

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

Application No : 18/04025/RECON

Ward:
Bickley

Address : Applegarth, Chislehurst Road,
Chislehurst, BR7 5LE

Objections YES

OS Grid Ref: E: 542432 N: 169669

Applicant : Mr Nigel Styles

Description of Development:

Minor material amendment under Section 73 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 to allow a variation of the planning permission 18/00425 granted for demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a detached two storey four bedroom house with accommodation in roof space and detached triple garage at front to allow increase in roof height, increase in massing and elevational alterations.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 10

Proposal

Approval is sought for a Minor Material amendment under Section 73 to vary Condition 8 pursuant to permission ref. 14/00425 in order to amend the design of the proposed development.

The proposed amendments are summarised as follows:

- Enlargement of building to include increase in roof height from 8.6m to 8.9m and increase in size of rear section of the building
- Fenestration alterations to include new doors and windows and additional rooflight on the rear elevation

All other aspects of the dwelling's design would remain as permitted under ref. 18/00425.

Location and Key Constraints

This site is located on the northern side of Chislehurst Road, and lies between Chellows, a two storey detached house, to the west, and Kingsmere, a two/three storey flatted development to the east. The site is occupied by a detached bungalow which is

set significantly further back into its plot than the neighbouring dwellings to the south-west which front Chislehurst Road, and is well screened from the road frontage.

The development at Kingsmere to the east is constructed in a staggered form, and extends further to the front and rear of Applegarth. A further flatted development is being constructed to the north-east of Kingsmere on the site of Little Moor, which was allowed on appeal in early 2015.

Comments from Local Residents and Groups

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

Comments:

- Given my limited knowledge and understanding of technical drawings it is unclear to me whether the proposed revision in the height of the property will make the building more visible and intrusive from my flat. If this is the case I object to these changes. As feared, once planning permission was granted changes are now being made.

Comments from Consultees

Highways: Chislehurst Road, B264, is a classified road and a local distributor road in the UDP. Although there is potential for the proposed dwelling to generate a small increase in vehicular use of the slightly widened existing access to Chislehurst Road should be adequate for the current proposal. The PTAL rating for the site is 1b (low) where car ownership would be expected to be associated with occupiers of the dwelling. The Council's parking standard for a 1b rating is a minimum of 1.5 spaces. The proposed parking includes a triple garage plus additional space for further parking off-street. The refuse storage arrangements should be referred to Waste Services for comment. There were no objections to the previous application from the highway point of view subject to standard conditions.

Drainage - No comment.

Environmental Health (Pollution) – No objections raised to the previous application subject to informatives.

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.

The National Planning Policy Framework was published on 24th July 2018. According to paragraph 48 of the NPPF decision makers can also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- a) The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- b) 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
- c) The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF

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

- 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply
- 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential
- 3.5 Quality and Design of Housing Developments
- 3.8 Housing Choice
- 3.9 Mixed and Balanced Communities
- 5.12 Flood Risk Management
- 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.1 Building London's Neighbourhoods and Communities
- 7.2 An Inclusive Environment
- 7.3 Designing Out Crime
- 7.4 Local Character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology
- 7.21 Trees and Woodland
- 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy

Unitary Development Plan

- BE1 Design of New Development
- H1 Housing Supply
- 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 4 – Housing Design
Draft Policy 8 - Side Space
Draft Policy 30 - Parking
Draft Policy 32 – Highways Safety
Draft Policy 37 – General Design of Development
Draft Policy 73 – Development and Trees
Draft Policy 116 – Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)
Draft Policy 123 – Sustainable Design and Construction

Additional 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

Permission was refused in October 2014 (ref.14/02625) for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of a three storey building containing 6 two bedroom flats, together with basement level car and cycle parking and a refuse and recycling store on the following grounds:

"The proposed development due to its excessive proportion, scale and bulk would result in the unacceptable sub-division of the existing plot resulting in a cramped overdevelopment of the site harmful to the appearance of the street scene, the visual amenity of the surrounding area and detrimental to residential amenity contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework."

The subsequent appeal was dismissed in February 2015 wherein the Inspector considered that although the proposals would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, they would significantly affect the living conditions of the occupants of adjacent residential properties.

Permission was refused in September 2015 (ref: 15/01891) for the demolition of existing bungalow and the erection of a three storey building comprising 2 three bedroom and 3 two bedroom flats with basement and frontage car parking and cycle and refuse storage on the following grounds:

"The proposed building would, by reason of its size, bulk and close proximity to the dwelling and rear garden of Chellows, have a seriously detrimental impact on the amenities of the adjoining occupiers by reason of loss of outlook and privacy, thereby contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan".

