

Section '3' - Applications recommended for PERMISSION, APPROVAL or CONSENT

Application No : 17/05156/FULL1

Ward:
Hayes And Coney Hall

Address : 56 Harvest Bank Road West Wickham
BR4 9DJ

OS Grid Ref: E: 540117 N: 165091

Applicant : Mr & Mrs Liney

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Erection of detached 3 bedroom dwelling on land adjacent to No. 56 Harvest Bank Road with associated parking, terraces and hard and soft landscaping.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 51

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a detached three bedroom dwelling which would be set over three storeys upon the steeply sloping site.

The proposed dwelling would be set back from the front boundary of the site by a minimum of 6m increasing to 7.2m to account for the angled front boundary.

From the front, the building would have a single storey appearance, with the upper storey of the building broadly corresponding with the Street level of Harvest Bank Road. The main entrance to the house would be from this level, accessed via a stepped switchback pathway leading from the parking spaces between the dwelling and the front boundary of the site. This storey would provide two bedrooms with en-suite bathrooms positioned towards the front of the floor plan. At the rear, the bedrooms would be lit by angled windows including internal glazed Juliet balconies and this would be the top floor visible from the much lower garden level at the rear.

The middle level of accommodation would provide an open plan kitchen/living/dining area. This level is set below ground level at the front of the site, and would appear as the first floor of the three storey building at the rear elevation. A large set of sliding doors would provide access to the raised terrace which would be screened to either side by 1.8m vertical louvres.

The lower level of accommodation would be slightly lower than the ground levels of the sloping site at the rear, and would provide a large master bedroom with sitting area and small patio leading to steps down into the rear garden.

2 no. car parking spaces would be provided to the front of the site. At the rear, amenity space comprises a steeply sloping garden with the terrace and patio areas to the immediate rear of the proposed dwelling.

The building would have a flat roof which would be covered with sedum and would include photovoltaic and solar thermal panels. Materials used in the external elevations of the building comprise vertical timber cladding interspersed with zinc cladding and horizontal clerestory glazing at each level.

The application is supported by the following documents:

- Tree report comprising arboricultural impact assessment and arboricultural method statement, linked to tree protection and tree constraints plans.
- Cover letter incorporating design and access statement.

Location and Key Constraints

The application site lies on Harvest Bank Road. Harvest Bank Road is a suburban residential street which has 2 distinct parts. The lower level is characterised by modest semi-detached dwellings and has a distinct suburban character with a tarmac road.

To the north-west, the road bends sharply back on itself, the road is unmade and the ground level rises. Dwellings in the upper section of the road are characteristically semi-detached on the southern side and detached on the northern side and are of a variety of styles. The section of the street within which the application site lies comprises 5 pairs of semi-detached mainly flat roofed post-war dwellings which are reasonably consistently positioned relative to the road and 2 detached dwellings which are sited slightly deeper into their plots and at an angle to the road. The dwellings on the southern side of the street have a single storey appearance from the street, with the bulk of the development following the contour of the hill to provide 3 storey elevations at the rear.

Plots vary in size and shape and the topography of the land falls dramatically from the north to the south resulting in an interesting and varied street scene. The host dwelling is detached and lies further into its site than the semi-detached dwellings to the west. The host dwelling and the western neighbouring dwelling at No. 54 have a large separation and more generous side space than is characteristic in the street scene.

The street scene in the upper section of the road has a less intensely developed character than that of the lower section, with an attractive woodland setting of mature trees and substantial terraced gardens with mature landscaping which as a consequence of the falling ground levels down from the north to the south means houses on the southern side of the upper section of the street occupy elevated and prominent positions relative to those houses positioned in the lower section of the street. The shape of the individual house plots tends to be irregular, following the contours of the elevated bank on which the houses are positioned. In particular, the

three pairs of semi-detached dwellings at Nos. 44 - 54 lie parallel with the street, while their respective rear gardens follow the slope resulting in the rear gardens of each dwelling being offset relative to the host dwellings.

The abundance and maturity of the trees and landscaping contribute to a semi-rural feel and the contribution that the woodland makes to the character of the area has been recognised in the making of a TPO No. 443 which covers the application site and extends down the slope to include the lower sections of the rear gardens of Nos. 44 - 54. The TPO was confirmed in March 1989 and protects "any tree of whatever species."

