

Application No : 16/05782/FULL1

Ward
Cray Valley East

Address : Klinger Works, Edgington Way
Sidcup DA14 5AF

OS Grid Ref: E: 547799 N: 170450

Applicant : Chancerygate (Erdington) Ltd

Objections : No

Description of Development:

Partial demolition and redevelopment of the Klinger factory and associated buildings to provide 15 units to be used for B1(c), B2, B8 uses together with associated access and parking.

Joint Report 16/05782/FULL1 and 16/05784/LBC

Key designations:

Areas of Archaeological Significance
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
Green Belt
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 20

Proposal

The proposal consists of the demolition the majority of the existing buildings and associated structures on site except for the front elevation and side returns of the listed building and the redevelopment of the site for purpose built B1/B2/B8 industrial units. The proposal comprises:

- Erection of 13 purpose built industrial units in 3 rows
- Small mezzanine to each area
- Extension to the Klinger building to provide a self-storage unit
- Detached two storey commercial unit adjacent to the original Klinger building
- Amendments to existing vehicular access points and provision of in/out access
- Provision of access roads and car parking
- Provision of landscaping
- Retention of the tower and reinstatement of all exterior details
- Retention and re-use of the original piers and railings

Building and Works

The application proposal seeks to retain, restore and enhance the front and side returns of the Grade II listed Klinger building in order to provide a commercial/industrial unit. The existing Klinger building has been designed to

enclose a two storey mezzanine. The proposal also seeks to redevelop the land to the rear of the Klinger building by demolishing the existing dilapidated warehouse and production buildings and erecting 14 new B1(c), B2, B8 units (Units 2 to 14), providing a range of employment accommodation.

Unit 2 (split into 2a and 2b) is a new building, shown as sited adjacent to the east of the Klinger building in the north east section of the site. Units 3-14, also new units, are set behind in three parallel rows of units running horizontally across the site

158 car parking spaces are shown on the site within the curtilage of each of the units, in addition to an area of overflow parking to the east of the site. Operationally it is proposed that visitors will use the spaces adjacent to the relevant unit they are visiting, and the overflow parking is envisaged to be used sporadically. Of the 158 spaces, 16 are disabled spaces, and there are 32 electric vehicle charging point spaces provided (16 of which are passive). Staff parking for each of the units is included in the overall parking provision.

The proposals include landscaping including the retention and enhancement of mature perimeter trees and planting. The frontage to the site includes a landscaping zone, and existing off site mature highway landscaping.

Access arrangements

A separate planning application for proposed works to the vehicular accesses to the site has been submitted to LB Bexley and are therefore not submitted as part of this current application. The vehicular access to the site off Edgington Way is proposed to be located within the central section of the frontage, with the egress proposed to the north east. The proposals have been designed to enable access by vehicles required to service modern employment operators and represent an improvement to the current arrangement.

Listed Building Consent Application

A separate listed building consent application has been submitted to accompany this application under ref 16/05784/LBC. It is considered that the issues discussed in this report deal with the requirements of the listed building consent application. A separate report setting out details of relevant conditions specifically related to the LBC is also on the agenda.

Supporting Documents

Along with the submitted plans, the following supporting documents have been submitted with the application. Where appropriate, they are examined in greater depth throughout the body of this report:

Clock Replacement Specification dated 5.12.2016

Schedule of External Building Materials - Unit 1 dated 10.10.2016

Schedule of External Building Materials - Unit 2 dated 10.10.2016

Schedule of External Building Materials - Units 3-14 dated 10.10.2016

Schedule of External Building Materials - Units 1-14 dated 7.10.2016

Masonry Repair and Cleaning Statement dated 12.12.2016 (Rev A)
Repair and Cleaning Statement for the Works to the Interior of the Central Tower dated 12.12.2016 (Rev A)
Method Statement and Demolition Specification for Demolition and retention of Frontage Building 16-028R_001
Energy and Sustainability Statement dated 16.12.2016
Arboricultural Assessment dated December 2016
External Lighting Assessment
Car Park Management Plan dated December 2016

Flood Risk Assessment ref 16-028R_004
Transport Assessment dated December 2016
Design and Access Statement Rev C dated 16.12.2016
Heritage Statement dated December 2016
Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey ref 16-0420.01
Justification Statement dated November 2016
Land Contamination Site Investigations ref 16-028R_005
Noise Screening Statement dated December 2016
Drainage Strategy Report ref 16-028R_007
Air Quality Screening Statement dated November 2016
Nocturnal Bat Survey ref 16-0420.04
Reptile Survey ref 16-0420.03
Planning Statement ref 9911
Statutory Services Report ref 4826/03
Archaeological desk Based report ref LP2247L-DBA-v1 10
Condition Report on Existing Windows dated August 2016
Structural report on Existing Façade ref 16-028R_003 Rev C
Construction Management Plan dated 2.3.2017

Location

The application site is the former Klinger Factory site located on Edgington Way, Sidcup, with the site within the Borough of Bromley, and Edgington Way, within the Borough of Bexley, with Bexley being the relevant Highway Authority.

There is a significant change in levels on the site and with adjoining land uses, with an embankment and landscaping along the southern boundary of the site. The site is allocated in the adopted Bromley UDP as a Business Area and is situated in a busy commercial area in close proximity to the Strategic Highway Network and the A20.

The application site comprises several buildings that form part of the disused Klinger factory complex which ceased production in the late 1990s. The Klinger Building was originally built in 1937 to the designs of the architectural practice Wallis, Gilbert and Partners. There have been a series of subsequent developments on site, including an extension to the Klinger Building in addition to a further large building to the south of the site. This building, as well as the gatehouse, railings and walls on the northern edge of the site are Grade II listed (first designated in July 1999) and also feature a number of attached unremarkable warehouse and production buildings as part of the wider complex to the rear. The Heritage Statement submitted with the application contains a detailed historical and architectural appraisal of the site and surroundings.

The application site has been vacant for over 15 years and during this period the buildings on the site have been subject to arson and vandalism, causing significant and extensive damage to the structure and its fabric. The frontage building was placed upon Historic England's Heritage at Risk Register.

The surrounding area comprises a mixture of uses including light industrial, warehousing and other commercial operations. To the north of the site beyond Edgington Way is the Ruxley Corner Industrial Estate. The site is bound to the east by a BP petrol filling station and further commercial units on Sandy Lane. There are also commercial uses to the south with the Sidcup by-pass road beyond. To the west of the site is a Tesco superstore with a large surface level car park.