The subsequent appeal was dismissed with the Inspector stating that the development would have considerable height and bulk very close to the planted boundary of Chellows. The part of the proposed building nearest the joint boundary would comprise large areas of unrelieved elevation. Despite the planting at Chellows and some retained on the appeal site, that part of the proposed building would dominate views from the nearest parts of the garden at Chellows. For this reason it would feel oppressive when viewed from within it. With regard to privacy, the proposed building would include windows to habitable rooms in flats 3 and 5, which would increase the potential for overlooking into the private rear garden of Chellows. Further, it would include a side terrace at first floor level, to flat 3, which, although it would be recessed, would also allow some views into that private rear garden.

Planning permission was refused under ref. 16/03224 for demolition of existing bungalow and the erection of a 2.5 storey building comprising 4 two bedroom apartments with car parking, cycle and refuse storage. The refusal grounds were as follows:

‘The proposed building would, by reason of its size, bulk and close proximity to the dwelling and rear garden of Chellows, have a seriously detrimental impact on the amenities of the adjoining occupiers by reason of loss of outlook and privacy, thereby contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.’

The subsequent appeal was dismissed with the Inspector stating that the building would be considerably more conspicuous than the existing arrangement at the site. The first floor windows of Flat 3 were considered to result in overlooking of Chellows. The presence of boundary vegetation, and the planting of new vegetation, did not lead the Inspector to consider the relationship acceptable in terms of overlooking. The height of the building was considered to compound the harm arising from loss of privacy. The proposed second floor balcony was also considered to have a harmful impact on the privacy enjoyed by Sandfield Cottage to the rear of the site.

Planning permission was refused under ref. 17/01502 for demolition of existing bungalow and the erection of a 2.5 storey building comprising 4 two bedroom apartments with car parking, cycle and refuse storage. The refusal grounds were as follows:

‘The proposed building would, by reason of its size, bulk and close proximity to the dwelling and rear garden of Chellows and Sandfield Cottage, have a seriously detrimental impact on the amenities of the adjoining occupiers by reason of loss of outlook and privacy, thereby contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.’

The application was subsequently dismissed on appeal. The Inspector concluded that the development would have a detrimental impact on the living conditions of occupiers of Sandfield Cottage.

Planning permission was granted under ref. 18/00425 for demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a detached two storey four bedroom house with accommodation in roof space and detached triple garage at front.

Considerations

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

- Resubmission
- Principle
- Design
- Neighbouring amenity
- Highways
- Sustainability
- Trees
- CIL

Resubmission

Following the grant of permission under ref. 18/00425, the current application seeks permission for an enlargement of building to include increase in roof height from 8.6m to 8.9m to provide additional second floor headroom along with an increase in size of rear section of the building. The first floor central bedroom will be increased in massing so that the rear wall extends to the same rearward point as the ground floor rear wall of the house, providing a first floor additional projection of 0.7m.

Further alterations include the provision of fenestration alterations to include enlarged doors windows and additional rooflight to the front elevation of the building. Two full length windows have been introduced to the western ground floor elevation. A ground floor window on the eastern elevation has been relocated and a second ground floor window removed. The first floor windows on the eastern elevation are proposed to be joined to form one larger window.

Principle of Development.

Housing is a priority for all London Boroughs and the Development Plan welcomes the provision of development 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 3.4 of the London Plan seeks to optimise housing potential, taking into account local context and character, the design principles and public transport capacity.

Policy H7 of the UDP sets out criteria to assess whether new housing developments are appropriate subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the appearance and character of the surrounding area, the residential amenity of adjoining and future residential occupiers of the scheme, car parking and traffic implications, community safety and refuse arrangements.

On this basis, the principle of a replacement residential building on this site has been accepted through previously permitted application (ref. 18/00425), therefore the proposal can be considered an appropriate form of development and use of the site, subject to an assessment of all other matters inclusive of design, neighbouring amenity and highways.

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.

Policy BE1 states that development should be imaginative and attractive to look at, should complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas. Development should not detract from the existing street scene and/or landscape and should respect important views, skylines, landmarks or landscape features. Space about buildings should provide opportunities to create attractive settings with hard or soft landscaping and relationships with existing buildings should allow for adequate daylight and sunlight to penetrate in and between buildings.

Policy H7 requires that 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.

