

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

Application No : 18/03191/RECON

Ward:
Plaistow And Sundridge

Address : Imani Court 49 Park Avenue Bromley
BR1 4EG

Objections: Yes

OS Grid Ref: E: 540126 N: 170600

Applicant : Mr D FRANCIS

Description of Development:

Removal of condition 13 (relating to Drawing No. PA-655-PD-SITE PLAN) of permission 17/01846/RECON allowed on appeal for the variation of conditions 3, 6, 8 and 9 (relating to soft landscaping, hard landscaping, waste and recycling facilities and cycle storage respectively) of permission 14/02727 allowed on appeal for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two/three storey building containing 3 no. 1 bed flats and 5 no. 2 bed flats with associated parking and landscaping

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 7

Proposal

The application site has a very complex planning history which is detailed in the planning history section of this report.

Planning permission was allowed on appeal for the residential development of the site to provide a flatted block. The permission was subject to a number of planning conditions, including some pre-commencement conditions. Two separate applications to discharge the planning conditions were made, with the details provided being approved, and an application for the minor material amendment of the permission to allow the provision of a lift shaft was also granted under reference 16/02066/RECON.

However, when the development was constructed it was not in compliance with the details provided to discharge conditions, relating to soft landscaping, hard landscaping, waste and recycling facilities and cycle storage. An application was submitted in order to regularise the situation, post-completion of the development, under reference 17/01846/RECON. This application was refused. The subsequent appeal against the Council's decision was allowed.

The Inspector's decision notice included conditions however, in that while allowing the appeal there was a requirement that details of the hard and soft landscaped areas, including replacement planting should be subject to approval by the Council. In addition, details of lighting to the cycle store were required to be approved, along with lighting to the access drive/car park.

In allowing the appeal the Inspector also imposed a condition (condition 13) requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with drawing PA-655-PD-SITE PLAN.

The details pursuant to conditions imposed by the Inspector were submitted within the directed 3 month period. However, the drawing submitted with the conditions discharge application did not directly replicate PA/655/PD/SITE PLAN.

As a consequence, this application has been submitted so as to remove condition 13 which was imposed by the Inspector. If the application is allowed, conditions can be imposed requiring compliance with the substituted plan which shares the same plan reference number, but is clearly annotated: "28/5/18 REVISED DRAWING SHOWING THE DETAILS REQUIRED BY THE APPEAL DECISION."

The details for which further information was required related to:

- Details of hard landscaping (Conditions 1 and 4 of Inspector's decision notice)

The Inspector noted that the use of a single brick pattern contributed to a commercial style character to the site, and that the raised planting of the laurel to the side of the building introduced additional elements of hard landscaping adding to this impact.

Conditions 1 and 4 combine to require details of materials for hard surfaced areas, boundary enclosures/treatments to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority and to be installed in accordance with these approved details.

The details provided within this application on the plan annotated 28/5/18 REVISED DRAWING SHOWING THE DETAILS REQUIRED BY THE APPEAL DECISION differ from those considered by the Inspector on the appeal plan in that the proportion of the site frontage given over to hardstanding relative to soft landscaping (enlarged/additional beds proposed, see below) is reduced in this current proposal. The main area of hardstanding in front of the building is proposed to be as constructed, with materials comprising Marshall concrete block paving. The raised sleeper bed to the eastern boundary would be removed. The front boundary treatment is shown to comprise a mix of planting beds, trees and the retention of the brick piers as constructed. It is not proposed to alter the rear and side boundaries of the site, which would be retained as existing.

- Details of soft landscaping (Condition 2 of Inspector's decision notice)

The Inspector expressed concern that the exclusive use of laurel for soft landscaping offered no variation and created a single green barrier. As such it failed to respect the varied character of soft landscaping in the locality and did not soften the scale of the built form of Imani House.

In response, the submitted plan PA/655/PD/SITE PLAN (28/5/18) is annotated with soft landscaping proposals which provide in front of the building beds with a mix of shrubs rather than the single type of planting that has been provided on site. The beds at the front/side would be a mix of robinia and laurel. Tree planting is shown to the front boundary comprising a mix of field maple (acer campestre) and rosebud cherry (prunus autumn rosea).