Site Constraints:

Listed Building (Grade II)

Area of Archaeological Importance

Allocated Employment Site

Close proximity to Site of Importance for Nature Conservation known as Ruxley Woods

Close to Site of Special Scientific Interest at Ruxley Gravel Pits

Contamination of both buildings and soil relating to previous use of asbestos on site

Ground Water Protection Zone

PTAL 1a/1b

Strategic Highway implications

SIL in London Plan

Consultations

Comments from Local Residents

No letters of objection or support have been received. A number of neutral comments have been received which note that the south and east sides of the site have geological value and should remain visible and accessible in any future development of the site. A request has been made that a gate be put into the boundary fencing so that access can be achieved if required.

Comments from Consultees

Highways:

The site is within Bromley and Edgington Way lies within LB Bexley who are the highway authority for the road. There is a separate application to LB Bexley for the reconfiguration of the access arrangements (Bromley ref 17/00129). The site has a low (1a) PTAL assessment. Pre-application discussions have taken place with LB Bexley and TfL.

The Klinger building is being refurbished and there are 14 other units proposed on the site giving a total of 15,805m² of floorspace. The proposed use is a mixture of B1, B2 and B8 with some trade counters. There are 158 car spaces shown which equates to 1

space per 100m² which is at the top end of the UDP parking standards. The B8 use also requires lorry spaces. One is shown for each unit.

The exact use split is unknown at present. Various scenarios for the split between the uses for trip generation purposes were presented. B2 use tends to have higher trip generation than B1 or B8. If the proportion of trade counters is increased that could in turn increase the amount of trips generated by the site as customer trips increase.

The roads that are likely to have the most impact from the development are not within Bromley. All traffic will turn left when leaving the site so the impact is likely to be on Edgington Way and Crittalls Corner roundabout. The nearest roads to the site within LB Bromley are Sandy Lane (Ruxley Corner roundabout) and Sevenoaks Way (Crittall's Corner roundabout). Only the latter roundabout was modelled as part of the TA. With a split between the various uses the increase in trips on Sevenoaks Way was estimated to be 5 trips in the AM peak and 3 trips in the PM peak, there was no impact on Sandy Lane. With the trip rates weighted towards B2 use, there was an increase in trips on Sevenoaks Way of 20 trips in the AM peak and 2 in the PM peak, again there was no impact on Sandy lane. In percentage terms these increases are negligible. LB Bexley and TfL may wish to comment on the effect on the impact on the immediate road network.

Given the location and low PTAL the majority of trips are likely to access the site by vehicle. TfL have indicated a desire to improve the cycling facilities in the area, any contribution sought towards infrastructure would need to be agreed with LB Bexley and TfL. The TA indicates that cycle parking is being provided to London Plan standards. There is no working shown given the mix of uses but the 78 spaces appears to be in line with B1 use, the highest, and so I would not object to that. The spaces are spread around the site, some within buildings, which should aid security and encourage use.

Also given the location there are unlikely to be many walking trips to the site. Within the site there is a continuous footway through to the back of the site.

Please include the following conditions in any permission.

- H03 parking
- H16 hardstanding for wash down facilities
- H17 materials for estate road
- H21 car parking to be for customers/employees
- H22 cycle parking
- H23 lighting
- H29 construction management plan
- H32 highway drainage

It was subsequently advised that condition H30 should be applied regarding the travel plan.

Transport for London (TfL):

TfL remains in the position that car parking should be reduced as this is an ongoing aspiration of TfL and the London Plan to reduce congestion and traffic levels and encourage sustainable travel. However, as the proposed quantum does not exceed London Plan standards, TfL would not have sufficient grounds to object on this occasion.

With regard to the S106 contributions, this was not a request by TfL but any contribution secured would be supported. However, it should be noted that this was and still is highly encouraged by TfL but should be borough-led due to the nature of the highway.

London Borough of Bexley

As adjoining Authority, has raised no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of conditions covering the travel plan, parking management, construction logistics, and delivery and servicing plan. Has expressed that the construction of an additional unit to the east of the existing building is unsatisfactory.

Historic England:

As you will note, we are supportive of these proposals in principle in the interest of securing a long-term future use for the Grade II listed Klinger Factory which is a longstanding entrant on our Heritage at Risk Register. As the listing is restricted to the central tower and flanking wings, we also accepted that most of the proposed demolition could be accommodated without harming the significance of the listed building.

However, we raised concern about the proposed demolition of the internal floors and rear walls of the listed wings, and advised that 'clear and convincing justification' should be provided for the harm that would inevitably be caused in line with Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Justification Statement (Chancerygate, November 2016) states that the listed building contains "differing ceiling heights and narrowing floor plates" (p5) and the client Titan Storage requires a "non-negotiable clear internal height of 8.65metres" (p6) in order to provide the correct sized rooms customers require to store their possessions. We acknowledge this argument, and your Council must be satisfied that this justification is sufficient to satisfy the relevant planning policies.

We also note that a Demolition Specification has been prepared by Bradbrook (December 2016) which sets out a brief methodology for the work including the means of retention of the Klinger Factory tower, and the front and flank elevations of the wings. The report states that a "detailed method statement and proposals will be prepared by specialist contractors in due course" (p2). These details should be subject to condition should your Council be minded to approve the scheme. The details should include monitoring of the fabric for any potential movement during the works. We recommend that the demolition work is undertaken by specialist contractors with experience of structural alterations to historic buildings.

We note from the proposed drawings that there would only be a slight change to the floor levels in the Klinger building, and it is encouraging to learn that the new floor plates would have no resulting impact on the fenestration.

We also mentioned at pre-application stage, that the likely harm that would be caused to the Klinger Factory should be mitigated by the delivery of public benefits as is required under Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework. As we previously mentioned, the potential for removal of the Klinger Building from our Heritage at Risk Register, can contribute to the heritage-related public benefits of the scheme in our opinion. However, we also strongly recommended that the conservation and repair of the Central Tower should be offered as part of the heritage related public benefits.

We are pleased to see that the intention is to repair and clean the Central Tower and retain and reinstate features where possible. We note that the submitted Central Tower Repair and Cleaning Statement (Ian C King Associates Architects, December 2016) sets out a brief methodology for the work which includes a full survey and recording of the interior, and the salvage and reuse of features “where possible” (p3).

We recommend that a gazetteer of items is provided as part of these investigations, with a recommendation for each. These details should be subject to a condition in consultation with your Council’s Conservation Officer, and we recommend that an accredited conservation specialist is appointed to undertake this work.

We also recommended that the boundary wall, railings and gatepiers are included in the conservation work if possible. The annotations to the Demolition Plan (drawing no.16-028/004 rev.P4, Demolition Specification document, December 2016) state that the “wall and railings will be repaired and retained, and gates will be replaced with like-for like new ones” (p16). Whilst this is encouraging in principle, your Council should consider requesting details of the wall features such as gates and gatepiers which could be catalogued as part of the gazetteer items for the Central Tower, again with a recommendation for each. We note that this plan also proposes a 2.4m high timber perimeter fence. Your Council will need to be satisfied that would not significantly impact on the setting of the factory in important views.