In the recent appeal regarding the refusal of planning permission for the erection of a new dwelling on the site, the Inspector referred to the garden area of No. 56 (together with the side garden of No. 54) as forming a large open landscaped area which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area when viewed from both the upper and lower parts of Harvest Bank Road, commenting on the landscape setting of the buildings on the upper part of Harvest Bank Road.

Comments from Local Residents and Groups

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

Objections

- Garden infilling would impact on the area resulting in poor parking, large build and adverse impact on the semi-rural outlook of neighbours
- Overlooking to neighbouring terrace resulting from the flank wall being erected together with terraces - development would loom over the neighbouring garden, reducing the quality of the main usable amenity area and light in the garden
- Out of character with the area
- No construction management plan has been submitted
- Inconsistency between plans and elevation with regards to the top floor
- Possible removal of T4 would have a negative impact on the street scene
- There is no rear access to No. 56
- Possible settlement issues at neighbouring properties resulting from the excavation and retention works required
- Section of the street not suitable for increased traffic flow, especially during the building work
- Loss of privacy resulting from overlooking
- Additional noise pollution
- Would set a precedent for similar development on existing gardens

Comments from Consultees

Trees: From a trees perspective it is noted that the site consists of a small plot with the west third covered by an area TPO. There are a number of trees on site that could be affected by the proposal but the Tree Protection Plan alleviates any

concerns regarding the retention of the healthy protected trees on site. Provided the details within the TPP are followed there are no objections to the proposed development.

Drainage Engineer:

No objections

Highways:

Harvest Bank Road is an unmade road; the applicant is proposing to provide two off street parking spaces for the proposed development, which is acceptable. However the donor property requires two off street parking spaces too. The parking spaces indicated on the submitted plans are on street parking. In respect of the previous application this was considered to be unsatisfactory. The applicant appealed against the Council's decision and it was dismissed by the Inspector but not on Highway grounds. In the appeal decision reference APP/G5180/W/15/3140078 the Inspector was of the view that it was unlikely that the proposed development would subject on-street parking to significantly more pressure than currently experienced to an extent that would be severely harmful to highway safety. No highways objections are raised in respect of this current application. A number of planning conditions are recommended, should permission be granted.

Policy Context

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:

- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
- (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
- (c) any other material considerations.

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that any determination under the planning acts must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

According to paragraph 216 of the NPPF decision takers can also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

The Council is preparing a Local Plan. The submission of the Draft Local Plan was subject to an Examination in Public which commenced on 4th December 2017 and the Inspector's report is awaited. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

The development plan for Bromley comprises the Bromley UDP (July 2006), the London Plan (March 2016) and the Emerging Local Plan (2016). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

London Plan Policies

Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing potential
Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.4 Local Character

Unitary Development Plan

BE1 Design of New Development
H7 Housing Density and Design
H9 Side space
T3 Parking
T13 Unmade roads/unadopted highways
NE7 Development and Trees

Emerging Local Plan

1 Housing Supply
4 Housing Design
3 Backland and Garden Development
8 Side Space
37 General Design of Development
73 Development and Trees
30 Parking

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG1 - General Design Principles
SPG2 - Residential Design Guidance

Planning History

The relevant planning history relating to the application site is summarised as follows:

15/03083 - Erection of new detached three bedroom dwelling REFUSED

Permission was refused on the grounds:

1. The proposed dwelling, by reason of its size and siting, would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the side garden site which would be out of character with neighbouring development, detrimental to the distinctive character and quality of the street scene and the area in general and contrary to Policies H7, H9 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proposal, by reason of its siting, height and design incorporating large terraced areas, would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties, leading to an unacceptable loss of prospect and privacy, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan.
3. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that adequate off-street parking facilities can be provided within the curtilage of the site to serve the occupants of the existing and the proposed dwellings, in the absence of which the proposal would give rise to an undesirable increase in on-street parking thereby contrary to Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan.

An appeal was lodged and subsequently dismissed by decision letter dated 6th May 2016.

In dismissing the appeal the Inspector found that because of changes in land level and the slope from the road a large part of the proposed house would have been visible from the street scene, resulting in a large mass of building which was considered incongruous and out of place. The existing dense vegetation would have been cleared to provide car parking, as a result of which the front of the building would have been highly visible and the proposal would have resulted in the loss of the "open verdant character and landscaped setting of houses along the road."