- Details of means of lighting for cycle store (condition 6 of Inspector's decision notice)

The appeal Inspector noted with regards to this aspect that the level of the lighting and the fact that it was on a dusk to dawn dimmer, the lighting as provided "may have an impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the development and neighbouring occupiers." As such, the condition was varied by the Inspector to condition 6 including the wording

"Details of a scheme to light the bicycle store shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority within 3 months of the date of this decision."

The drawing currently under consideration is annotated to show the provision of lighting bollards which would be BS 5489-2013 compliant, with a bollard positioned at each end of the cycle store.

- Details of a scheme to light the access drive and car parking areas (Condition 8 of the Inspector's decision notice)

The drawing currently under consideration is annotated to show the provision of street lighting bollards which would be BS 5489-2013 compliant. The bollards at the front would be sited within/adjacent to planting beds, lighting the vehicular access, parking spaces and the front of the building.

Other conditions imposed by the Inspector related to:

- Implementation of soft landscaping (condition 3)
- Retention of refuse storage facility as provided (condition 5)
- Retention of the secure side gates as constructed (condition 7)
- Implementation of measures to minimise risk of crime as shown on PA-655-PD-02 COND March 2015 (condition 9 of the Inspector's decision notice).
- Retention of obscure glazing as approved by decision dated 12/8/15 (condition 10 of Inspector's decision notice)
- No additional doors and windows in flank elevations (condition 11 of Inspector's decision notice)
- No windows to dormer roof projections approved under reference 16/02066 (condition 11 of Inspector's decision notice)
- Compliance with plan PA-655-PD-SITE PLAN (condition 13 of Inspector's decision notice).

These other conditions relate to retention of the existing provision/layout and also to prohibit future amendments without planning permission that might see the installation of additional flank windows.

Other matters

The submitted drawing also includes the provision of brick piers to the front of the site, on either side of the access and at the flank boundaries of the site. These are proposed to be retained as constructed. The site plan provided with this application annotated 28/5/18 REVISED DRAWING SHOWING THE DETAILS REQUIRED BY THE APPEAL DECISION shows the siting of the piers and photographs of the development are available on file.

Location and Key Constraints

The application site was formerly occupied by a detached, two storey single family dwelling house. The site is now occupied by a two/three storey residential flatted block providing 8 flats. It is located on the north side of Park Avenue, within a predominantly residential area. There is a nursing home immediately adjacent to the west (No. 47) and a single storey dwelling to the east (51A) with a two storey building converted into flats (51) attached. To the north of the site lie the rear gardens of properties in Quernmore Road and Quernmore Close.

Park Avenue is a wide, straight road with mature street trees and mostly single dwelling houses, some of which have attractive landscaped front garden areas although it is noted that the immediately adjacent property at No. 47 has a front parking/access area that is

almost wholly block paved. Generally the residential dwellings and flats in the locality have front amenity areas that are marked by planting to the front and side around hardstanding parking areas.

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

- Concern that the proposal would involve alteration of/removal or amendment to conditions imposed by the Planning Inspector at appeal, including that the allowed appeal related to the drawing considered by the Inspector, and that all details should comply with that site plan rather than be amended
- The Council does not have the power to revoke a condition imposed by a Planning Inspector
- The pillars at the front are unsightly and were not considered by the Inspector at the time of the appeal
- Installation of meter boxes at the front of the building does not comply with the inspector's decision since these were not shown on the drawing considered by the Inspector
- Paving at the rear of the site including the path to cycle store and round area of patio does not accord with the drawing taken into account by the Inspector
- Level of screening to the rear and side not as originally proposed under 14/02727
- Raised beds continue to be shown despite Inspector's concerns regarding the raised laurel planting providing additional elements of hard landscaping. Maintenance of this requires additional water as no run-off to the beds
- Impact of raised beds on boundary fencing
- Wooden sleepers out of character with the area
- Increased light pollution associated with the bollard lighting proposed in contrast with the lower level lighting formerly proposed on either side of the store (NB the details considered by the Inspector in the most recent appeal comprised a light attached to the store and set on a dusk to dawn dimmer, where the current proposal is for the provision of 750mm high bollard lighting on either side of the store)
- No details of brightness of the lighting
- Reference to development at 15/17 Bromley Common which is by the same applicant and also the subject of conditions
- Environmental impact of increased areas of paving in relation to original permission
- Site lies within an AQMA (Air Quality Management Area) - reference to House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report, July 2018
- Previous refusal of permission on the site has referred to lack of sufficient soft landscaping on the site and the additional soft landscaping proposed under 14/02727 was considered sufficient to overcome this concern