Finally, should your Council be minded to approve the scheme, we also recommend that further conditions are imposed regarding the brickwork repairs and new brickwork to the rear walls of the factory wings, a mock-up of the new windows which should be subject to an on-site inspection, and the proposed signage, which should not undermine the historic character of the main façade.

Recommendation

We would urge your Council to address the above advice and recommended conditions in the determination of this application. We enclose the draft letter authorising the granting of consent (draft attached) and have referred the case to National Planning Casework Unit. Subject to the Secretary of State not directing reference of the application to him, they will return the letter of direction to you. If your authority is minded to grant listed building consent, you will then be able to issue a formal decision. Please send us a copy of your Council’s decision notice in

due course. This response relates to listed building matters only. If there are any archaeological implications to the proposals please contact the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service for further advice (Tel: 020 7973 3712).

Bromley Conservation Officer

The existing statutory listed building on the site is described as “*Offices, cutting shop, toolroom and storage for factory. Completed in 1937 to the designs of Wallis Gilbert and partners for Richard Klinger Ltd*” . Unusually the listing refers mainly to the frontage rather than all the structures. It is designed in the modernist style and being statutory listed is considered to be of national importance. It is also of interest that the building was deliberately impressive to present a modern image of the company but also to hide the more mundane structures to the rear.

After Klinger Ltd left the building it came into the ownership of IKEA but has been vacant since the 1990s with several failed attempts at reuse. It is also on the Historic England “Heritage at Risk Register”. Therefore the principal of reuse and repair is strongly welcomed from a heritage perspective.

The Heritage Statement submitted gives a lot of background on the building and its architects but is disappointingly light on how the proposal addresses local and national policies, but nonetheless there is sufficient detail to make a recommendation. The special interest of the building can be summarised in its use of the modernist style, characterised by the horizontal emphasis, crittal type windows and the central tower. Internally much has been lost but some terrazzo stairs with steel handrails survived.

It is proposed to demolish the large shed type structures to the rear of the brick built frontage and replace them with modern portal frame structures. I have no objection to the loss of these structures as they make no contribution to the special interest of the listed building. Furthermore the replacements are relatively modest and out of view from Edgington Way. I have no objection to their material finish but it may be appropriate to condition this.

Within the main listed building itself it is proposed to demolish the floors behind the front and side facades but retain the main central tower. The justification is that the new use requires higher floor to ceiling levels and specialist construction for modern storage use such as avoiding UV lights near windows and presumably high levels of climatic control. This is not surprising given the proposed use but nonetheless removing original floors causes some degree of harm, albeit mitigated by the fact that there is little of architectural or historic interest in these locations, as detailed in the heritage statement. In the main tower the remaining stairs would be conserved along with the handrails. Externally the existing crittal windows are beyond repair having been neglected for decades so modern replica crittals are proposed.

In terms of signage little detail is given except for some 3d renderings and whilst I have no major objection to the Titan signage, individual applied letters would be much better and was the approach used by Klinger and other buildings by the same architect such as the Hoover building.

HE mention the boundary treatment but at the front it is intended to keep the existing railings so I have no additional concerns in this respect.

Conclusion

There is a very strong public benefit in bringing this building back into use but nonetheless I can identify some elements which cause harm. These include the removal of the internal floors and the loss of the gate lodge (not really covered in the heritage statement). Therefore para 134 of the NPPF applies. It is my view that the harm caused is relatively modest and would not damage the fundamental interest of the building. It is also far outweighed by the benefits of restoring the building and safeguarding its future.

If minded to recommend consent I suggest the following conditions as some detail on materials and the demolition works is given but some extra clarification would be needed

C08
G01
G03 and G08

(These last two fulfil need for a method statement as suggested by HE to go with the Bradbrook Drawings 16-028/002 etc)

Thames Water:

Waste Comments

Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary.

Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. The contact number is 0800 009 3921. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

Water Comments

On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

Drainage:

Reviewing the submitted "Drainage Strategy Report" with Ref No. 16-028R_007 dated December 2016. I note the use of three geo-cellular system tanks to restrict the discharge to 5l/s for all events including the 1 in 100 year plus 30% climate change, I also note that the applicant has allowed overground flooding for extreme events which is acceptable as long as it is contained on site and the submitted calculations have not included the storage capacity available in the proposed pipe network.

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

Reason: To reduce the impact of flooding both to and from the proposed development and third parties

Environmental Health:

I have looked at this application including the following documents:
Phase 2 Site Investigations prepared by Bradbrook Consulting (ref 16-028R-005)
Noise Screening Statement prepared by TRC Co Ltd (December 2016)
Air Quality Screening Statement prepared by TRC Co Ltd (November 2016)

and would have no objections to permission be granted.

Designing Out Crime Officer:

In summary I would recommend the principles and standards of 'Secured By Design' Commercial 2015' as a planning condition for the development noting the size and historical criminality at the site. I saw in the Design and Access statement there is provision for the entrance doors and ground floor windows to meet 'SBD accreditation' for the retained building which I recommend-I endorse the LPS 1175 SR2 standard doors proposed and recommend a sufficient level of lighting for the exterior.

I would also include this standard for the proposed warehouses including doors, shutters and ground floor windows.

I would recommend the boundaries are of a sufficiently dissuasive height (minimum 1.8) and construction and that there is a security rated vehicular gating system. Noting the number of vehicular spaces I would recommend provision for CCTV and a good level of lighting for the external area's.

Archaeology:

Recommend No Archaeological Requirement

The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) provides archaeological advice to boroughs in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and GLAAS Charter.

I am grateful to Mr Barton of LP Archaeology Ltd for a copy of the geotechnical report dated May 2016 in respect of the above site. The data contained demonstrate that the historic land forming will have had a severe and widespread impact upon any archaeological resource that may have been present.

Despite the proximity of the site to known in situ prehistoric archaeology, it is concluded that there is no discernible on-going archaeological interest with this site. It is therefore recommended that the planning application can be determined without the requirement to further consider archaeology.

Natural England

No objection - subject to appropriate mitigation being secured

As submitted the application may damage or destroy the interest features for which Ruxley Gravel Pits Site of Special Scientific Interest has been notified.

In order to mitigate these adverse effects and make the development acceptable, the following mitigation measures are required:

The development should maintain the same run off rate to ensure that hydrology is not affected.

Planning Considerations

In determining planning applications, the starting point is the development plan and any other material considerations that are relevant. The adopted development plan in this case includes the Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (2006) and the London Plan (March 2015). Relevant policies and guidance in the form of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) as well as other guidance and relevant legislation must also be taken into account.

