

Application No : 18/00805/OUT

Ward:
Petts Wood And Knoll

Address : 80 Crescent Drive Petts Wood
Orpington BR5 1BD

OS Grid Ref: E: 544238 N: 167134

Applicant : Mr Terry Willis

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Erection of detached bungalow OUTLINE APPLICATION

Key designations:

Smoke Control SCA 8

Proposal

The proposal seeks outline planning permission for a detached bungalow at the site fronting onto Shepperton Road. All matters are reserved, including details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

An Arboricultural Statement has been submitted with the application which addresses the impact on the protected trees near to the site.

Location and Key Constraints

The application site is located to the southern edge of Shepperton Road and occupies the rear of the rear gardens of Nos. 76, 78 and 80 Crescent Drive. The rear of Nos. 76 and 78 is subject to a Tree Preservation Order. The area is characterised by predominantly two storey dwellings set in spacious plots.

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

- Excessive form of overdevelopment and harmful impact on the character of the area
- Dwelling would be sited in close proximity to the highway and would have a cramped appearance.

- Impact on protected trees at the site and an outdated Tree Survey has been submitted.
- If permission is granted, future extensions should be prevented by condition
- Existing car parking issues on the area would be exacerbated by the proposal

Comments from Consultees

Highways Officer: This is an application with all matters reserved. There have a number of previous similar applications which have all been refused. The first 2013 application was refused including a highway ground due to inadequate parking, the second 2013 application was refused but with no highway ground as the parking layout had been amended. Members included a highway ground of objection to the 2014 application (14/03044) but this was not upheld by the Inspector at Appeal. There was no highway objection to the 2016 application (16/02648). Members again included a highway ground of objection to the 2017 application. I would raise no objection to this application.

Drainage Officer: A standard condition is recommended.

The Council's Tree Officer has not commented on the proposal, however no objection was raised to the previous application.

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 (2016)

3.3 Increasing Housing Supply
 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential
 3.5 Design and Quality of Housing Developments
 3.8 Housing Choice
 5.1 Climate Change
 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
 6.9 Cycling
 6.13 Parking
 7.2 An Inclusive Environment
 7.3 Designing out Crime
 7.4 Local Character
 7.6 Architecture
 7.15 Noise
 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy

Unitary Development Plan

BE1 Design of New Development
 H7 Housing Density and Design
 H9 Side Space
 NE7 Development and Trees
 T3 Parking
 T18 Road Safety

Emerging Local Plan

Draft Policy 1 – Housing Supply
Draft Policy 3 – Backland and Garden Land Development
Draft Policy 4 – Housing Design
Draft Policy 8 – Side Space
Draft Policy 30 – Parking
Draft Policy 32 – Road Safety
Draft Policy 33 – Access For All
Draft Policy 37 – General Design of Development
Draft Policy 73 – Development and Trees

Other Guidance

Housing: Supplementary Planning Guidance. (March 2016)

Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015)

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 – General Design Principles
Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 – Residential Design Guidance

Planning History

Planning permission was refused under ref. 17/04534 for erection of a detached single storey three bedroom dwelling on land rear of 76-80 Crescent Drive with vehicular access onto Shepperton Road. The refusal grounds were as follows:

‘The proposal would, by reason of its size, location, scale and design, represent the introduction of a conspicuous and unacceptable form of development that would be harmful to the character and spatial standards of the area, along with existing views to the rear of the site, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policies 4 and 37 of the Draft Local Plan.

Based on local knowledge of the site it is considered that the proposed means of vehicular access would not be in the interests of good highway planning and would have poor visibility onto Shepperton Road, prejudicial to the free flow of traffic and conditions of general safety in the highway, contrary to Policies T9, T11 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan, Policies 32, 33 and 34 of the emerging Local Plan, and Local Knowledge.’

Planning permission was refused under ref. 16/02648 for erection of a detached single storey three bedroom dwelling on land rear of 76-80 Crescent Drive with vehicular access onto Shepperton Road. The refusal grounds were as follows:

‘The proposal would, by reason of its size, location, scale and design, represent the introduction of an unacceptable form of development that would be harmful to the character and spatial standards of the area and

contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.'

The application was subsequently dismissed at appeal. The Inspector states:

'Whilst the current proposal is for a single storey dwelling the roof is, nevertheless, the same height as the previous scheme albeit without the dormer windows. Although the appeal site now includes land to the rear of no 76 the depth of the building has increased resulting in a building of slightly greater scale, footprint, mass and bulk than the previous scheme. The proposal would still result in the loss of views through to the rear gardens and trees of Crescent Drive and Nightingale Road when viewed from Shepperton Road with a consequential loss of openness.