With regards to the rear of the previous proposal, the Inspector noted that the building would not have projected further down the hillside than the current buildings at Nos 56 and 58, notwithstanding that it would have been located further down the hill than the properties to the east. The Inspector noted that less than 1m space would be retained to the boundary with No. 54 and that the closeness of the house to the boundaries on both sides would leave little space for planting within its own curtilage. Again, this was considered uncharacteristic of the surrounding pattern of development.

The removal of T4 (a cherry tree) along with the removal of shrubs and vegetation on the hillside would significantly urbanise the site. The loss of this tree, the extensive vegetation and the lack of side space would, cumulatively, have been harmful to the "open landscape setting" of the area.

With regards to the second ground of refusal, the Inspector raised concern regarding the visual impact of the proposed dwelling on the occupiers of No. 54, in particular upon users of the adjacent patio area. The quality of this main usable amenity area would have been significantly reduced resulting from the overbearing

impact caused by the size, height and extent of the proposed house so close to the boundary.

The Inspector found that the impact on the proposal on outlook from the rear windows of No. 54 and upon the privacy of that property and the host dwelling at No. 56 would not be significantly adverse.

With regards to the final ground for refusal, referring to highways safety and parking, the Inspector found that the proposal would not be harmful to highway safety and considered it unlikely that the proposal would result in significantly more pressure than currently experienced to such an extent that would impact adversely upon highway safety.

Other sites

The planning statement refers to development at No. 58 Harvest Bank Road and No. 30 Harvest Bank Road. No. 58 is an existing house and planning permission has been granted for the extension of the existing dwelling (15/03604/FULL6).

Planning permission was granted under reference 15/01106/FULL1 for the demolition of existing extensions and the erection of a single dwellinghouse at No. 30 Harvest Bank Road. It should be noted that this site lies in the lower section of Harvest Bank Road and not in the upper section which has a substantially different character to the sites in the upper section, where plots tend to be irregular in size and shape, benefitting from a verdant character.

Considerations

The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- o Resubmission
- o Design
- o Standard of residential accommodation
- o Highways
- o Neighbouring amenity
- o Sustainability
- o Trees
- o CIL

Resubmission

The application seeks to overcome the grounds for refusal in respect of application 15/03083/FULL1 which was subsequently dismissed at appeal.

The differences between the schemes can be summarised:

- Depth of the building reduced and rearward projection decreased
- Footprint squared off rather than incorporating an angled rear terrace projection

- Height reduced from approx.10.9m to 8.3m, with height above street level lowered from 5.15m to approx.1.5m (building set deeper into the slope)
- Extent of rear terrace reduced and privacy screening introduced to both sides of the terrace.
- 1m side space provided to the boundary with No 56 and separation between building and boundary with No. 54 increased from minimum 0.8m to a minimum of 3.3m
- Width of the site increased, so as to include a larger proportion of the front garden at No. 56.

Design

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, and 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.

It is considered that the appearance of the host dwelling would not be out of character with the design detailing of surrounding development. The flat roof design of the dwelling would complement surrounding development, particularly in context with the dwelling at No. 54 which also has a flat roof and with which in terms of siting the proposed dwelling would most closely relate (rather than the host dwelling at No. 56 which is set much further back from the front boundary). The setting of the building deeper into the slope results in the street scene impact of the proposed dwelling being reduced in comparison with the previous scheme.

The scale of the development provides a visually appropriate bridge between the higher development at No. 54 and the openness afforded by the deeper front garden retained at No. 56. In dismissing the appeal the inspector found that the previous proposal would have resulted in a large mass of building which would have been incongruous and out of place resulting in a highly visible front of the

building and the loss of the open, verdant character and landscaped setting of houses along the road. The proposed development affords the provision of a more meaningful landscaping to the front of the site. That said, in dismissing the previous appeal the Inspector stated:

"the proximity of the new house to its boundaries on both sides would leave little space for planting within its own curtilage."

The increased side space provided between the proposed dwelling and the boundary with No. 54 is noted. However there has been a reduction in the space provided to the boundary with No. 56. It is acknowledged that some greenery and openness is afforded by the front garden retained to No. 56. The submitted site plan shows no detail regarding how access from the front to the rear garden might be achieved other than through the house, and the plan appears to show vegetation/soft landscaping in front of the side space to each boundary which would tend to make rear access somewhat impracticable without there being steps/removal of vegetation. On the eastern side of the site there would be some reliance upon the retention of vegetation to the front of No. 56 to provide a suitably landscaped setting. If planning permission is granted it would be appropriate to impose a condition to seek the submission and approval of landscaping details to provide a high quality setting for the proposed dwelling.