Unitary Development Plan (2006)

BE1 Design of New Development

BE7 Railings, Boundary Walls and Other Means of Enclosure

BE8 Listed Buildings

BE9 Demolition of Listed Buildings

BE16 Ancient Monuments and Archaeology

EMP4 Business Areas

NE1 Development and SSSI

NE2 Development and Nature Conservation Sites

NE3 Mitigation
NE7 Development and Trees
ER7 Contamination Land
ER10 Light Pollution
T1 Transport Demand
T2 Assessment of Transport Effects
T3 Parking
T5 Access for People with Restricted Mobility
T7 Cyclists
T10 Public Transport
T11 New Accesses
T15 Traffic Management
T17 Servicing of Premises
T18 Road safety

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1: General Design Principles

Bromley's Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan:

It is expected the emerging Local plan Examination in Public will commence in 2017. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances. These documents are a material consideration. Updated Policies relevant to this application include:

13 Renewal Areas
17 Cray Valley Renewal Area
30 Parking
31 Relieving congestion
33 Access to services for all
34 Highway infrastructure provision
37 General design of development
38 Statutory Listed Buildings
68 Development and SSSI
69 Development and Nature Conservation Sites
70 Wildlife Features
72 Protected Species
73 Development and trees
46 Archaeology
80 Strategic Economic Growth
81 Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL)
84 Business Improvement Areas
115 Reducing flood Risk
116 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
118 Contaminated Land
122 Light Pollution
120 Air Quality
119 Noise Pollution
123 Sustainable design and construction
124 Carbon reduction, decentralised energy networks and renewable energy
125 Delivery and implementation of the Local Plan

Draft Allocation, further policies and designation document (Sept 2015)
Chapter 7: Getting Around – Revised Draft Parking Policy
Chapter 9: Working in Bromley

London Plan (March 2015)

2.6 Outer London: vision and strategy
2.7 Outer London: Economy
2.8 Outer London: Transport
2.17 Strategic Industrial Locations
4.1 Developing London's Economy
4.4 Managing Industrial Land and Premises
4.8 Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector and related facilities and services
5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
5.3 Sustainable design and construction
5.6 Decentralised energy in development proposals
5.7 Renewable energy
5.8 Innovative energy technologies
5.0 Overheating and cooling
5.10 Urban Greening
5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
5.12 Flood Risk Management
5.13 Sustainable drainage
5.21 Contaminated Land
6.3 Assessing effects of Development on Transport Capacity
6.9 Cycling
6.10 Walking
6.12 Road Network Capacity
6.13 Parking
7.2 An Inclusive Environment
7.3 Designing Out Crime
7.4 Local character
7.5 Public Realm
7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
7.9 Heritage-Led Regeneration
8.2 Planning Obligations
8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy
Mayor's SPG: "Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment" (2014)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) must also be taken into account.

The most relevant paragraphs of the NPPF include:

Para 14: Achieving sustainable development
Para 17: Core planning principles
Paras 18-22: Building a strong competitive economy
Paras 29 - 41: Promoting sustainable transport

Paras 56 – 66: Requiring Good Design
Paras 93-103: Meeting the challenge of climate change & flooding
Paras 109-125: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
Paras 126-141: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
Paras 188-195: Pre-application engagement
Paras 196-197: Determining applications
Paras 203-206: Planning conditions and obligations

Planning History

01/03745/LBC - Two storey rear extension . Granted

01/03746/OUT - Two storey extension, detached single storey building and change of use of factory (Class B2) to self storage warehousing with car parking, and erection of 4 buildings to provide 9 units for Classes B1, B2 and B8 purposes with ancillary offices, loading areas, car parking and access road (PART OUTLINE)
Granted

02/02254/ADJ - Formation of new road and pedestrian access with associated road markings and associated works to Edgington Way (CONSULTATION BY LONDON BOROUGH OF BEXLEY) No objection raised

Conclusions

It is considered that the main planning issues relating to the proposed scheme are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Layout, Scale, Massing, Design and Appearance
- Historic Asset Impact
- Highways and Parking
- Amenity Impact
- Trees and Landscaping
- Other Technical Issues

Principle of Development

The NPPF states that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system and identify strategic sites for local and inward investment.

The London Plan identifies Fooks Cray (Ruxley Corner) as a SIL (Industrial Business Park). The application site is located within this identified area. Planning decisions paragraph B of policy 2.17 states that 'development proposals should be refused unless they fall within the broad industrial type activities outlined in paragraph 2.79.' Paragraph 2.79 states that: London's strategic industrial locations (SILs) are London's main reservoir of industrial land comprising approximately 50 per cent of London's total supply. They have been identified following an assessment of future need

In addition, the Majors SPG: Land for Industry and Transport 2012, puts Bromley in the category of 'restricted transfer' commenting that this applies to Boroughs with typically low levels of industrial land relative to demand.... Boroughs in this category are encouraged to adopt a more restrictive approach to the transfer of industrial land to other uses. This approach is reflected in Policy 4.4 of the London Plan.

The site is designated within the UDP as a Business Area. Policy EMP4 sets out the criteria for evaluating proposals in designated business areas stating that only proposals for uses within Use Classes B1, B2 and B8 will normally be permitted.

The site is identified in draft policy 80 as the Cray Business Corridor – a strategic priority area for economic growth. The policy states that the focus within this area will be on bringing forward adequate development capacity, the co-ordination of public and private investment and the delivery of enabling infrastructure.

The Site is designated as a Strategic Industrial Location (SIL) in Draft Policy 81, which states that within these areas, uses falling within Class B1(b) and B1(c), B2 and B8 will be permitted and safeguarded. The supporting text to the policy states that the Council will restrict further expansion of retail floorspace within the SIL to instances where the use is demonstrated to be ancillary to a primary B use.

In respect of the proposed mix of uses, the units are to be B1(c)/B2 and B8 units which all comply with planning policies. The applicant has expressed the intention to install ancillary trade counters throughout the scheme. However, in accordance with the policies outlined above, to protect the industrial character of the site, this can be restricted through condition. This can require details of the extent and scale of any trade counters to be submitted for approval prior to their installation. The provision of trade counters could change the nature of the use from storage and distribution to retail based business. The Draft Local Plan Policy in relation to SIL's clearly states that "Proposals involving a portion of floorspace to be used for display and sales should demonstrate that the use is clearly ancillary to a primary Class B use." This form of development would be discouraged on site.

The principle of development is policy compliant and appropriate in this designated employment area. In addition, the proposal would bring a long standing, under used site, back into an industrial/commercial use in accordance with NPPF, London Plan and local policy aspirations.

Layout, Scale, Massing, Design and Appearance

Design is a key consideration in the planning process. Good design is an important aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. The NPPF states 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.