Recent extensions to No 80 have extended the footprint of the property up to the boundary with Shepperton Road and the proposed development would alter the frontage further. The frontage of the proposed dwelling is set further back from the road which would enable greater opportunities for landscaping to soften the impact of the proposal to a degree. However, this would not sufficiently reduce the prominence of the proposal in the street scene or compensate for the loss of openness. The current appeal proposal has not, therefore, altered sufficiently to reach a different conclusion to my colleague.

I, therefore, consider that the proposal would introduce a prominent and incongruous feature within the street scene. Furthermore, the proposal would reduce views through to the spacious rear gardens and mature landscaping of surrounding properties. Taking these factors in combination, the proposal would be at odds with the spacious and open character of the area.'

Planning permission was refused under ref. 14/03044 for erection of a detached two storey three bedroom dwelling on land rear of 78-80 Crescent Drive with vehicular access onto Shepperton Road. The Refusal grounds were as follows:

'The proposal would, by reason of its size, location, scale and design, represent the introduction of an unacceptable form of development that would be harmful to the character of the area and contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposal would constitute a cramped overdevelopment of the site, out of character with surrounding development, lacking in adequate amenity space, harmful to the spatial standards of the area, and detrimental impact to highway safety, thereby contrary to Policies BE1, H7 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan, The London Plan, and the Paragraph 53 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).'

The application was subsequently dismissed at appeal, with the impact of the development on the character of the area forming the main area of concern. The Inspector states:

‘A two storey dwelling would be introduced into the rear gardens of 78-80 Crescent Drive with access from Shepperton Road. Due to its location, height and scale the dwelling would have prominence within the street scene and when viewed from the adjoining properties on Nightingale Road and Crescent Drive. It would be particularly harmful to the character and appearance which is derived from the views of the trees between Crescent Drive and Nightingale Road when viewed from Shepperton Road. The dwelling would also detract from the spacious open character and appearance of the area.

The appellant has identified a number of infill developments in the vicinity of the appeal site where new dwellings have been built. Some of those developments have been introduced without detriment to the character of the area; others have been less successful with respect to their impact on character. Where new developments have been successfully introduced into the area they have generally been small bungalows which are of a scale which does not compromise the spaciousness of the original estate layout. In the case of the appeal dwelling, its bulk and scale, while comparable with surrounding development would detract from the openness of its context.

On the opposite side of Shepperton Road no. 71 is an infill development which the appellant has highlighted. This is a single storey bungalow which is set back further from the carriageway than the proposed two storey dwelling at the appeal site. The proposed development would therefore have greater prominence in the street scene of Shepperton Road than no.71.

Whilst recent extensions to 80 Crescent Drive have extended the footprint of the building up to the boundary with Shepperton Road the proposed development would alter the character of the frontage further. This is particularly the case as the opportunities for soft landscaping would be limited given the siting of the new dwelling as described above. Consequently the proposed dwelling would appear cramped and out of character with the surrounding development.

On this basis the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to policies BE1 and H7 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) July 2006. These policies seek to ensure that development should not detract from the existing street scene and that the site layout, buildings and spaces about new housing should recognise as well as complement the qualities of the surrounding areas.

The garden of the proposed dwelling would be much smaller than most of the gardens within the area. Having regard to policies BE1 and H7 of the Bromley UDP which aim to achieve attractive settings around buildings and

adequate private amenity space, I conclude that the proposal would fail these policy expectations. In addition, the proposal would be contrary to paragraph 53 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens by virtue of the harm caused to the local area and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2011 which requires development to have regard to the form and structure of an area.'

The Inspector also raised concerns in terms of the neighbouring protected trees:

'The impact of the trees to the north of the appeal site on the proposed development has been raised by the Council and other parties. The Council's tree officer raised no objection to the proposal but the proximity of the oak tree to the site would in my view adversely impact upon the ability of future occupiers of the proposed development to enjoy the garden space.'

