extension projects considerably forward of the existing detached garage at No. 55
- A previous application for a bungalow for a family member of a former occupier was refused in 1990 on the grounds that the proposal would subdivide the plot
- Would represent a cramped overdevelopment of the site out of character with neighbouring properties
- Would set a precedent for undesirable terracing
- There may be covenants which would prevent the development
- Concern regarding the ownership of the site and relationship with owner of the neighbouring site
- The applicant should implement the permission granted for an extension rather than pursue this application

- Overlooking to neighbouring bungalow
- Impact on outlook from neighbouring properties
- Increased noise and disturbance associated with comings and goings
- The case should be determined on its own merits regardless of the appeal allowed at the neighbouring dwelling (no. 53)

Technical comments

From a technical highways perspective it is noted that the proposed crossover may interfere with the existing street lighting column and if this is the case the applicant should fund the relocation of the lamp column. No objections are raised from a highways perspective, although a number of planning conditions are recommended should permission be granted.

Comments from Environmental Health (Housing) refer to the Housing Act 2004 Part 1 - Housing Health and Safety Rating System (HHSRS) and raising some concern regarding the ventilation and window sizes of the proposed dwelling. These comments are available on file.

Planning Considerations

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

Unitary Development Plan

Policy BE1	Design of New Development
Policy H7	Housing Density and Design
Policy H8	Residential Extensions
Policy H9	Side space
Policy T3	Parking

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that an updated Local Development Scheme will be submitted to Development Control Committee on November 24th 2016 and Executive Committee on November 30th 2016, indicating the submission of the draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State in the early part of 2017.

Policies in the draft Local Plan of relevance to the determination of this application are:

Draft Policy 4 Housing Design
 Draft Policy 6 Residential Extensions
 Draft Policy 8 Side Space
 Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development
 Draft Policy 30 Parking

London Plan

Policy 3.3	Increasing Housing Supply
Policy 3.4	Optimising Housing Potential
Policy 3.5	Quality and Design of Housing Developments
Policy 7.4	Local Character
Policy 7.6	Architecture

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Para. 56 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and indivisible from good planning. Para. 58 states that planning decisions should respond to local character and history and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials

Planning History

The application site has been the subject of several recent applications for permission to extend the property to the side/rear as well as an application submitted in 1990 for the erection of a detached bungalow adjacent to the host dwelling at No. 55. While it is a fundamental principle that each case be considered on its merits in relation to the individual application site, the close proximity of the dwelling at No. 53 means that the planning history of that property is of strong relevance to the proposed development adjacent to No. 55, and that planning history is also summarised.

No. 55 Kechill Gardens

90/01145

Outline planning permission was refused in 1990 for the erection of a detached bungalow with an attached garage. Outline permission was refused on the grounds:

- 1. The proposal constitutes an unsatisfactory and cramped form of backland development lacking adequate amenity space, detrimental to the amenities of adjoining residents by reason of loss of privacy, prospect and general disturbance out of character with the area generally, and as such the development would be contrary to Policy H.2 of the Bromley Borough Plan.*
- 2. The proposal would be prejudicial to the maintenance and repair of the River Ravensbourne (South Branch) Culvert running along the west boundary of the site.*

It should be noted that the application related to development proposed to be sited at the rear of the garden of No. 55.

15/04204

Planning permission was refused for a part one/two storey front/side and rear extension on the grounds:

1. *The proposal, by reason of its excessive width, bulk and siting in relation to the boundary, would have a cramped and overdominant appearance, out of character with and detrimental to the appearance of the host dwelling, the visual amenities of the street scene and the distinctive residential character of the area, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.*

15/05501

Planning permission was refused for a part one/two storey front/side and rear extension. An appeal against the refusal of planning permission was dismissed. Permission was refused on the grounds:

1. *The proposal, by reason of its excessive width, bulk and siting, would have a cramped and overdominant appearance, out of character with and detrimental to the appearance of the host dwelling, the visual amenities of the street scene and the distinctive residential character of the area, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.*

In dismissing the appeal the Inspector noted the main issue as being the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and concluded:

"Notwithstanding the other extensions in the area I consider that the proposal before me is of a width and bulk that detracts from the character and appearance of the existing house. Also, while just over 2 metres would remain between the house and the side boundary, the proposal would still substantially reduce the existing side space."

The Inspector considered that the extensions would have been disproportionate to the existing dwelling, being large and bulky and accordingly harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

16/04784

Planning permission was granted for the erection of a part one/two storey front/side/rear extension. The application had sought to overcome the previous ground for refusal and the Inspector's reasoning in dismissing the appeal. Of particular note, the proposed extension was narrower than the host dwelling, incorporated a first floor set back from the adjacent first floor front elevation and a lower ridgeline than the main host roof. Further, the rear extension was considered to have a less convoluted roof design and the overall bulk and scale of the extension was considered to be less dominant. A side space of 3m was proposed to be to the flank boundary rather than the 2.15m previously proposed.