The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to undertake a design critique of planning proposals to ensure that developments would function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the

development. Proposals must establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit; optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses and support local facilities and transport networks. Developments are required to respond to local character and history, reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation. New development must create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

London Plan and UDP policies further reinforce the principles of the NPPF setting out a clear rationale for high quality design. UDP Policy BE1 sets out a list of criteria which proposals will be expected to meet, the criteria is clearly aligned with the principles of the NPPF as set out above. Policy EMP4 is also applicable. These policies seek to ensure the highest standard of design in all new development and require proposals for new business development to provide a high standard of landscaping which makes appropriate provision for biodiversity as well as space for vehicle circulation and parking. In addition, policy BE7 seeks to ensure that railings, walls, plantings and hedgerows are retained where they form an important feature of the streetscape.

A key feature of the proposal is the substantial refurbishment of the listed frontage. Subject to an assessment of the impact on the heritage asset (which will be dealt with in further detail below), the improvement works would significantly enhance the appearance of the site within the street scene.

The proposal will also result in a number of new buildings being erected on the application site. The new single storey block, shown as Unit 2, is proposed to the east of the frontage building with a brick faced façade and fenestration to Edgington Way. It has been designed in a manner that is sympathetic to the retained façade of the listed building without copying its features. A 6m wide space is proposed between Unit 2 and the retained Klinger façade. This would provide sufficient separation between the two buildings and would ensure that Unit 2 would appear subservient to the Klinger building.

The area to the front of the listed building has been designed with a high quality landscaping scheme to respect and enhance the setting of the listed building and provide an attractive setting in the street scene. Limited car parking is proposed to this frontage area with the majority of spaces located elsewhere within the main site. The original existing railings and gate piers at the front of the site are shown as being retained and upgraded. This would all enhance the appearance of the building within the street scene and provide for a high quality development.

The layout and orientation of the further proposed units (Units 3-14) located behind the Klinger building responds to the site's natural features and topography. This in addition to the introduction of further landscaped areas and new tree planting along the side and rear boundaries would ensure that the visual impact of the proposed buildings on the neighbouring sites is softened and reduced.

The proposed development incorporates Secured by Design principles, as required by Policy to take account of crime prevention and community safety.

The proposed scheme reflects the original design rationale of Wallis Gilbert and Partners, by positioning functional and utilitarian structures behind the principal 1930s façade, albeit now using modern materials and structures that meet the needs of modern day occupiers.

Due to the positioning and reduced scale of the new build elements, the principal façade will remain the focus of the scheme.

In summary, the proposal would result in a high quality development that responds to the character of the listed building, and provides a functional, non invasive wider provision to accommodate a policy compliant use of the site.

In accordance with NPPF policy, the proposed site would function well, add to the overall quality of the area, and establish a strong sense of place through the use of sensitive landscaping and boundary treatments. The proposal would optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, and create an appropriate provision of use. The development would respond to the history of the site and would reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials.

Historic Asset Impact

The NPPF sets out the importance of retaining and enhancing Heritage Assets and paragraph 131 identifies the need to take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 132 considers the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, where great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It identifies that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or the destruction of the asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

Paragraph 134 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

Paragraph 130 also sets out that where there is neglect or damage to a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

Policies 7.8 and 7.9 of the London Plan seek to address the issues surrounding Listed Buildings and Heritage Assets. Policy 7.8 states that development should identify, value, conserve, restore, re-use and incorporate heritage assets, where

appropriate and development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

Policy 7.9 identifies the benefit of Heritage – Led regeneration and schemes should be designed so that the heritage significance is recognised both in its own right and as a catalyst for regeneration. Wherever possible heritage assets (including buildings at risk) should be repaired, restored and put to a suitable and viable use that is consistent with their conservation and the establishment and maintenance of sustainable communities and economic vitality.

Policies BE8 of the UDP relates to listed buildings, their setting and the need to preserve the character, appearance and special interest of the listed building and the setting. Policy BE9 also identifies the key issues to consider with proposals for the substantial demolition of a listed building.

Historic Value of the Site

The frontage building on the site is Grade II listed. It is also on Historic England's Buildings at Risk Register. It is recognised that the building has suffered the effects of vandalism and fire damage and it is accepted that the loss of the rear section of the listed building will enable the site to be redeveloped and the front section and elevation of the building retained. Therefore the proposal to retain the original modernist frontage building with new development behind is welcomed in principle.

The Applicant has engaged in pre application discussion with both the Council and Historic England regarding the impact of proposed works on the character and setting of the listed building. The current application under consideration reflects the advice given and provides a justification for the works in a comprehensive Heritage Statement.

The Heritage Statement outlines how *'the designs of Wallis, Gilbert and Partners often featured a dominant frontage building and a simplified series of hidden storage and production spaces housed in unremarkable structures to the rear. The frontage building often incorporated a central tower with flanking wings in the mid-late-1930s 'geometric phase' of their work. This provided the desired public image to the business and industry, so included an increased level of architectural detail, expenditure and materiality which remains identifiable with almost all the 1920s and 1930s work of the practice.'*

'This hierarchy of structures or spaces within a given site was also often replicated in the reception spaces areas within the frontage buildings designed by Wallis, Gilbert and Partners, such as in the centralised staircases and lobby. These spaces once again reinforced the public image of the company and industry through high quality design. As a result, these core elements invariably form the special architectural and historic interest of their buildings. They express the core design rationale of all buildings designed by the practice, which was 'to elevate the status of the industry and company brand or identity'.

'Conversely, the secondary elevations, spaces and structures to the rear of the principal areas were constructed of poorer quality materials and conveyed a very basic level of architectural application. These spaces were seen as subservient and of a lesser importance or significance. Instead, it was the principal frontage buildings that provided the architectural statement and special architectural and historic interest within the 1930s factory complex's designed by Wallis Gilbert and Partners.'

It is accepted that the site's historic value is formed by the aesthetic value of the principal façade. In terms of setting, the structures to the rear provide a lesser contribution to the significance of the frontage building. The wider setting of the frontage building has altered over time to include modern industrial, retail and commercial warehouse units. These buildings have large footprints and spans, incorporating simple utilitarian modern cladding and materials, thus forming the predominant character of the area and the building's wider setting.

Demolition works

The proposal seeks to demolish existing buildings, spaces and associated sections of fabric to the rear of the principal façade. It is accepted that these areas are of limited historic or architectural significance. They form a mixture of failed and redundant 1930s and 1960s warehouse and production spaces. They comprise simple, poor quality, utilitarian structures hidden behind the principal façade. The loss of these units will not impact on the ability to appreciate the aesthetic significance or 'special architectural interest' of the retained 1930s façade. It will have an impact upon the historic fabric and immediate setting of the complex, however, this is outweighed by the ability to preserve and enhance the primary features of architectural significance identified on site.

Furthermore, the new replacement units will fit the requirements of modern day users and will reflect the original Wallis Gilbert and Partners design rationale by placing

Works to the Frontage Building

The internal works to the tower are extensive but would retain the plan form of the original spaces, expressing their original configuration and use.