Comments from Consultees

Environmental Health Pollution Officer: Initial comments stated that generally we would condition lighting based on an illuminance level but that as the condition has been set by the Planning Inspectorate the lighting design was been assessed on the basis of the submission. It is not anticipated that there would be a problem with the design although there is limited information available.

Further comments were sought regarding the lighting to the cycle store at the rear in view of the concerns expressed by the Inspector with regards to the installed lighting (high

level) and neighbouring amenity. Comments received stated that the concern expressed was understandable considering the height and design of the previous light. It is noted that the proposed columns are low level which are less likely to have an impact. While the wattage is stated on the specification, this does not really correlate with brightness and how that will be perceived. However, all things considered the impact is likely to be negligible. It is acknowledged that Environmental Health has powers under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 though the standard is higher than amenity.

Highways: No comment on this application but comments received in relation to 17/01846/CONDIT stated that the information submitted with regards to Condition 6 - Cycle store lighting and Condition 8 - Parking lighting was satisfactory.

Trees and Landscaping: The soft landscaping includes the planting of 6 trees on the boundary with Park Avenue, 3 either side of the access. The size stated (heavy standard) seems appropriate for the scale of the development and location of planting. 2 species are chosen; Field maple (*Acer campestre*) is a native tree, medium size in maturity, no reason why this would not be suitable for this location; *Prunus autumnalis rosea* is a little smaller in maturity, more of an ornamental Cherry species and again no reason why this would not be suitable for this location. Overall the scheme appears to be in keeping with the character of the road and will go some way to softening the new development.

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 Hearings from 4th December 2017 and the Inspectors 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.

The application falls to be considered in the context of the following planning policies and guidance:

Unitary Development Plan

Policy H7 - Housing Density and Design
Policy BE1 - Design of New Development
BE7 - Railings, Boundary Walls and other Means of Enclosure
Policy T3 - Parking
Policy T7 - Cyclists

Draft Local Plan (November 2016)

Draft Policies of relevance to the assessment of the proposals include:

Policy 4 - Housing Design
Policy 37 - General Design of Development
Policy 30 - Parking
Policy 122 - Light Pollution

London Plan

3.5 Quality and Design of Housing Developments
5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
5.13 Sustainable Drainage
6.9 Cycling
6.13 Parking
7.4 Local Character
7.6 Architecture

Planning History

The planning history of the site includes proposals under application refs. 05/03784 and 06/00980 to demolish the house in order to extend the adjacent nursing home. These applications were refused by the Council and dismissed at appeal, regarding issues such as overdevelopment and intensification of use by the Nursing Home.

More recent history includes permission for a two storey side extension, ref.11/03069.

Planning permission was refused by the Council for a residential redevelopment under reference 13/04198 for the following reasons:

1 The extent of proposed development would leave a deficiency in the provided amenity area resulting in an overdevelopment of the site by reason of the amount of site coverage by buildings and hard surfaces and would be out of character with the area contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

2 The proposed development by reason of its excessive bulk, mass and site coverage, and insufficient car parking would constitute an overdevelopment of the site, harmful to the character of the area, thereby contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan

Planning permission was refused under reference 14/02727 for the development which has now been implemented. An appeal against the Council's refusal of planning permission was allowed. The Inspector imposed a number of conditions on the permission.