Planning permission was refused under ref. 13/04265 for erection of a detached two storey three bedroom dwelling on land rear of 78-80 Crescent Drive with vehicular access onto Shepperton Road. The refusal grounds were as follows:

'The proposal would, by reason of its size, location, scale and design, represent the introduction of an unacceptable form of development that would be harmful to the character of the area and contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposal would constitute a cramped overdevelopment of the site, out of character with surrounding development, lacking in adequate amenity space and harmful to the spatial standards of the area, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and the Paragraph 53 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

The proposal, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, is likely to result in the loss of mature trees on the site subject to Tree Preservation Order No. 373 which contribute significantly to the visual amenities of the area and would therefore be contrary to Policies BE1 and NE7 of the Unitary Development Plan.'

Planning permission was refused under ref. 13/02947 for erection of detached single storey dwelling with accommodation within roofspace and access onto Shepperton Road. The refusal grounds were as follows:

'The proposal would, by reason of its size, location, scale and design, represent the introduction of an unacceptable form of development that would be harmful to the character of the area and contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposal would constitute a cramped overdevelopment of the site, out of character with surrounding development, lacking in adequate amenity space and harmful to the spatial standards of the area, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and the Paragraph 53 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

The proposal, by reason of the inadequate dimensions of the garage and parking area, would represent an unacceptable level of parking provision that is likely to result in on-street parking and the overhanging of the footway by vehicles, harmful to the safety of pedestrians and contrary to Policies T3 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposal, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, is likely to result in the loss of mature trees on the site subject to Tree Preservation Order No. 373 which contribute significantly to the visual amenities of the area and would therefore be contrary to Policies BE1 and NE7 of the Unitary Development Plan.'

Considerations

The main issues relating to the application are:

- Resubmission
- Design
- Highway Safety
- Residential Amenity
- Trees

Resubmission

Following the refusal of application ref. 17/04534 at Plans Sub-Committee on 21/12/17, the current application is submitted in outline form in order to attempt to address the previous concerns with regard to the impact of bulk and scale on the character of the area and issues of highway safety. The outline application reserves all matters for future consideration and simply requires Members to assess the principle of the development.

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.

Housing is a priority use for all London Boroughs. Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply, Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential and Policy 3.8 Housing Choice in the London Plan (2015) generally encourage the provision of redevelopment in previously developed residential areas provided that it is designed to complement the character of surrounding developments, the design and layout make suitable residential accommodation, and it provides for garden and amenity space.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states in Paragraph 49 that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The NPPF sets out in Paragraph 14 a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In terms of decision-making, the document states that where a development accords with a local plan, applications should be approved without delay. Where a plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

The document also encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) and excludes gardens from the definition of previously developed land.

Policy H7 of the UDP advises that new housing developments will be expected to meet all of the following criteria in respect of; density; a mix of housing types and

sizes, or provides house types to address a local shortage; the site layout, buildings and space about buildings are designed to a high quality and recognise as well as complement the qualities of the surrounding areas; off street parking is provided; the layout is designed to give priority to pedestrians and cyclists over the movement and parking of vehicles; and security and crime prevention measures are included in the design and layout of buildings and public areas.

Draft Policy 3 of the Local Plan states that new residential development will only be considered acceptable on backland or garden land where there is no unacceptable impact on the character, appearance and context of an area in relation to the scale, design and density of the proposed development. Development should also result in no unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of future or existing occupiers through loss of privacy, sunlight, daylight and disturbance from additional traffic.

Supplementary Planning Guidance No. 2 (Residential Design Guidance) states "local context is of particular importance when adding new buildings to established areas. Building lines, spaces between buildings, means of enclosure and the use and location of garden or amenity space should all respect the character of the locality".

It is proposed to erect a detached dwelling fronting onto Shepperton Road. Details of the building's appearance, siting, scale, access and landscaping are reserved for future consideration and therefore the current application requires the principle only to be considered.

The previous Inspector was concerned that the scale, footprint, mass and bulk of the previous design in this location would result in the loss of views through to the rear gardens and trees of Crescent Drive and Nightingale Road when viewed from Shepperton Road. The Inspector stated that the resulting loss of openness would be harmful to the character of the area.

The siting and prominence of the development in the street scene, and the associated loss of openness, was considered not to be compensated by the set back from the highway or the opportunity for landscaping that this setback provided. Following this dismissed appeal, the application refused under ref. 17/04534 proposed the same siting and footprint within the plot and was refused by Members at Plans Sub-Committee on 21/12/17.

The principle of a new dwelling on the site has been considered acceptable by both the Council and the Inspectorate when considering previous planning applications. It has been the scale of the particular design of previous developments, along with highway safety issues, that have comprised the previous causes for concern and subsequent refusal and dismissal of past applications.

