

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

Application No : 18/00707/RECON

Ward:
Penge And Cator

Address : 213 Kings Hall Road Beckenham BR3
1LL

OS Grid Ref: E: 536597 N: 170331

Applicant : Walker

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Erection of 3 dwelling houses in accordance with parameters approved under planning consent ref: 17/00398/DET, with the exception of alterations to the proposed height and roofscape to the three garages, and alteration of the position of the garage associated with plot 1.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 25

Proposal

Under reference 15/04458/OUT outline planning permission was granted on appeal for the construction of 3 detached dwellinghouses. Subsequently, under reference(s) 17/0398/DET the matters reserved from consideration at outline stage (scale, appearance and landscaping) were approved. Under reference 15/04458/CONDIT, the details pursuant to some of the conditions on the outline permission were approved. The development of the site has commenced. This application seeks to vary the scheme granted planning permission by:

- Amendment to garage roof designs to include a flattened roof with inset roof lights
- Amendment to the height of the garage roofs, increasing height of eaves from 2.5m to 3.3m and the maximum height from 4.75m to 6m
- Provision of en-suite/dressing room in enlarged garage roof space
- Re-positioning of garage to Plot 1 to align with the main rear elevation rather than projecting to the rear. Attendant repositioning of surface car parking spaces to project forwards of the main front elevation of the dwelling
- Amended garage door detailing

Location and Key Constraints

The application site is a large parcel of residential garden land to the rear of No's 207-215 Kings Hall Road, currently serving No.213. The site adjoins residential gardens to the north and east belonging to properties in Lennard Road and Kings Hall Road respectively with the area being predominantly residential in nature, although the ground floor of No. 213 is currently used as offices. The site has no designation in the adopted UDP but it is bounded by Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) to the south and Pool River to the west.

The site falls within Flood Zone 2 and the far western edge is covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

The site does not lie in a designated Conservation Area.

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

- The applicant is reneging on concessions relied upon in seeking approval of the detailed application
- The roof of each garage would have increased bulk and height
- The proposal would revert to the positioning of the garage and use of roof space for Plot 1 which was withdrawn in 2017 and the use of the roof space over the garages of Plots 2 and 3 was also abandoned
- Permission was granted on appeal subject to conditions requiring accordance with approved plans
- The conditioning of the proposed sketch elevations in the appeal decision and under 17/03050/RECON was considered reasonable and necessary in the interest of the character and appearance and residential amenities of the area
- The amendments are for financial gain and no other purpose
- No deviation from the plans approved by the Inspector should be considered
- The scale of the development would be out of keeping with the local area and the proposed houses would be significantly larger than other dwellings in the area
- Increased massing of development across the site will have an increased impact on local residents
- Noise and disruption during heavy construction activity has already been a problem and deep piling activity has resulted from variable ground conditions and high water content in the ground. The proposal would result in additional construction activity
- Proposal would be overheight, exceeding 10m in height

The representations include a group objection with attached list of neighbouring residents in agreement with the content of that representation.

Comments from Consultees

Drainage Engineer: The submitted "Drainage Layout" Plan carried out by SWP with DRW No. 201 Rev J (BHL) dated April 2017 to reflect the changes of layout is satisfactory.

Highways: No objection so long as garage internal floor to ceiling height would be 2.5m.

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 makers 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 3.8 Housing choice

Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation

Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling
Policy 5.10 Urban greening
Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
Policy 5.14 Water quality and wastewater Infrastructure
Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies
Policy 5.16 Waste self-sufficiency
Policy 5.17 Waste capacity
Policy 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste
Policy 5.21 Contaminated land
Policy 6.5 Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure
Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 8.2 Planning obligations
Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

Unitary Development Plan

BE1 Design of New Development
BE7 Railings, Boundary Walls and Other Means of Enclosure
H1 Housing Supply
H7 Housing Density and Design
H9 Side Space
NE3 Wildlife Features
NE7 Development and Trees
NE8 Conservation and Management of Trees and Woodland
ER10 Light pollution
T3 Parking
T7 Cyclists
T18 Road Safety