The proposal shows that the retained external envelope will be sensitively refurbished, adapted, repaired and cleaned. This includes the reinstatement of a comparable clock tower fitting, the removal of existing graffiti and the like for like repair of damaged, failed masonry and render, as well as the sympathetic replacement of period doors and windows that are no longer serviceable. These works are significant heritage benefits.

All failed windows are shown as being removed and replaced. All replacement windows are shown as replicating the profile, breakdown and detailing of the existing 1930s façade. They will remain unobscured and light the proposed circulation spaces within the new core behind.

Some minimal alterations have been shown to the front elevation. The proposed works to the envelope include the establishment of a new glazed reception access and lightweight entrance canopy within an existing opening in the north-east corner of the façade. The structure has been designed to reflect the existing fenestration and period detailing of windows within the principal façade, ensuring the character and appearance of the façade is preserved. In addition, two utilitarian loading bays are placed discretely within the western side return, which would remain largely invisible from Edgington Way.

These adaption works are considered to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the building and would minimise intervention to significant areas of fabric whilst responding to the requirements of an occupier and any prospective end users.

Significant detail of the works has been submitted with the applications, to the satisfaction of Bromley's Conservation Officer and Historic England.

New Development

A sheet metal clad, steel framed unit (unit 1) has been designed to adjoin the rear face of the retained 1930s façade. The new sub-structure and cladding will form the new body of the building and spaces within. It would be obscured from view within the public realm and would remain lower than the existing building parapet at roof level when viewed from Edgington Way.

The primary elevation of the proposed units (2a-2b) fronting Edgington Way has been designed to reflect the architectural treatment of the retained 1930s façade which it flanks. The two storey building remains subservient in scale and features banded brickwork and comparative fenestration. It sits comfortably next to the listed building without offering an architectural pastiche, and would appear appropriate within the industrial setting.

The structure formed behind the façade of units 2a-2b is shown as steel framed and clad in sheet metal with a roof that would not be visible from Edgington Way. The additional units (3-14), positioned to the rear of the site, are shown as steel framed and clad in sheet metal in their entirety. The two storey units reflect the established architectural character of modern warehouse buildings within the area, forming the wider setting of the existing buildings on site.

Boundaries

The existing dilapidated gatehouse and smaller standalone outbuildings on site are proposed to be demolished, and the existing gates to the frontage which are in a poor state of repair are shown as being replaced with modern alternatives. The access is shown as enlarged to comply with modern requirements. New piers, walls and railings will be added on each side of the new opening, as necessary, to match the existing. A substantial section of wall and railings to the east which has been lost is shown as being reinstated.

The application includes a landscaping plan showing improved landscaping and boundary treatment.

It is considered that the boundary works would improve the existing dilapidated frontage of the site and enhance the foreground setting of the façade. When coupled with the removal of undergrowth and tree growth, the façade will be better appreciated from within the public realm and the site will feature enhanced security. These works would provide for additional heritage benefits to the appearance and setting of the heritage asset.

Summary

It is considered that the proposed scheme would reflect the original design rationale of Wallis Gilbert and Partners, by positioning functional and utilitarian structures behind the principal 1930s façade. The positioning and reduced scale of the new build elements would ensure that they remain subservient and that the principal listed façade would remain the focus of the scheme. The works would enhance the historic integrity of the existing building and reflect the history of the site.

It is accepted that, as stated within the submitted Heritage Statement *‘Whilst all existing structures and spaces to the rear of the façade will be demolished, removing compromised and redundant sections of both original and non-original structure, the core element of significance on site (1930s façade) will be retained and secured. The proposed demolition will have a direct impact upon the completeness of the original complex and immediate setting of the frontage building, however, it will also offer a secure use and substantial funding for the refurbishment and conservation of the principal façade which is ailing and dilapidated at present.’*

The works to the main façade and tower represent a considerable heritage benefit and would enhance the wider street scene. The proposal represents a high quality architectural intervention that responds to the significance, as well as the development history of the site.

The Applicant has identified the significance of the Grade II listed building. It has also identified the setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest. There would be an impact upon the setting and significance of the Grade II statutory listed building, which on balance, would be positive. Whilst areas of lesser significance will be lost, a substantial heritage benefit would be achieved by preserving and enhancing key features of special architectural or historic interest and removing the site from the Historic England At Risk Register. In accordance with the statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the significance of the listed building will be preserved and enhanced.

The Applicant has sufficiently assessed the significance of the heritage assets (both designated and non-designated), as required by paragraph 128 of the NPPF, and the conservation of those heritage assets has, in line with paragraph 132 of the NPPF, been given great weight. The application proposals will, on balance, have a positive impact upon the setting and significance of the Grade II statutory listed building. As a result, the application proposals are in accordance with paragraphs 126, 129 and 131 of the NPPF.

Para 134 of the NPPF applies as the harm caused is relatively modest and would not damage the fundamental interest of the building. The less than substantial harm that would be caused is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use and the benefits of restoring the building and safeguarding its future.

The potential for removal of the Klinger Building from the Heritage at Risk Register would also contribute to the heritage-related public benefits of the Scheme.

The proposal would ensure that the key heritage values of the building are preserved and enhanced. The works would reinvigorate the landmark Grade II listed building and re-using the derelict site, which would subsequently make a positive contribution to the surrounding public realm, streetscape and wider cityscape. As such, the proposals are in accordance with Policy 7.8 and 7.6 of the London Plan.

The proposed scheme will make a positive contribution to the character of Bromley's historic and built environment, by preserving and enhancing the character, appearance and special interest of the listed building. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy BE8.

Highways and Parking

The NPPF recognises that transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability objectives. All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people. It should be demonstrated that improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. The NPPF clearly states in Paragraph 32 that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts are severe.

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

This application has been accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) and a Travel Plan which considers the accessibility of the site by all modes of transport. Bromley Highways Engineer has advised that a revised travel plan should be requested by condition.

When compared to the potential trip generation of both the previous proposals on the site and the potential existing uses on the site, the proposed development of the employment uses will result in a significant reduction in trips to the site during both the AM and PM peak hours.

Furthermore, when considered on its own, it has been shown that the traffic generation of the proposed development would have a negligible impact on the surrounding road network.

UDP parking standards have been adhered to with overall development on site being served by 158 car parking spaces within the curtilage of each of the units as well as an area of overflow parking to the east of the site. Operationally it is expected that visitors will use the spaces adjacent to the relevant unit they are visiting, and the overflow parking is envisaged to be used sporadically. Of the 158 spaces, 16 are disabled spaces, and there are 32 electric vehicle charging point spaces provided (16 of which are passive). Staff parking for each of the units is included in the overall provision.

Bromley Highways Engineer, and TfL have raised no objections to the highways impact and parking provision on the site, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

Amenity Impact

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

The application site is set within an established Business Area/SIL. The nearest residential properties are located in excess of 200m away, across roads and behind other industrial sites.