Under reference 15/02783 permission was refused for a material amendment to the scheme which proposed the installation of enlarged balconies.

Under reference 16/02066 approval was granted for the variation of condition 16 to allow the installation of a side dormer projection to serve a lift shaft.

An application for variation of conditions was received under reference 17/01846/RECON, seeking the variation of conditions 3, 6, 8 and 9 (relating to soft landscaping, hard landscaping, waste and recycling facilities and cycle storage respectively) of permission 14/02727 allowed on appeal for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two/three storey building containing 3 no. 1 bed flats and 5 no. 2 bed flats with associated parking and landscaping, to allow the retention of soft and hard landscaping, refuse and cycle storage as built/provided.

The application was refused. A subsequent appeal against the Council's decision was allowed subject to conditions as detailed in first section of this report.

There is also enforcement history on the site, relating to the development being implemented without according with the conditions imposed on the development, and the details pursuant to these conditions.

Considerations

The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are the extent to which the details provided within the amended site plan (annotated 28/5/18 REVISED DRAWING SHOWING THE DETAILS REQUIRED BY THE APPEAL DECISION), and the lighting specification and clarifications received on 4th December and 15th December 2018 meet the requirements and purposes of the conditions imposed by the Inspector at appeal ref. 17/01846/RECON in terms of:

- Hard and soft landscaping & brick piers
- Lighting to car park and cycle parking area

Assessment of these matters relates principally to the impact of the amended details on the visual amenities of the area and to the lighting's impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

Hard and soft landscaping

The main car parking area/manoeuvring space would be retained as existing, with the materials comprising block paving with demarcation of individual bays with paving of a different colour. The Inspector in the most recent appeal referred to the frontage of the site as existing as having a commercial appearance as a consequence of the combined impact of the uniform monotony of the planting (100% laurel) in conjunction with the lack of trees to the front of the site and the extensive area of hardstanding with its single pattern of block paving.

The current plan seeks to overcome this concern by increasing the proportion of soft to hard landscaping through the provision of an enlarged planting bed towards the western front corner of the site and also to the eastern front corner. The planting plan provides for a mix of shrubs. In addition, the plan includes the planting of trees to the front boundary of the site. Immediately adjacent to the front elevation of the building it is proposed to provide Type B planting beds which comprise a mix of berberis, eleagnus and chaenomdes shrubs. These beds would replace part of the existing hardstanding to the north of the metal drainage grating which crosses the retained hardstanding between the parking area and the building itself. The raised laurel bed to the side of the building which was shown on the plan considered by the Inspector at appeal (in conjunction with his "by eye" assessment of the proposals where these related to the retention of existing development)

is not shown on the plan currently under consideration and the agent has confirmed that this would be removed.

It is noted that representations have been received which refer to the deficiency of the existing hard/soft landscaping in relation to the scheme allowed on appeal under reference 14/02727 and the assessment of the Inspector in the recent appeal under reference 17/01846. Concern is also expressed regarding the retention of existing paving at the rear of the site.

It is considered that the soft landscaping, in particular in the provision of the additional planting immediately adjacent to the building, would more closely recognise the plan which was considered at appeal under reference 14/02727. The provision of beds to the front/side of the parking area, along with the use of a mix of species in the planting plan would reflect the original permission more closely than the landscaping as existing and as previously proposed in more recent application(s).

The paving at the rear of the site would be retained as existing and as existed when the appeal Inspector under reference 17/01846 visited the site and assessed the previous proposal. With regards to landscaping generally, the Inspector found that "although the area of hardstanding to the rear is not out of keeping with residential patio areas in general, the extent of hardstanding which has been provided in a single brick pattern creates a commercial style character to the site." It is considered that this assessment provided that there was particular concern regarding the commercial appearance of the frontage and its impact on the character of the area rather than the paving at the rear.