Planning permission was granted subject to a number of conditions including that the extension shall only be used for purposes incidental to the residential use of the main dwelling and for no other purpose.

It is noted that the physical scale and siting of the proposed built development in this current application replicates that granted planning permission under reference 16/04784.

No. 53 Kechill Gardens

The adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No. 53 has been the subject of a number of applications following the grant of planning permission for a substantial two storey side extension which replaced an unattractive and substantially wide flat roofed extension. Following the grant of planning permission for the replacement/enlarged two storey side extension under reference 12/02589, subsequent applications and appeals have sought the development of the side of the house to provide a self-contained dwellinghouse.

12/03353

Two storey detached dwelling house. Planning permission was refused on the grounds that the proposal represented an overdevelopment of the site harmful to the spacious character of the surrounding area thereby contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan. The subsequent appeal against the refusal of planning permission was dismissed

13/00228

Demolition of two storey extension and erection of two storey detached dwelling together with associated work to provide off street parking. Planning permission was refused on the grounds that the proposal would have represented an overdevelopment of the site harmful to the spacious character of the surrounding area thereby contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan. An appeal against the Council's decision to refuse planning permission was dismissed.

13/03420

Erection of two storey dwelling with garage and additional attached garage to serve 53 Kechill Gardens on land adjacent 53 Kechill Gardens. Permission was refused on the grounds that the proposal would have represented an overdevelopment of the site harmful to the spacious character of the surrounding area thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan. A subsequent appeal against the Council's refusal was dismissed.

14/02617

Planning permission was refused and dismissed on appeal for the erection of an attached two storey 3 bedroom dwelling, with extensions and alterations. The Inspector found that the bulk of the extensions proposed, with the exception of a

single storey garage, would have been very similar to that permitted under ref. 12/02589.

The Inspector reasoned that the bulk of the extension and the subdivision of the front garden need not appear as a cramped overdevelopment. However, the replication of the design of the existing semi-detached pair incorporating a second front door, the extension of a porch canopy over both doors and the replication of the fenestration pattern would cumulatively have resulted in the property as enlarged "appearing as a terrace of three houses". The Inspector felt that this would have been uncharacteristic in the context of the semi-detached form and appearance of the surrounding development.

The Inspector considered that "it may well have been possible to create an imaginatively designed and attractive new dwellings here that would not have resulted in the semi-detached pair as extended having the uncharacteristic appearance of the a terrace block which, in turn, would give rise to an impression of overdevelopment."

15/03041

Planning permission was granted for a part one/two storey side extension.

16/01129

Planning permission was refused for the erection of an attached dwelling on the grounds:

1. *The proposal represents a cramped overdevelopment of the site out of character with adjacent properties harmful to the appearance of the street scene and spacious character of the surrounding area thereby contrary to Policy BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan.*

A subsequent appeal against the Council's refusal of planning permission was allowed, and permission was granted on appeal. The Inspector took into account the physical proportions of the extension granted planning permission under reference 15/03041 and considered that the only significant difference would be a ground floor window in place of a garage door. The Inspector considered the concerns that the proposal would set a precedent for similar forms of development in the area, but emphasised that each case must be considered on its merits, stating that even though the proposal would involve the creation of a separate dwelling/a terrace of three properties "there is no substantive evidence to suggest that this in principle would be harmful to either the character or appearance of the area."

It was noted that the proposed terrace would be similar in appearance to other semi-detached properties in the locality, which were noted to have substantial side extensions, and it was therefore considered that the proposal would not appear out of place in the street scene. Even though the proposal would involve part of the appear site in front of the host and proposed dwellings being given over to parking,

space would remain to the front of the appeal site for a front garden area and the Inspector noted that off-street parking in front of dwellings is a common characteristic of the area.

In reaching the conclusion, the Inspector had regard for the fall-back position of the built development granted planning permission as an extension to the host dwelling. Significant weight was attached to the fact that should the appeal have failed the implementation of built development of the same proportions and siting (albeit as an extension) would have been a genuine fall-back position.

The permission has not, to date, been implemented.

17/00474

A current application has been submitted for minor amendments to the permission granted on appeal to revise the roof line to reflect that of the development granted planning permission at No. 55 along with a single storey rear extension and fenestration amendment. The application has not, to date, been determined.