A Noise Screening Statement has been submitted by the Applicant. It concludes that the residual operational noise impacts are of negligible magnitude and not significant (when compared against the existing baseline conditions). The potential impacts as a result of the demolition and construction phase have also been assessed in relation to the impacts upon existing receptors. The closest receptors are located within the neighbouring industrial/commercial units within 50m of the site boundary. It is considered that with appropriate mitigation, the proposed development is acceptable with regard to both operational and construction noise impacts.

The potential for adverse noise impacts from construction vehicles and plant during the works can be minimised through a range of measures which can form part of a site specific Construction Management Plan within which all contractor activities would be undertaken. This could be required by condition and agreed prior to any works taking place on site.

The proposed use itself is unlikely to generate significant levels of noise and, given the generous separation distances of the site from residential dwellings the proposal is unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on neighbouring amenities.

Trees and Landscaping

Policy NE7 requires proposals for new development to take particular account of existing trees and landscape features on the site and adjoining land and Policy BE1 requires proposals to respect existing landscape features.

The existing site is overgrown with self-seeded low level shrubs and plants with some trees and more mature planting along the perimeter of the site. The landscaping scheme submitted with the application indicates that most of the perimeter planting, including the trees on the southern and eastern embankment will be retained and enhanced. A high quality landscaping scheme is also proposed at the frontage of the site. It is considered that this would enhance the setting of the listed building.

An Arboricultural Survey, has been submitted with the application. It identifies and assesses a total of six trees and seven tree groups as part of the Survey, none of which are covered by Tree Preservation Orders or are within a Conservation Area. The survey sets out three recommendations regarding adequate tree protection, tree works and trees assessed with low bat roosting potential which can be required by condition.

Subject to implementation of the recommendations of the survey, the proposed development would not have a significant impact upon the existing arboricultural amenity of the area and therefore complies with UDP Policy NE7.

Other Technical issues

Ecology and Protected Species

The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes; minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. The NPPF addresses ecology in paragraph 109 which states, the planning system should aim to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitments, which include establishing ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. Paragraph 118 of the NPPF also states that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged.

UDP Policies NE2, NE3 and NE5 seek to protect wildlife features and protected species requiring development proposals to incorporate appropriate mitigation where damage may occur.

The application site lies close to a Site of Borough Importance (SBI 7.58) known as Ruxley Woods and the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) at Ruxley Gravel Pits is approximately 540 metres south-west of the site. An Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey has been submitted with the application which considers all biodiversity and conservation aspects, including potential impacts on protected and other species, notably reptiles and bats.

It concludes that despite the presence of suitable basking and foraging habitat at, the site and immediately adjacent to, the site, no evidence of reptiles was recorded during the surveys. It is, therefore, considered unlikely that the site supports a population of any reptile species. No further reptile surveys are considered necessary and no restrictions to the proposed development in relation to reptiles were identified.

The proposed development is considered acceptable with regard to ecological and nature conservation impacts.

External Lighting

An External Lighting Assessment has been submitted with the application which reviews the proposed external lighting scheme at the site. This incorporates measures to prevent night time lighting pollution. The scheme addresses the use of the site by bats and minimises light pollution to other parts of the site and the wider area addressing the requirements of para.125 of the NPPF.

Air Quality

An Air Quality Screening Statement has been prepared. An air quality neutral assessment has been submitted, which demonstrates compliance and a negligible impact. The assessment demonstrates that the development will not lead to an increase in air pollution within the locality.

The development therefore meets the London Plan requirements that new developments are air neutral, and air quality impact in the local area as a result of this development is not expected to be significant. Conditions have been recommended to ensure and address any matters which could subsequently affect air quality and which could be attached to any approval.

Sustainability and Renewable Energy

The London Plan provides the policy framework in respect of sustainable construction and renewable energy, and in particular Chapter 5 of the London Plan (in particular policies 5.3 & 5.6) and the Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled Sustainable Design and Construction. In addition, Policy BE1(vi) of the UDP, regarding sustainable design, construction and renewable energy is also relevant.

The application is supported by an Energy and Sustainability Statement which confirms that as a result of the sustainability features incorporated within the proposed development this allows for a 35.85% carbon saving against Part L 2013 requirements for the scheme which exceeds the 35% improvement requirement under the London Plan and demonstrates that the scheme is a sustainable development.

This is shown to be achieved through passive design, energy efficient measures incorporating design features such as energy efficient lighting, sub-metering of relevant areas, upgrading of 'U' values and occupancy sensing in relative areas.

Further to this, photovoltaic (PV) arrays are included within the proposed development, which allows for a 31.82% carbon saving from the inclusion of the renewable technology in accordance with London Plan and UDP planning policies.

The Application advises that it is anticipated that further measures will be adopted as a means of reducing carbon emissions associated with the development such as the use of construction materials which have undergone a life cycle impact assessment through analysis on the Green Guide to Specification. In addition, it is anticipated that construction materials will be responsibly sourced and have environmental certification. To reduce the energy demand of the development as well as help to conserve water resources within the local area, it is anticipated that the fit out works will provide for sanitary fittings which will be water efficient through measures such as dual flush toilets and low flow taps.

The proposed development is considered to comply with London Plan Policies 5.7 to 5.11, the Mayor's SPG and also UDP policy BE1.

Archaeology

The data contained in a geotechnical report submitted in support of the application demonstrates that the historic land forming will have had a severe and widespread impact upon any archaeological resource that may have been present.

Despite the proximity of the site to known in situ prehistoric archaeology, Historic England Archaeology Advisor has concluded that there is no discernible on-going archaeological interest with this site. It is therefore recommended that the planning application can be determined without the requirement to further consider archaeology in line with NPPF guidance and policies BE16 of the UDP and 7.8 of the London Plan.

Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)

The application site is not in a Flood Zone but the River Cray is located west of the site. The site is also in a Ground Water Source Protection Zone.

A 'Flood Risk Due Diligence Appraisal' has been submitted with the application in addition to a more recent 'Review of Flood Risk Assessment'

The documents conclude that overall, flood risk is not considered to pose a significant threat to the functioning of the site and future development could implement appropriate measures to manage surface and foul water discharge, subject to appropriate agreements.

The application is accompanied by a drainage scheme which meets discharge rates agreed with Thames Water. The Drainage Officer has assessed the submission and advised that subject to appropriate conditions, the submission is considered to be acceptable in this respect.

Contaminated Land

A Phase II Geo Environmental Assessment Report has been submitted with the application. The report concludes that a potential for localised contamination exists, however, the risk of significant soil and groundwater contamination is considered to be low.

Laboratory analysis has not identified any significant contamination issues within the soil and groundwater that pose a risk to Human Health or the wider Controlled Water environment.