Policy H9 requires that new residential development for a proposal of two or more storeys in height, a minimum of 1m side space from the side boundary is maintained

and where higher standards of separation already exist within residential areas, proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space.

In terms of the impact of the previous schemes on the character and appearance of the area, the Inspector accepted that the building would be of quite a substantial scale, and that the prevailing form of development along Chislehurst Road was generally of a low suburban character. Despite this, he considered that "the proposal would not be out of keeping with the more intensive built form of Kingsmere, or that recently approved at Little Moor, and which together also provide a distinct character to the site's immediate context." Taking this into account, and the fact that the proposed building would not be situated closer to the road than the existing bungalow along with the presence of a deep band of existing mature vegetation to screen the development, he found that "the size, scale and bulk of the proposed building would not constitute a cramped form of development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area."

This appeal decision guided a change in form and a subsequent traditional appearance was considered suitable under the previous scheme. When Members considered application ref. 18/00425 at Plans Sub-Committee on 22nd March 2018, they considered that the proposed single dwelling would be acceptable. They also considered that the reductions in bulk and massing, including a reduction in width of 1.2m at two storey level and a reduction in height of 0.6m, to be acceptable. The building also had a reduced footprint.

In comparison to the previous application, the roof height has now been increased by 0.3m from 8.6m to 8.9m. The resulting structure is therefore 0.3m lower than the previously dismissed proposal. The bulk and scale of the scheme has been increased but remains reduced form the previous appeal decision (17/01502) whereby the Inspector found no impact on the character of the area. It is considered that the design changes are not significant and the overall character, proportions and appearance of the dwelling will be very similar to that granted under ref. 18/00425. It is therefore considered that the overall massing of the proposal is not objected to in principle, subject to its impacts on neighbouring properties. It is considered that the amendments would complement the area without dominating the site or harming the established form and character of the road.

The scheme has a modern appearance, with pitched roof and accommodation in the roof space. Whilst it is considered that the material palette proposes high quality materials, the scheme does appear quite convoluted and busy, particularly with regard to the differing roof pitches and fenestration arrangement. Nevertheless, there is a mix of architectural styles found within the wider Chislehurst area and, on balance, It is therefore considered that this form of development would be acceptable in light of the recent planning history.

The proposed detached garage will be sited in advance of the main replacement house, however this will be set back from the highway and set behind the building line established by Chellows and Kingsmere. The proposed garage will have a low roof height and bulk has been designed to be as low as possible. The siting, scale and set back from the road are considered acceptable so as not avoid any sense of prominence and harm to the open character of the nearby frontages. The garage in this position and configuration has been previously considered acceptable under the previous application.

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.

As the proposed dwelling has been enlarged from that previously granted, comments made by the Inspector pertaining to the size and scale of the scheme and the impact on neighbouring properties is considered a material consideration in the determination of this application.

In terms of overlooking, the Inspector raised concern as to the impact of the habitable windows causing overlooking into the rear elevation of Chellows. This impact was considered to be exacerbated by the bulk of the building. The permitted proposal reduced the bulk to the western elevation in order to relieve the sense of massing perceived from Chellows. The fenestration was also designed so that the first floor front windows serve a dressing room and hallway, all of which could be obscurely glazed by condition in order to prevent overlooking and loss of privacy to Chellows. The current proposal retains this fenestration arrangement in relation to Chellows and therefore would not introduce any further issues of overlooking and loss of privacy. The small increase in roof bulk would have a limited visual impact, however it is noted that the increase would remain less tall and bulky than the previous appeal proposal, where no visual impact was considered by the Inspector to result due to the hipped roof design and siting away from the western boundary. These details remain as approved under ref. 18/00425.

With regard to the impact of Sandfield Cottage to the rear, a separation of 35m is maintained between the rear elevations, and the previous Inspectors comments are noted as to the lower land level of the neighbouring property. In order to address the concerns of the Inspector, the previous permitted scheme replaced the second floor rear balcony with a rooflight and this remains along with a second introduced rooflight. The result is an improved relationship with Sandfield Cottage that Members may consider to be acceptable on balance and in light of the previous decision.

The proposed triple garage will be sited adjacent to the flank boundary adjacent to Kingsmere and will be separated from the nearest flat by approximately 12m. The replacement house will be sited in a similar location to the existing and it is therefore considered that there would be no significant harm to the amenities of occupiers of Kingsmere as a result of the proposal. The previous Inspector also concluded that the scheme would have no significantly detrimental impact on neighbouring properties at Kingsmere and this view was shared by Members in their consideration of the garage under ref. 18/00425.

