

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 17/00812/FULL1

Ward:
Copers Cope

Address : 24 Downs Hill Beckenham BR3 5HB

OS Grid Ref: E: 538665 N: 169917

Applicant : Mr & Mrs Bloomer

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of host dwelling and erection of new detached house.

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Downs Hill
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 12

Proposal

It is proposed to demolish the existing dwelling and erect a replacement two storey house with accommodation in the roof space. The dwelling would be partly set into the site so as to address the sloping gradient.

The proposed dwelling would be sited approx. 4.1m from the boundary with No. 26 which lies to the north west and 1.1m space would be provided to the south eastern boundary of the site with No. 20 Downs Hill. The total separation between the dwellings on either side would be approx. 4.5m to the single storey part of No. 26 and 3.6m to the two storey flank elevation of No. 20 (excluding the overhanging eaves).

The dwelling would comprise two distinct gabled 'wings' which would be slightly staggered so as to break up the front and rear elevations. The projecting front (southern) wing would align with the front elevation of the existing dwelling and consequently the setback northern wing would be set back by approx. 1.25m from the existing front elevation on that side of the property. At the front the proposed dwelling would project by approx. 1m beyond the front elevation of No. 20 and by a similar distance beyond the front elevation of the single storey side element of No. 26.

At the rear the proposed dwelling would project by approx. 4.8m beyond the rear elevation of the existing dwelling on the southern side and by 5m beyond the rear elevation of the two storey projection at the existing dwelling on the northern side of the house (as scaled from the red line overlay drawing ref. 2720 Rev. 1). In terms of the relationship between the rear elevation of the proposed dwelling and the rear elevations of neighbouring dwellings, the submitted block plan indicates that the proposed dwelling would project by approx. 2m beyond the nearest part of

the rear elevation at No. 20 to the south east and by approx. 3.05m beyond the nearest (single storey) part of the rear elevation at No. 26 to the north west.

The proposed dwelling would be of contemporary design, comprising two deeply pitched gables to front and rear, with a linking flat (crown) roof element at second floor level between the projecting gables. The projecting gables incorporate deep overhanging eaves with 1 roof light provided in the north western roof slope and 2 roof lights proposed in the south eastern roof slope.

The materials used for the external surfaces of the proposed dwelling comprise stucco/rendering to the walls, aluminium clad wooden windows and doors with slate roof tiles rather than the clay tiles as existing.

In terms of amenity space, the property includes a large rear garden and the submitted drawings show the provision of a terrace to replace the existing terrace, which would be raised in comparison with the sloping rear garden beyond.

The existing vehicular access to the property would be retained and hardstanding car parking provided on the driveway at the front as existing.

Location

The application site lies on the north eastern side of Downs Hill and currently comprises a detached single dwellinghouse set within a generously deep plot. The land slopes down from the road to the end of the rear garden which backs onto railway land. The site is 1880m² in area. The existing dwelling has a wide footprint in contrast with its depth, with the ground floor extending for almost the full width of the site. It incorporates a single storey attached double garage to the south eastern side of the dwelling which immediately abuts the boundary with No. 20 and a covered side passage linked to a flat roofed two storey extension is sited adjacent to the north western boundary of the site.

The dwelling is set at a lower level than the adjacent highway as a consequence of the siting of the street on a hill which slopes down to the railway land at the rear of the generously deep rear garden.

The site lies within the Downs Hill Conservation Area and a TPO covers the front of the site and neighbouring sites. The front of the site is partly screened from view from the higher level street/pavement by mature Scots Pine trees which are covered by the TPO.