The siting of the dwelling in relation to the staggered building line of the dwellings to the west is considered acceptable and would not itself result in an adverse visual impact or an inappropriate loss of openness in the street scene. The unmade section of Harvest Bank Road is set at a considerably higher level than the lower semi-detached dwellings in the made section of Harvest Bank Road. As such there are some views of the site from these lower dwellings resulting from the elevated position of the site. However, trees to the rear of the proposed dwelling would provide some screening particularly when trees are in leaf and in view of the distance of separation between the sites in the lower section and the application site it is not considered that the visual impact would be unacceptable to the rear. In terms of the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the host dwelling at No 56, it is considered that the limited depth of the building and the retention of adequate space to the boundary and between the front elevation of 56 and the proposed rear elevation of the dwelling would be satisfactory. Similarly, the separation between the dwelling and the boundary with No. 54 has increased, providing an improved setting and reduced visual impact when viewed from outside of the site.

Standard of residential accommodation

Policy H7 of the UDP sets out the requirements for new residential development to ensure a good standard of amenity. The Mayor's Housing SPG sets out guidance in respect of the standard required for all new residential accommodation to supplement London Plan policies. The standards apply to new build, conversion and change of use proposals. Part 2 of the Housing SPG deals with the quality of residential accommodation setting out standards for dwelling size, room layouts and circulation space, storage facilities, floor to ceiling heights, outlook, daylight and sunlight, external amenity space (including refuse and cycle storage facilities)

as well as core and access arrangements to reflect the Governments National Housing Standards.

The London Plan makes clear that ninety percent of new housing should meet Building Regulation requirement M4 (2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' and ten per cent of new housing should meet Building Regulation requirement M4 (3) 'wheelchair user dwellings', i.e. is designed to be wheelchair accessible, or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. The relevant category of Building Control Compliance should be secured by planning conditions.

Policy 3.5 of the London Plan and the Housing SPG (2016) Standard 24 states the minimum internal floorspace required for residential units on the basis of the level of occupancy that could be reasonably expected within each unit should comply with Technical housing standards - nationally described housing standard (2015).

It is considered that the proposed dwelling would provide accommodation of a satisfactory standard of amenity/accommodation.

Highways

The NPPF recognises that transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. The NPPF clearly states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

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

With regards to highways safety, in dismissing the appeal against the refusal of planning permission under reference 15/05083 the inspector found that the proposal would not be harmful to highways safety and considered it unlikely that the proposal would result in more pressure than currently experienced to such an extent as would adversely impact upon highway safety. It is not therefore considered that a refusal ground relating to the impact of the development upon highways safety would be sustainable if planning permission is refused for the proposed dwelling. There are no objections to the proposal from a highways perspective on this basis.

Neighbouring amenity

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.

In the second ground of refusal under 15/03083 the inspector raised concern regarding the visual impact of the proposed dwelling on the occupiers of No. 54, with particular reference to the users of the adjacent patio area which was noticed to be the main usable amenity area. The size, height and extent of the proposed house in relation to its proximity to the boundary were considered to significantly reduce the quality of that area of amenity space. The inspector found that the impact of the proposal upon the outlook from the rear windows of No. 54 and upon the privacy of both Nos. 54 and 56 would not have been significantly adverse.

The current proposal has increased the separation between the flank of the dwelling and the boundary with No. 54 from 0.8m to a minimum of 3m (from the 1.8m high terrace louvres). The height of the proposed dwelling has been reduced by approx. 2.6m. Cumulatively, these amendments represent an improvement in the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the patio/amenity area at No. 54.

It is acknowledged that the building would be appreciable from the neighbouring terrace, and that the proposal would concentrate the activities associated with a household in closer proximity to the boundary than is the case at present where the land in questions forms part of a much larger site. It falls to consider whether the visual impact and noise and disturbance associated with the proposed dwelling would cause significant and demonstrable harm to the amenities of the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling. The increased side space provided to the boundary with No. 54 along with the reduction in the depth of the dwelling visible from that site would result in an improved relationship between the development and the neighbouring property in contrast with the previous proposals. It is considered on balance that the increased side space provided to the boundary with No. 54 along with the reduction in the depth of the dwelling results in a development that would not have a significant impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling.