On balance, it is considered that the amendments to the approved building in addition to the alterations to its fenestration would not significantly affect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties to warrant a refusal on those grounds.

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.

Chislehurst Road, B264, is a classified road and a local distributor road in the UDP. Although there is potential for the proposed dwelling to generate a small increase in vehicular use of the slightly widened existing access to Chislehurst Road should be adequate for the current proposal. The PTAL rating for the site is 1b (low) where car ownership would be expected to be associated with occupiers of the dwelling. The Council's parking standard for a 1b rating is a minimum of 1.5 spaces. The proposed parking includes a triple garage plus additional space for further parking off-street. No objections are raised from a highway safety perspective.

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

The application site is not subject to tree related restrictions. Application ref. 18/00425 was supported by a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) and Tree Survey Report which indicated trees to be removed to facilitate the development. These trees proposed for removal are category C and should not form a constraint to the development. It is clear that a number of trees along the boundaries will be retained and protected for the duration of the scheme. None of the trees within the site would merit the making of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) even where the risk of loss is high. The landscape plan submitted was considered adequate for the layout of the site. The precautions adopted as part of the Tree Survey Report will reduce the impact upon retained trees and the conclusion in regards to trees is considered similar to the previous application.

The landscape plan submitted was considered adequate for the layout of the site. The precautions adopted as part of the Tree Survey Report will reduce the impact upon retained trees. The appropriate tree protection condition imposed on permission ref. 18/00425 can be repeated in this case.

CIL

The Mayor of London's CIL is a material consideration. CIL is payable on this application and the applicant has not completed the relevant form.

Conclusion

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the size, scale, design and spatial relationship of the proposed development to surrounding properties is acceptable and sits well with surrounding development. The proposed development causes no harm to the wider locality and whilst of a considerable size and scale, is considered in keeping with its residential setting and of acceptable design. It is therefore recommended that Members grant 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: APPROVAL

subject to the following conditions:

CONDITIONS

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than 04/04/2021.**

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

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

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

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

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

- 4** Details of the windows (including rooflights and dormers where appropriate) including their materials, method of opening and drawings showing sections through mullions, transoms and glazing bars and sills, arches, lintels and reveals (including dimension of any recess) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The windows shall be installed 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.

- 5** 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 a satisfactory means of surface water drainage and to accord with Policy 5.13 of the London Plan.

- 6** Before commencement of the use of the land or building hereby permitted parking spaces and/or garages and turning space shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter shall be kept available for such use and no permitted development whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order 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.

- 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 and to accord with Policy 5.13 of the London Plan.

- 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.

You are further informed that:

- 1** The applicant is advised that any works associated with the implementation of this permission (including the demolition of any existing buildings or structures) will constitute commencement of development. Further, all pre commencement conditions attached to this permission must be discharged, by way of a written approval in the form of an application to the Planning Authority, before any such works of demolition take place.
- 2** You are advised that this application may be liable for the payment of the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) and the Planning Act 2008. The London Borough of Bromley is the Collecting Authority for the Mayor and this Levy is payable on the commencement of development (defined in Part 2, para 7 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)). It is the responsibility of the owner and /or person(s) who have a material interest in the relevant land to pay the Levy (defined under Part 2, para 4(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)).

If you fail to follow the payment procedure, the collecting authority may impose surcharges on this liability, take enforcement action, serve a stop notice to prohibit further development on the site and/or take action to recover the debt.

Further information about Community Infrastructure Levy can be found on attached information note and the Bromley website www.bromley.gov.uk/CIL

- 3 Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.
- 4 The applicant is advised that discharging surface water run-off to public sewer without attenuation is not acceptable.
- 5 Before works commence, the Applicant is advised to contact the Pollution Team of Environmental Health & Trading Standards regarding compliance with the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and/or the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The Applicant should also ensure compliance with the Control of Pollution and Noise from Demolition and Construction Sites Code of Practice 2008 which is available on the Bromley web site.

If during the works on site any suspected contamination is encountered, Environmental Health should be contacted immediately. The contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to the Local Authority for approval in writing.

- 6 You should contact extension 4621 (020 8313 4621 direct line) at the Environmental Services Department at the Civic Centre with regard to the laying out of the crossover(s) and/or reinstatement of the existing crossover(s) as footway. A fee is payable for the estimate for the work which is refundable when the crossover (or other work) is carried out. A form to apply for an estimate for the work can be obtained by telephoning the Highways Customer Services Desk on the above number.