Taking into account the amendments to the provision of soft landscaping beds and the inclusion of more generosity in planting relative to the (retained) front block paved driveway, it is not considered that the refusal of permission for the amended details would be appropriate and justified. In reaching this conclusion regard has been had to the scope of the original permission under 14/02727 and the layout and provision of hardstanding to the rear of the property in view of the assessment of the appeal Inspector under 17/01846 that this would not be out of keeping with residential patio areas in general.

While the materials and general extent of the drive/parking hardstanding to the front of the site would only be slightly less extensive than that considered by the Inspector it is considered that the introduction of softening planting beds in front of the building along with enlarged areas of planting to the front/side and the use of a mix of shrubs/trees would serve to suitably soften the overall appearance of the site when viewed from Park Avenue and would, once implemented, mitigate the visual impact of the extent of parking on the site's frontage space.

With regards to the brick piers to the front of the site, these were not referred to in the Inspector's appeal decision and were not included on the drawing that the Inspector under reference 17/01846 referenced, but it is noted that the revised site plan which formed part of the application originally allowed on appeal (ref. 14/02727) showed the provision of 1.96m high brick piers along the front of the site. The agent has confirmed that with regards to the boundary treatments on the site, it is only the brick piers/front wall which differs from the scheme assessed by the Inspector.

In view of the permission allowed at appeal under 14/02727 and the appearance of the piers, which is acceptable in the context of the front boundary treatments along the street including that of the adjacent nursing home, it is not considered that this aspect of the proposal has a significant impact on the visual amenities of the area.

Representations have been received regarding the meter boxes provided on the front of the building. These have been observed on site and were in existence when the appeal Inspector dealt with the previous appeal. They are coloured brown and are modest in scale and their number/siting is not considered to be uncharacteristic of flatted development of the type granted permission at appeal. In any case, the provision of a planting bed in front of the boxes will limit the extent to which they would continue to be readily visible from adjacent properties/the street.

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.

Policy 122 of the draft Local Plan relates to light pollution in particular and states that lighting in new development should be at an appropriate level to minimise impact on amenity whilst ensuring safe and secure places. Policy 122(i) specifically states that lighting should "have no adverse effect on residential amenity through glare or hours of operation."

The submitted drawing is annotated to state that the proposed bollards at the front and those at the rear which are associated with the cycle parking would be low level and would comply with the requirements of BS 5489-2013. This lighting at the rear would replace that which was in place when the Inspector considered the appeal under 17/01846, which comprised a light mounted on a vertical pillar facing into the site, positioned at a slightly lower level than the flank boundary fencing and operating on a dusk to dawn timer.

The agent has provided a specification sheet for the proposed installation (15/12/18) and on the basis of this information in tandem with the site layout no technical environmental health objections are raised.

Other matters

It is noted that concern has been expressed regarding the capacity of the Council to revoke a condition imposed by a Planning Inspector. In this case, the proposal is to remove a condition (condition 13 which required compliance with the plan considered by the Inspector at appeal). Contrary to this perspective, the Council does have the power to amend/remove conditions imposed at appeal. Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 relates to the determination of applications to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached (with there being no distinction between applications allowed at appeal or those granted by the Local Planning Authority).

The common approach to amend proposals that have planning permission, either afforded at appeal or by the Local Planning Authority itself, is to seek to substitute amended drawings for those specified under a planning condition. That the condition in question was imposed by an appeal Inspector rather than the Local Planning Authority does not override the capacity of the Council to determine this application in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

The appeal decision notice included at condition 13 a requirement that the development accord with the submitted drawing. The appeal decision notice also sought additional details and revised proposals relating to various matters and it was therefore to be anticipated that in addressing this (i.e. amending the proportion of hard/soft landscaping), it would be appropriate to refer to an amended drawing. If Members grant this application it

would be appropriate to impose a new condition specifying the plan with which the development must accord, essentially rewording the condition imposed by the Inspector so as to refer to the current plan.