A condition could be attached to any planning permission securing a contaminated land assessment and an appropriate remediation strategy, which could address all these aspects appropriately in accordance with Policy ER7 of the UDP.

Secured by Design

The proposal needs to incorporate Secured by Design principles (as required by Policy BE1 (vii) and H7 (vii) to take account of crime prevention and community safety. Paragraphs 58 and 69 of the NPPF are relevant. Compliance with the guidance in Secured by Design and the adoption of these standards will help reduce the opportunity for crime, creating a safer, more secure and sustainable environment.

The Designing Out Crime Officer has recommended the principles and standards of 'Secured By Design' Commercial 2015' as a planning condition for the development noting the size and historical criminality at the site. There is provision for the entrance doors and ground floor windows to meet 'SBD accreditation' for the retained building which is supported.

Environmental Impact Assessment

As the site has an area of over 1ha it was necessary to “screen” an application as to whether it requires to be accompanied by an Environmental Assessment under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Amendment) Regulations 2015. The screening process identified that an EIA was not required, and a formal opinion was issued on 20th February 2017.

Geological Value

It has been noted in consultation responses that geological exposure around the site is identified as GLA41 in the London Plan SPG 'Londons Foundations: Protecting the Geodiversity of the Capital' The Thanet Sand formation lies outside of the developed area of the site. The provision of additional gates to access this would not accord with the requirements for security of the site and as such, the Applicant has not been requested to make the area accessible by an access gate. However, the designation of the land, and that the area is outside the developed area of the proposal are noted.

CIL

The development would be liable for the payment of Mayoral CIL.

Conclusion

The proposed use of the site complies with planning policy and is acceptable in principle.

The proposal would result in a high quality development that would function well, add to the overall quality of the area, and establish a strong sense of place through the use of sensitive landscaping and boundary treatments. The proposal would optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development. The development would respond to the history of the site and would reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials.

The refurbishment and occupation of the listed frontage building will secure long term occupation and maintenance of this heritage asset, removing it from the at Risk Register which is a significant heritage benefit. In accordance with the statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the significance of the listed building will be preserved and enhanced.

The application proposals will, on balance, have a positive impact upon the setting and significance of the Grade II statutory listed building. As a result, the application proposals are in accordance with paragraphs 126, 129 and 131 of the NPPF.

The less than substantial harm that would be caused by the works is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use and the benefits of restoring the building and safeguarding its future in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

The proposal would ensure that the key heritage values of the building are preserved and enhanced. The works would reinvigorate the landmark Grade II listed building and re-using the derelict site, which would subsequently make a positive contribution to the surrounding public realm, streetscape and wider cityscape. As such, the proposals are in accordance with Policy 7.8 and 7.6 of the London Plan.

The proposed scheme will make a positive contribution to the character of Bromley's historic and built environment, by preserving and enhancing the character, appearance and special interest of the listed building. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy BE8.

The listed building application has not been referred to be determined by the Secretary of State and Historic England have confirmed by way of decision notice dated 7th February 2017 that the Council are authorised to determine the application as it sees fit.

The proposals are supported by comprehensive set of technical reports which demonstrate that the proposals do not result in any significant impacts.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PLANNING 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 approved shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the application plans, drawings and documents as detailed below:**

Clock Replacement Specification dated 5.12.2016
Schedule of External Building Materials - Unit 1 dated 10.10.2016
Schedule of External Building Materials - Unit 2 dated 10.10.2016
Schedule of External Building Materials - Units 3-14 dated 10.10.2016
Schedule of External Building Materials - Units 1-14 dated 7.10.2016
Masonry Repair and Cleaning Statement dated 12.12.2016 (Rev A)
Repair and Cleaning Statement for the Works to the Interior of the Central Tower dated 12.12.2016 (Rev A)
Method Statement and Demolition Specification for Demolition and retention of Frontage Building 16-028R_001
Energy and Sustainability Statement dated 16.12.2016
Arboricultural Assessment dated December 2016
External Lighting Assessment
Car Park Management Plan dated December 2016
LP-N-01
C-160-TP-D-01
C-160-TP-D-02A
C-160-TP-D-03
C-160-TP-N-01-CPMP
C-160-TP-N-01C
C-160-TP-N-02A
C-160-TP-N-03A
C-160-TP-N-04A
C-160-TP-N-05A
C-160-TP-N-06A
C-160-TP-N-07A
C-160-TP-N-08A
C-160-TP-N-09A
C-160-TP-N-10A
C-160-TP-N-11B
C-160-TP-N-12C
C-160-TP-N-13A
C-160-TP-N-14A
C-160-TP-N-15A
705.10.05
705.19.03
705.29.03

16-028/001 P6
16-028/002 P6
16-028/003 P6
16-028/004 P4

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application and is acceptable to the local planning authority when judged against the policies in the London Plan 2015 and the Bromley UDP 2006

- 3 No trade counter shall be installed in any of the units hereby approved without the prior written approval from the Local Planning Authority. Proposals to install a counter shall include details of its extent and scale, and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Council that the counter is ancillary to the primary use of the unit.

Reason: To prevent the erosion of the permitted use of the site and ensure consistence with the NPPF, Policy 2.17 and 4.4 of the London Plan, UDP Policy EMP4, and draft UDP Policies 80, 81 and 82.

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

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

- 6 The finished surfaces of the access road and parking areas, and the external lighting installations, shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule of external materials and external lighting assessment, and shall be completed in accordance with the approved details before any of the units hereby permitted are first occupied.
-

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

- 7 The car parking area hereby permitted shall be used only by customers and employees of the premises at the application site and for servicing of the said premises hereby permitted.**

Reason: Development without adequate parking or garage provision is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and to be detrimental to amenities and prejudicial to road safety and would not comply with Policy T3 and Appendix II of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 8 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.

- 9 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.

- 10 Prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan should include measures to promote and encourage the use of alternative modes of transport to the car. It shall also include a timetable for the implementation of the proposed measures and details of the mechanisms for implementation and for annual monitoring and updating. The Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timescale and details.**

Reason: In order to ensure appropriate management of transport implications of the development and to accord with Policy T2 of the Unitary Development Plan.

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

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

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

- 13 The boundary enclosures indicated on the approved drawings shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied 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.

- 14 Sustainability measures as detailed in the approved Energy and Sustainability Statement shall be incorporated into the development prior to its occupation.

Reason: To achieve a sustainable development in accordance with London Plan Policies 5.7 to 5.11, the Mayor's SPG and UDP policy BE1.

- 15 Recommendation 1 as set out in the arboricultural assessment dated December 2016 shall be adhered to in full throughout construction works.

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

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**

 - 2 If any further bricks are noted to be missing from the former factory building which supports a cavity wall, before demolition is undertaken, a licenced bat ecologist should attend Site to assess the potential for roosting bats**
-