Subject to a suitable design and modest roof height that retains views through to the spacious rear gardens and mature landscaping of surrounding properties, it may be considered that the principle of the development is acceptable. The Inspector was concerned that other single storey dwellings in the locality, particularly the one opposite the site at No. 71 Shepperton Road, had lower roof heights than that previously proposed at No. 80, and that the general bulk and

prominence in the street scene would result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

The outline application requires all details relating to appearance, scale and siting to be approved at a future date. Subject to a sensitive design as outlined above, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policies 3, 4 and 37 of the Draft Local Plan.

Impact on Highway Safety

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.

The Inspector has considered that the use of the access on Shepperton Road to serve one additional dwelling would not impact harmfully on highway safety in the area. Application ref. 17/04534 was subsequently refused by Members on the basis of the impact of the new development and access onto Shepperton Road on local parking stress and conditions of highway safety.

The current scheme proposes a similar development at the site, however the details of access are reserved for future consideration. It is anticipated that a vehicle access will be required onto Shepperton Road and therefore Members are asked to consider this in light of the previous decision and the comments from Highways engineers.

Technical advice received concludes that such an arrangement would not introduce a further highway safety implication, however it is acknowledged that Members previously considered differently. In light of the Inspector's previous view and the technical comments made by the highways engineer, the scheme is considered acceptable and compliant with Policies T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 32 of the Draft Local Plan.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan states that development should respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and ensure they are not harmed by noise disturbance, inadequate daylight, sunlight, and privacy or overshadowing.

Concerning potential impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties, this area was not considered to be a concern for the Inspector or by Members under

the previous application. The massing and scale of the building is a reserved matter that can be considered at a later time and generally in light of the planning history it is considered that the introduction of a single storey dwelling to the site would not create a further significant visual impact for neighbouring properties.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 37 of the Draft Local Plan in this regard.

Trees

The rear of the site, situated to the rear of No. 78, is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order that applies to the rear gardens of Nos. 66-80 Crescent Drive and Nos. 63-71 Nightingale Road. A Tree Survey has been submitted with regard to the impact of the development upon these trees and the Tree Officer has previously stated that the impacts would not be significant and the Inspector raised no particular concern subject to conditions. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy NE7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 73 of the Draft Local Plan.

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.

CIL

The Mayor of London's CIL is a material consideration. CIL is not payable on this application as it is for outline consent, and the applicant has not completed the relevant form. CIL liability will be triggered by the consideration of the reserved matters.

Conclusion

Having regard to the above it is considered that the development in the manner proposed is unacceptable in that it would impact harmfully on the character of the area. It is therefore recommended that Members refuse planning permission.

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.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

1 (i) Details relating to the

- (a) access**
- (b) appearance**
- (c) landscaping**
- (d) layout**
- (e) scale**

shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced.

- (ii) Application for approval of the details referred to in paragraph (i) above must be made not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

- (iii) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the details referred to in paragraph (i) above, or in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.**

Reason: No such details have been submitted and to comply with the requirements of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 No development shall take place until details of drainage works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and drainage works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to first use of any dwelling. Prior to the submission of those details, an assessment shall be carried out into the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage systems set out in Annex F of PPS25, and the results of the assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority. Where a sustainable drainage system scheme (SuDS) is to be implemented, the submitted details shall:

- i) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and / or surface waters;**
- ii) specify the responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SuDS scheme, together with a timetable for that implementation; and**
- iii) provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development, which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.**

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

Reason: To ensure satisfactory means of surface water drainage and to accord with Policy ER13 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 3 Before any work is commenced details of parking spaces and/or garages and sufficient turning space shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and such provision shall be completed before the commencement of the use of the land or building hereby permitted and shall thereafter be kept available for such use. No development whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 1995 (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.

- 4 Parking bays shall measure 2.4m x 5m and there shall be a clear space of 6m in front of each space (or 7.5m if garages are provided) to allow for manoeuvring and these spaces shall be permanently retained as such thereafter.**

Reason: In order to comply with Appendix II of the Unitary Development Plan and to the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety.

- 5 Before the access hereby permitted is first used by vehicles, it shall be provided with 3.3m x 2.4m x 3.3m visibility splays and there shall be no obstruction to visibility in excess of 1m in height within these splays except for trees selected by the Local Planning Authority, and which shall be permanently retained thereafter.**

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

- 6 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 adopted Unitary Development Plan.

- 7 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.

- 8 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 order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

- 9 Details of the proposed slab levels of the building(s) 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 order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.