Sustainability

The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change. London Plan and Draft Local Plan Policies advocate the need for sustainable development. All new development should address climate change and reduce carbon emissions.

Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction of the London Plan states that the highest standards of sustainable design and construction should be achieved in London to improve the environmental performance of new developments and to adapt to the effects of climate change over their lifetime. Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions of the London Plan states that development should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the hierarchy; Be Lean: use less energy; Be clean: supply energy efficiently and Be green: use renewable energy.

Trees

When planning permission was refused for the previous development it was not on grounds relating to the impact of the proposal on trees within or adjacent to the site. When the appeal was determined by the planning Inspector, she noted that the cherry tree to the rear would have been removed and stated that the tree was large, well-positioned and contributed to the character of the hillside. The loss of the tree alongside the extensive area of vegetation, along with the lack of side space to provide new planting, was considered to be harmful to the open landscape setting of the area. With regards to this application, the tree protection plan is considered to provide adequate reassurance that so long as it is followed, the retention of healthy trees can be ensured. The proposal includes the cutting back of the cherry tree to clear the proposed dwelling and to enable the siting of protective fencing to safeguard the tree during construction. It is not considered that the refusal of planning permission on the grounds of the impact on protected trees would be warranted, and as stated above, a planning condition could be imposed to secure the submission and approval of satisfactory landscaping details to ensure that the setting of the building would complement the surrounding land and development, providing a suitably landscaped backdrop for the proposed dwelling.

CIL

The Mayor of London's CIL is a material consideration. CIL is payable on this application and the applicant has completed the relevant form.

Conclusion

It is considered that the resubmission satisfactorily addresses the previous grounds for refusal of planning permission and the Inspector's reasoning in dismissing the appeal. While the proposal would have some impact on visual amenity, the scale of the development when viewed from the street would be very modest, and the proposal provides adequate space about the building to provide high quality landscaping. The proposed building will be visible from the neighbouring dwellings and in particular from the rear of the dwelling at No. 54. The impact of the proposal on the amenities of that property falls to be very carefully considered. On balance it is considered that the amendments to the scheme cumulatively limit the impact on residential amenity to an acceptable degree, with the separation to the boundary and the setting of the development into the sloping site resulting in a less than substantial impact on the amenities of No. 56.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the files set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 04.01.2018

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.

Reason: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 Details of the proposed slab levels of the buildings and the existing site levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before work commences and the development shall be completed strictly in accordance with the approved levels.

REASON: In the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

3 No trees on the site shall be felled, lopped, topped or pruned before or during building operations except with the prior agreement in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any trees removed or which die through lopping, topping or pruning shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees of such size and species as may be agreed with the Authority.

REASON: In order to ensure that as many trees as possible are preserved at this stage, in the interest of amenity.

4 Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, details of a scheme of landscaping which shall include the materials of paved areas and other hard surfaces and boundary enclosures (including height and type) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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.

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

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

6 The development shall be implemented in complete accordance with the Tree Protection Plan dated 15/1/15 (U682TPP).

Reason: In the interest of the health and long terms retention of trees to be retained and to accord with Policy NE7 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 7** 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 the interest of the appearance of the development and the visual amenities of the area.

- 8** Details of means of screening to the terraced areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall be installed before first occupation, and permanently retained thereafter.

REASON: In the interest of the amenities of neighbouring residential properties and to accord with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

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

REASON: To ensure satisfactory means of surface water drainage.

- 10** Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted, a survey of the condition of the road shall be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority and any damage caused to the surface of the road during the construction phase of the development will be reinstated to a standard at least commensurate with its condition prior to the commencement of the development.

REASON: In the interests of pedestrian and vehicular safety and the amenities of the area.

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

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory means of surface water drainage.

- 12** Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include measures

of how construction traffic can access the site safely and how potential traffic conflicts can be minimised; the route construction traffic shall follow for arriving at and leaving the site and the hours of operation, but shall not be limited to these. The Construction Management Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timescale and details.

REASON: In the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

- 13 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) no building, structure or alteration permitted by Class A, B, C, or E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the 1995 Order (as amended), shall be erected or made within the curtilage(s) of the dwelling hereby permitted without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area, to allow the Council to assess future development proposals at the site and to accord with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

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

REASON: In the interest of the visual and residential amenities of neighbouring residential properties and the area in general, to accord with Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

You are further informed that :

- 1 You should consult the Street Naming and 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