Emerging Local Plan

Policy 37 General Design of Development
Policy 1 Housing Supply
Policy 4 Housing Design
Policy 8 Side Space
Policy 70 Wildlife Features
Policy 73 Development and Trees
Policy 74 Conservation and Management of Trees and Woodlands
Policy 30 Parking

Policy 32 Road Safety
Policy 122 Light Pollution
Policy 119 Noise Pollution

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG No.1 - General Design Principles
SPG No.2 - Residential Design Guidance
London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)
Housing: Supplementary Planning Guidance. (November 2012)

Planning History

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

14/01561/OUT

Planning permission was refused and a subsequent appeal against the refusal of outline planning permission was dismissed for the introduction of access road and erection of 6 dwellings comprising 3 pairs of semi-detached houses, parking and landscaping.

The ground for refusal was:

"The proposed development by reason of the restricted plot size and amenity space would be an overdevelopment of the site which would not accord with the spatial standards prevailing in the locality, and the proposal would therefore not be sensitive to the character of the surrounding residential area. Traffic accessing the site will harm the amenities of adjoining residential properties by reason of fumes, noise and disturbance. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan."

The Inspector commented that in terms of the relationship with the surrounding properties that there would be no significant overshadowing of the adjoining houses and gardens. It was also commented that the outlook of surrounding residents would evidently change from the view over the existing extensive garden area and orchard, but there would be sufficient separation for the proposed houses not to be overbearing in views from the neighbouring dwellings.

In terms of traffic accessing the site it was not considered that there would be likely to be excessive noise and disturbance for existing occupiers. Similarly with regard to drainage with implementation of a suitable SUDS scheme there was no evidence that a satisfactory drainage scheme could not be devised.

15/00357/OUT

Outline planning permission was refused for the construction of 5 dwellinghouses comprising 2 pairs of semi-detached and 1 detached property, access road,

parking and associated landscaping. A subsequent appeal against the refusal of planning permission was dismissed.

The reason for refusal of outline planning permission was:

"The proposed development by reason of the restricted plot size and amenity space would be an overdevelopment of the site which would not accord with the spatial standards prevailing in the locality, and the proposal would therefore not be sensitive to the character of the surrounding residential area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan."

In dismissing the appeal the Inspector concluded that the proposal would appear cramped and out of keeping with the area. The Inspector also commented that at present there are open views above the extension and garage between Nos 215 and 217 Kings Hall Road to mature landscaping within the existing garden area and to the land beyond which contains a number of large mature trees which add to the verdant and open character of the area. The Inspector was not convinced that the indicative landscaping proposal would be capable of screening the proposal to such an extent that the impact on the open character and appearance of the area would be acceptable.

15/04458/OUT

Outline planning permission was refused for the access and layout of a development comprising the introduction of an access road and the erection of three detached dwellings, each with a double garage, parking and associated landscaping. The application was in outline, with details of the scale, appearance and landscaping of the development being reserved matters. Outline permission was refused on the ground:

"The revised proposals constitute an overdevelopment of the site which would have a detrimental impact on the spacious and open character and appearance of the surrounding area, and would therefore be contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan."

A subsequent appeal against the Council's refusal of planning permission was allowed. The Inspector considered that the main issue in the case was the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector considered that the orientation of the dwelling on Plot 1 (which corresponds to the current Plot 3) was such that the garage would be closest to the northern boundary, reducing the height of the development in direct views down the access road. The landscaping in front and behind the dwelling would soften views of the dwelling and allow retained views over and beyond the plot to the area of woodland behind. Landscaping to the southern and eastern site boundaries would also provide landscaped views between existing dwellings and would assist in screening the development from the rear of neighbouring properties. In respect of the concern that the development would result in an overdevelopment of the site, it was considered that the density of development would be appropriate in the location and that the proposal would not form overdevelopment. Having regard to the spacious size of the plots, the footprint of the dwellings and the retention and

enhancement of the landscaping, it was not considered that the proposal would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

The Inspector considered the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring dwellings, highways matters, drainage, flood risk, ecology and sustainable design and construction and in all these matters agreed with the Council that there were no concerns in respect of these matters. With regards to the concerns expressed by neighbouring residents regarding impact on visual amenity, security and light and noise pollution the Inspector concluded that there was no evidence to suggest that the proposal would result in security issues or pollution such that would cause material harm to the amenity of nearby residents and that the landscaping proposed would soften the visual impact of the development.