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. The extent to which the proposal would provide accommodation of a satisfactory level of amenity for prospective occupiers and would provide adequate parking to serve the needs of the existing and proposed development also falls to be considered.

Impact on residential amenity

When planning permission was granted for the extension of the host dwelling to the side (ref. 16/04784) condition 8 of that permission required that the extension be used for purposes incidental to the host dwelling and for no other purpose, with the reason for the condition specifically referring to the interest of the residential amenities of the area.

The current proposal would replicate in terms of height, width and siting the development granted planning permission, but would result in that development being functionally severed from the host dwelling to provide a separate three bedroom house. The proposal would result in the comings and goings associated with the formed dwelling being concentrated along the side of the property, along with all the activities associated with the residential occupancy of the proposed dwelling concentrated into what is at present the generously wide side garden of the host property.

However, in view of the separation provided between the proposed dwelling and the boundary and the broad replication of built form that has already been granted planning permission, it is not considered that the use of the side passage to serve the proposed three bedroom dwelling would in itself have a significantly detrimental impact on the enjoyment of the neighbouring bungalow which is itself well

separated from the boundary and which occupies a position deeper into its site than the proposed dwelling.

In terms of the built form of the proposed dwelling, the outlook from the opposite side of the cul-de-sac would not be significantly different to that which would result if the permissions for side extensions to the host and neighbouring dwellings were to be implemented. The separation between the front elevations of the proposed dwelling and those opposite the site is sufficient to result in no substantial visual impact or loss of amenity to the neighbouring residents.

The extent to which the proposal would have an impact on the privacy of neighbouring dwellings would not be inherently greater than would have been the case with the extensions granted planning permission. While the rear facing first floor windows of the proposed dwelling would afford some potential for looking over the rear portion of the garden at No. 55, towards the rear garden of No. 57, and more distant views towards the rear gardens of dwellings fronting Bourne Vale the views would be oblique and would, in the case of No. 57, result in an impact not substantially greater than would have been the case in respect of the extensions granted planning permission under reference 16/04784. Adequate separation is retained between the proposed dwelling and No. 57 so as to limit the visual impact and impact associated with loss of privacy and noise/disturbance to an acceptable degree.

Residential amenities of prospective occupiers

The internal size of the proposed dwelling would be approx. 105.14m² which would meet the minimum space standards required under Policy 3.5 of the London Plan. The proposal incorporates a rear garden of commensurate depth of those of surrounding residential development and comparable with the garden size of the dwelling granted planning permission on appeal which would be attached to No. 53 Kechill Gardens.

While the garden retained to serve the dwelling at No. 55 would be narrower than is common in the immediate locality, the overall size of the garden is considered acceptable adequate to serve the needs of the retained dwelling and would be of similar proportions to the rear garden provided to serve the retained host dwelling at No. 53 under the recent permission for the provision of an attached dwelling adjacent to that property.

Impact on visual amenity

It is a fundamental principle that each case is considered on its merits, but due to the similarities between the current proposal and that relating to the adjoining semi-detached dwelling and the physical relationship between the buildings it is considered that the planning history of that adjoining site is a material consideration in the assessment of this proposal. As such, the granting of planning permission on appeal for the erection of an attached dwelling to the adjoining semi-detached property provides a strong precedent for this current proposal.

As with the neighbouring site, the main difference between what had been granted planning permission as an extension and what is currently proposed comprises the substitution of a front window for a garage door. The Inspector in that case (No. 53) concluded that the resultant built form of the three terraced dwellings would not have been dissimilar to the built form of other semi-detached dwellings in the vicinity which had each been the subject of substantial side extensions.

It was also concluded that the width of the host and appeal site would have been sufficient to provide parking as well as the provision of a front garden area to soften the appearance of the development, and that the building would retain space to the boundary commensurate with that between other buildings on Kechill Gardens and adequate to avoid a cramped or overdeveloped appearance. The Inspector had particular regard to the conclusions of the previous Inspector in respect of application reference 14/02617 where it was stated "when compared to the extant planning permission to extend the existing dwelling, the subdivision of the plot could...be achieved without the resulting development appearing as an overdevelopment of the site."

It falls to be considered whether the proposed terrace of 4 dwellings which would result if the permission at No. 53 was implemented in tandem with this current application would have a significantly greater impact on the character and visual amenities of the locality than the terrace of 3 dwellings which can be implemented following the granting of planning permission on appeal at No. 53. Taking into account the Inspector's reasoning quoted above, and in view of the limited alterations to the appearance of the host/proposed built form in comparison with the development that has been granted planning permission, it is considered that the subdivision of the plot as proposed is difficult to refuse.