With regards to the information relating to environmental considerations, referencing heatwaves and the relationship between hard landscaping and heating/soft landscaping and cooling, it is considered that in terms of the relationship between this current scheme and the scheme allowed on appeal under reference 14/02727, the overall increase in hardstanding on the site is limited and that this current proposal increases the amount of soft-landscaping on the site in relation to the development as constructed. As such, taking into account the site's planning history it is not considered that grounds exist in this respect to refuse this application on the basis of environmental impact.

Conclusion

The application details are considered adequate to address the Inspector's concerns expressed in decision notice ref. APP/G5180/W/17/3188508 and the planning conditions therein. The hard and soft landscaping and lighting proposed represents a genuine improvement over these elements as constructed, and are more representative of the information provided when planning permission was granted on appeal under reference 14/02727.

The brick piers as constructed are not considered visually harmful in the context of the street scene and surroundings, or in the context of the appearance of the building and landscaped frontage.

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

as amended by documents received on 04.12.2018 15.12.2018

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

subject to the following conditions:

- 1 Within 3 months of the date of this decision, the hard landscape works shown on the submitted drawing (including the formation of planting beds as per the approved details) shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter shall be retained permanently in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: In order to comply with BE1, NE7 and NE8 of the Unitary Development Plan to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development and to protect neighbouring amenity.

- 2 All soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The soft landscape works shall be carried out by the end of the first planting season following the date of this decision. The soft landscape works shall be maintained thereafter. Any trees, shrubs or hedges which die, become seriously damaged or diseased or are removed or destroyed within a period of 5 years from the date of this decision shall be replaced during the next planting season with specimens of the same size and species unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.**

Reason: In order to comply with BE1, NE7 and NE8 of the Unitary Development Plan to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development and to protect neighbouring amenity.

- 3** The waste and recycling storage arrangements and means of enclosure as constructed by/on the date of decision reference APP/G5180/W/17/3188508 shall be permanently retained for their designated use.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in order to provide adequate refuse storage facilities in a location which is acceptable in respect of residential and visual amenity impact.

- 4** The bicycle parking as provided at the date of the decision reference APP/G5180/W/17/3188508 shall be permanently retained for its designated use. The scheme to light the bicycle store hereby approved by this decision notice shall be implemented in accordance with the details provided within six months of the date of this decision and the lighting shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 6.9 of the London Plan and in order to provide adequate bicycle parking facilities at the site in the interest of reducing reliance on private car transport.

- 5** The secure side gates as constructed on the date of decision ref. APP/G5180/W/17/3188508 shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of security and crime prevention and to accord with Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 6** The scheme to light the access drive and car parking areas as approved under this decision shall be implemented in accordance with the details provided within 3 months of the date of this decision and the lighting shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T3 and Appendix II of the Unitary Development Plan in the interest of visual amenity and the safety of occupiers of and visitors to the development.

- 7** The development hereby permitted shall incorporate measure to minimise the risk of crime and to meet the specific needs of the application site and the development. Security measures shall be implemented in accordance with the details submitted under ref. 14/02727/CONDIT and approved by decision notice dated 12 August 2015, shown on PA-655-PD-02 COND dated March 2015.

Reason: In the interest of security and crime prevention and to accord with Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 8** The windows in the first and second floor flank western and eastern elevations of the building shall be permanently retained as obscure glazed as per the details submitted under planning ref. 14/02727 and approved by decision dated 12 August 2015.

Reason: In the interests of protecting residential amenity in accordance with Policy BE1 of the UDP

- 9 No windows or doors additional to those shown on the permitted drawings shall at any time be inserted in the flank walls of the development hereby permitted.**

Reason: In the interests of protecting residential amenity in accordance with Policy BE1 of the UDP

- 10 No windows shall at any time be inserted in the dormer roof projections shown on the plans approved under planning ref. 16/02066.**

Reason: In the interests of protecting residential amenity in accordance with Policy BE1 of the UDP

- 11 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan PA-655-PD-SITE PLAN dated 28/5/18 and annotated "REVISED DRAWING SHOWING THE DETAILS REQUIRED BY THE APPEAL DECISION," along with the lighting specification received 15/12/18.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the UDP and in the interests of visual and residential amenity.