The Inspector allowed the appeal and granted outline planning permission subject to a number of conditions, including Condition 10 which stated that the dwellings should not be more than 10m in height, with this condition considered necessary in order to protect the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the amenity of neighbouring residents.

At outline stage the applicant provided indicative elevations although the appearance and scale of development were reserved matter, as was landscaping. The indicative elevations which formed part of the application considered at appeal showed the dwelling at Plot 1 (now Plot 3) having a pitched roof approx. 9.8m high to the ridgeline and 5.6m high to the eaves, with the attached garage 4.8m to the ridge and approx. 2.5m to eaves height.

17/03050/RECON

Following consideration of the inclusion of the indicative sketch street scene elevation in the list of plans referred to under condition 4 of permission 15/04458/OUT (allowed on appeal) the applicant submitted an application under reference 17/03050/RECON, seeking to remove the reference to the illustrative street scene from the list of conditioned plans.

The application was reported to the Plans Sub-Committee meeting held on the 31st August 2017 on List 3 with a recommendation that the application be approved. It was determined however that the application should be refused on the ground:

"The inclusion of Condition 4 on appeal ref APP/G5180/W/16/3149502 was considered reasonable and necessary in order to protect the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the amenity of neighbouring residents. Accordingly, the variation of the condition would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan."

The application was refused by decision notice dated 5th September 2017.

17/00398/DET

This application was submitted comprising details pursuant to the outline permission granted on appeal under reference 15/04458/OUT. The details were approved by decision notice dated 4/12/18.

15/04458/CONDIT

Conditions submitted in relation to planning permission ref 15/04458/FULL1 won under appeals

Condition 5 - Arboricultural Method Statement, Condition 6 - Arboricultural Consultant, Condition 9 - Surface Water Discharge, Condition 11 - Visibility Splays, Condition 12 - Parking Spaces, Condition 16 - Construction Management Plan, Condition 17 - Finished Levels.

The details under conditions 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17 were approved by decision notice dated 18/1/18.

Considerations

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

- o Impact of the amendments on residential amenity
- o Impact of the amendments on visual amenity
- o Highways
- o Other matters
- o CIL

Impact of the amendments on residential amenity

In terms of the impact of the amended scale and massing of the attached garages on the amenity of neighbouring residents, it is considered that while materially higher, the garages as proposed would have no significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents.

The increase height and bulk of the garage would be of limited visibility from outside of the site. In terms of the impact of the amended garage to Plot 1 it is recognised that that garage is sited towards the formed boundary with Plot 2 and the garage would be screened from the back of dwellings fronting Kings Hall Road by the bulk of the host dwelling, which itself is sited some 46m (approx.) from the rear of these neighbouring dwellings. The garage would be sited approx. 25m from the northern boundary of the site with dwellings fronting Lennard Road.

The increased height garage at Plot 2 would be positioned approx. 25m from the boundary with the rear of No. 211 Kings Hall Road, partly screened by the building at Plot 1, and approx. 29.5m from the northern boundary with dwellings fronting Lennard Road.

The garage at Plot 3 would be sited approx. 3.7m from the boundary with the rear of 177/179 Lennard Road. It is noted that the rear gardens of these properties are approx. 35m long and that the design of the roof of the garage would retain a side

hipped element which would limit the visual impact of the increased height and bulk of the garage from neighbouring sites to the north of the application site.