It is noted that the hardstanding in front of the application site and partly in front of the host dwelling has a layout which results in the major proportion of the frontage which would be associated with the proposed dwelling being given over to hardstanding. The area in front of the host dwelling appears to be gravelled and narrower than the hardstanding in front of the dwelling taking into account raised dwarf walls defining a front pathway leading to the host. There is a separate hardstanding of different surface material leading to the existing garage which would be demolished in order to provide space for the proposed dwelling. The plans submitted with the application suggest that the side access for the proposed dwelling can only be achieved through the demolition of that garage which occupies the space proposed to be provided for the pedestrian access to the proposed dwelling.

It is recognised that the proposal would result in frontage car parking for the existing and proposed dwellings, with a total of 4 car parking spaces shown to be provided between the front elevation of the dwelling and the pavement. However, there is sufficient space not only for these parking spaces but also for the provision of front garden areas, and if permission is granted it would be appropriate to require the approval of a landscaping scheme along with details of boundary enclosures to be provided. Such a condition would afford the Council the opportunity to ensure that the appearance of the development could be suitably

softened by landscaping which would result in a balance between parking provision (2 spaces per unit) and the provision of front garden/soft landscaped areas.

Highways

No technical highways objections are raised regarding the proposal.

Other matters

It is acknowledged that planning permission was refused in 1990 for the erection of a detached bungalow at the rear of the application site on grounds relating to the river culvert and the development comprising backland development. It is not considered, in view of the passage of time and the difference between the current proposal and the siting of that previously proposed development that the refusal of planning permission on that occasion represents a strong material consideration in the assessment of this particular proposal.

Representations have referred to the potential that restrictive covenants may prohibit the sub-division of the site to provide an additional dwellinghouse. A covenant would constitute a matter of private property law and does not represent a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Representations have also referred to the applicant failing to identify a conifer tree which is positioned to the side of the donor dwelling. However it is noted that this tree is not protected by way of TPO and it is positioned where the extension which has been granted planning permission would be sited if that permission was to be implemented. It is not considered that the loss of the tree would have a detrimental impact on visual amenity.

Summary

Having had regard to the above, taking into account the planning history of the site and surroundings including appeal decisions relating to the host and neighbouring property it is considered that the application proposal would not have a significant impact on the visual and residential amenities of the area. Adequate parking would be provided to serve the needs of the development and there are no technical highways objections to the proposal. It is acknowledged that the proposal would result, if the permission granted at No. 53 is implemented, in a terrace of 4 dwellings and that this pattern of development is not consistent with the prevailing pattern of development in the cul-de-sac. However, in view of the limited alterations to the appearance of the building in comparison with the previous permission, and the extent to which the resultant development would appear similar to semi-detached dwellings with side extensions in the locality, it is not considered that this in itself represents strong grounds for refusal of planning permission.

It would be possible by way of planning conditions along the lines of those imposed by the Inspector on the permission at No. 53 to mitigate the visual impact of the proposal in terms of the parking provision to the front of the dwelling(s) and materials to be used for the development.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref(s). 90/01145, 15/04204, 15/05501, 16/04784, 12/03353, 13/00228, 13/03420, 14/02617, 15/03041 and 16/01129, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.**

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 residential and visual amenities of the area and to comply with Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 3 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.

- 4 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 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.

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

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

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

Reason: In the interest of the residential amenities of the area and to accord with Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

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

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

8 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. A clearly labelled drainage plan should be submitted showing pipe networks and any attenuation soakaways where infiltration forms part of the storm water system such as soakaways, soakage test results and test locations should also be submitted in accordance with BRE digest 365 and calculations should demonstrate how the system operates during the 1 in 30 year critical duration storm event plus climate change.

Reason: To secure a satisfactory means of surface water drainage and to accord with Policy 5.13 of the London Plan and Draft Local Plan Policy 116.

You are further informed that :

1 You should consult the Land Charges and Street Naming/Numbering Section at the Civic Centre on 020 8313 4742 or e-mail: address.management@bromley.gov.uk regarding Street Naming and Numbering. Fees and application forms are available on the Council's website at www.bromley.gov.uk

2 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

- 3 Any repositioning, alteration and/or adjustment to street furniture or Statutory Undertaker's apparatus considered necessary and practical to help with the forming of the vehicular crossover hereby permitted shall be undertaken at the cost of the applicant.
- 4 You should contact extension 4621 (020 8313 4621 direct line) at the Environmental Services Department at the Civic Centre with regard to the laying out of the crossover(s) and/or reinstatement of the existing crossover(s) as footway. A fee is payable for the estimate for the work which is refundable when the crossover (or other work) is carried out. A form to apply for an estimate for the work can be obtained by telephoning the Highways Customer Services Desk on the above number.