Generally the boundaries of the site are well-screened, and it falls to consider whether the increased sheer height of the structures from 2.5m to 3.3m and the overall height of the roof of the garages from 4.75m to 6m would have a significant increased visual impact on the neighbouring properties and attendant loss of residential amenity.

It is acknowledged that a crown roof can result in a bulkier profile to development and increased massing. It is also noted that the proposal would enable the use of the formed attic space for en-suite facilities connected with the master bedroom of each property. However, the proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms/occupants and the use of the attic space above the garage would not be immediately apparent from outside of the site, taking into account the use of rooflights rather than visible windows in the elevations of the garages.

In the context of the significant separation to each boundary and between the garages and the neighbouring houses, along with boundary screening and the limited scope of amendments to the bulk and massing of the garage structures, the refusal of planning permission on the basis of increased impact on neighbouring residential amenity would be unsustainable at appeal.

Impact of the proposal on visual amenity

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.

The site's position and character as a backland site of limited visibility from the neighbouring streets mitigates the extent to which the proposed amendments would impact upon the visual amenities of the street scene and the area in general. Given the secluded position of the development with generous separation to neighbouring dwellings outside of the application site the extent to which the dwellings would be viewed in context with the existing built development in the locality is quite limited. The garage at Plot 3, which is that most likely to be visible from Kings Hall Road as a consequence of its position in line with the long access drive is situated approx. 150m from the road and partly screened by a landscaped/planted area at the rear of 183/185 Lennard Road.

In the context of the development site's particular character, the increase in the height of the garages would not undermine their subservience to the host dwellings to a significant degree and the garages would still appear proportionate to their host houses. The main visual emphasis of the individual dwellings would be the decorative front gables, and the set back from the front elevation of the two storey dwelling to the substantially lower garages would further limit the visual impact of the proposals on the appearance of the dwellings and the final layout/character of the developed site. The design of the garage doors would complement the appearance of the host dwellings and would not be widely visible from outside of the application site. Concerns have been expressed regarding the scale of the houses in relation to the existing built development fronting Lennard Road and Kings Hall Road. The pocket of development would have a cohesive and relatively uniform appearance with each dwelling complementing the other dwellings in the cul-de-sac of three houses and while the footprint and plot shape of development does not precisely replicate the pattern of development in the adjacent streets, the layout, plot sizes and general appearance of the development has been found to be acceptable in previous planning applications.

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.

There are no technical objections to the proposal, whereby the existing footprint size of the garages and the number of parking spaces remains as approved under 17/00398/DET.

Other matters

The application has elicited strong local interest and objection, as was the case in previous applications on the site. It is noted that representations have been

received relating to the way in which the proposals correlate with the specific drawings referenced by the appeal inspector in allowing appeal APP/G5180/W/16/3149502 (Council ref:15/05584/OUT), as well as to the conditions imposed by the Inspector on that outline permission, where details of the design and appearance of the development were reserved from consideration.

Reference has been made to the impact of the construction noise, including the piling works associated with the development. The impact of the implementation of permission in terms of noise and disturbance is not a material planning consideration, as it is generally acknowledged that while such noise can be intrusive, it is of limited duration for the period of construction alone. The control of pollution and noise from demolition and construction sites falls outside of planning control, through the Control of Pollution Act 1974 Sections 60 and 61 and also through the Environmental Protection Act 1990 Section 80.

Representations have also referred to the height of the dwellings themselves, stating that the height would exceed the 10m threshold of condition 10 of outline permission 15/04458/OUT. As scaled from the submitted drawings, the chimneys of the development replicate the dimensions of those in the detailed scheme approved under reference 17/00398/DET. The height of Plot 1 to the ridge scales at 9.9m as does that of Plot 2. The ridge height of Plot 3 scales at max. 10m. Correspondence has referred to the height of chimneys, including the chimney flaunching/pots as exceeding 10m in height. In the context of the width/depth of the chimneys and their visual context in relation to the main bulk of the roofs and their eaves/ridge height it is not considered that there is a solid basis for objection to the overall scheme on the basis of the chimney pots/chimney design particularly in view of the replication within this application of those details submitted under reference 17/00398/DET.

It is noted that there is concern regarding there being solely a financial benefit to the developer rather than any other reason for the amendments. This is not a material planning consideration.

With regards to drainage, the details submitted are considered satisfactory and while it is noted that concern has been expressed regarding variable ground conditions and high water content in the ground, taking into account the limited scope of the amendments, it is not considered that the current proposal substantially differs in this respect to that which was previously approved.

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

The principle of the development has been deemed acceptable through the granting of outline planning permission and the subsequent approval of the details pursuant to the outline permission under reference 17/00398.

It is considered that the amendments to the development within this application would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, nor to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. While the garages would be somewhat higher and the roof profile somewhat bulkier, the extent to which this would be appreciable outside of the site is very limited. The impact of the development on the visual and residential amenities of the area would not be significantly greater than the scheme granted detailed planning permission under reference 17/00398/DET. As such it is not considered that grounds exist which would warrant the refusal of planning permission and which would be sustainable at appeal.

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: APPROVAL

subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 2 years from 2th December 2017.**

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

- 2 Details and samples of all external materials, including roof cladding, wall facing materials and cladding, window glass, door and window frames, decorative features, rainwater goods and paving where appropriate, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any above ground works are commenced. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

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

- 3 The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the application plans, drawings and documents hereby approved and listed:**

**13121 P610 A Proposed Plans and Elevations (Plot 1)
13121 P611 Proposed Plans and Elevations (Plot 2)
13121 P612 Proposed Plans and Elevations (Plot 3)
13121 P601 Proposed site layout (ground level)
13121 P602 Proposed site layout (roof level)
13121 C602 Coloured street elevation
13121 C601 Coloured site layout**

Along with the drawings approved under reference 15/04458/CONDIT and 17/00398/DET listed below:

**Tree Protection Plan 14013-BT5
Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement 15/9/17**

**PP03 Planting Plan
LP05 Landscaping**

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

- 4 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied the proposed first floor window(s) in the flank elevations shall be obscure glazed to a minimum of Pilkington privacy Level 3 and shall be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed and the window (s) shall subsequently be permanently retained in accordance as such.**

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

- 5 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 B or C of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the 2015 Order (as amended) shall be erected or made within the curtilage(s) of the dwelling(s) hereby permitted without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.**

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

- 6 The development shall be implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement and information, and with the supervision of the arboricultural consultant, as approved under reference 15/04458/CONDIT and listed below:**

**Cover letter dated 5/9/17 from applicant/agent
Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement dated 5/9/17 (ref: 14013-AIA5-MW)
Tree Protection Plan received 6/9/17**

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

- 7 The surface water drainage scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the Drainage Layout Plan E6769 201 J(BHL) April 2017 and the Storm Sewer Design (21/6/17) approved under reference 15/04458/CONDIT.**

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

- 8 The layout of the access road and turning area, including the junction with Kings Hall road and the provision of visibility splays shall be implemented in accorded with Drawing TSP/BRO/P2542/05 Rev A (Aug 2017) (approved under reference 15/04458/CONDIT) and Drawing 13121 C601 Coloured site layout, with the approved arrangements substantially completed before any part of the development is first occupied.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policies T3 and T18 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.

- 9 Parking spaces, garages and sufficient turning space shall be provided in accordance with drawing 13121 C601 Coloured Site Layout prior to the first occupation of the development hereby granted planning permission and these spaces/garages/turning areas shall be permanently retained as such thereafter.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policies T3 and T18 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.

- 10 The development shall be implemented in accordance with the Construction Management Plan approved under reference 15/04458/CONDIT (CMP Rev. O prepared by M. Smith).**

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.

- 11 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the slab levels shown on slab levels implementation Drawing E6769 200 B (received 8/12/17) approved under reference 15/04458/CONDIT by decision notice dated 18/1/18.**

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.