Consultations

Local representations

Nearby owners and/or occupiers were notified of the application when it was first received and the representations received (including from the Copers Cope Area Residents' Association) in response can be summarised as follows:

- The visual presence and massing of the proposal suggest it to be an overdevelopment of the site.
- The design is clumsily articulated in elevation and on plan
- The design is not of a sufficiently high standard and fails to preserve or enhance the character of the Downs Hill Conservation Area
- The projection of the house into the garden would reduce daylight to the adjacent dwelling at No. 20
- The combined height and depth of the proposal would result in inadequate light reaching the flank facing windows in the north western elevation of the neighbouring dwelling which serve a living room on the ground floor and a bedroom on the first floor
- Visual impact of the sheer wall
- The nearest window to a habitable room is currently approx. 7m from the south eastern boundary and as the existing house is set less deep into the garden overlooking is not currently an issue, but the proposed house would result in overlooking to the smaller rear garden at No. 20.
- Loss of privacy resulting from the proposed rear terrace
- The building would be over-bearing, out of character and out of scale with the neighbouring properties and detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area
- The house would dwarf the smaller dwelling at No. 20
- While the overall ridge height of the dwelling might be similar to No. 26 the mass of the development would dwarf that property
- The dwellings at Nos. 18 and 20 do not have additional living space in the roof area
- The basement would not be in keeping
- Potential subsidence

Representations further suggested that if permission is granted it should be subject to conditions relating to the management of the period of construction along with working hours.

The application has been amended by the submission of revised plans which were received on 19th April 2017. Neighbouring residents were re-notified of the proposal and subsequent objections are summarised:

- The depth of the dwelling in relation to the proximity to No. 20 would result in loss of daylight, outlook, privacy and a sense of "cramping." It is out of scale and would appear dominant in juxtaposition with No. 20 and would have an adverse impact on the character of the Conservation Area
- The height of the dwelling would dwarf the neighbouring house
- Would have an impact on the open feel that the neighbouring property currently enjoys because of height and depth in conjunction with proximity to the boundary
- Loss of daylight to the floor to ceiling windows facing the development at No. 20 and to the north east facing bedroom window
- Lack of side space to the boundary with No. 20 means the development would be cramped and while the existing building runs the full width of the plot the garage adjacent to No. 20 is single storey and cannot be seen from that property

- Overdevelopment and out of scale in the conservation area
- Concern regarding the footprint of the dwelling in relation to neighbours
- Concern that the proposal wouldn't meet BRE guidance on daylight testing
- Overshadowing of adjacent garden at No. 20 and loss of sunlight in afternoon and early evening. The existing house is much lower and at present there is sunlight in the garden at No. 20 across the trees and roof of No. 24 in the afternoon and early evening
- Loss of sunlight to the rear of the garden
- Contrary to planning policies including BE1 and BE11
- The Design and Access statement is misleading and neither Nos. 18 and 20 have additional accommodation in the roof space
- Suggestions regarding ways in which the development could be improved in terms of impact at No. 20.

The applicants' agent has commented on the objections to the proposal, with those comments summarised as follows:

- It would be difficult to argue that the proposal would result in loss of daylight to the supplementary windows at the adjacent property. The flank windows face north west and are 6.5m from the projection of the new house. The 45 degree rule is not breached.
- The nearest rear building line of the proposed house is approximately in line with the main rear section of the house at No. 20. There is a slight rearward projection beyond the most northerly wall at No. 20 but the buildings will at that point be 3.3m apart and the new house will be more than twice that distance from the side windows referred to.
- The rear half of the new house is 1m lower than the front half and similarly lower than the existing property at No. 24. The proposed terrace to the rear of the new house will also be 1m lower. Coupled with the existing boundary treatment and plantings (which will be retained) there will be no overlooking of either neighbouring garden from the proposed garden terraces and balcony.
- The new house will not overlook the neighbouring houses or gardens any more than the current one does. There is the argument that the increased rearward projection actually moves the view of neighbouring properties further down the garden and away from the immediate rear terrace and patio areas
- The new house does have a larger footprint than the existing house but it has been downscaled from the original application and all existing trees, plantings, screens and boundary treatments will remain as is.
- With regard to shadowing, because of the orientation of the two houses there will be at no time of the day, on any day of the year, any overshadowing of the house at number 20 by the proposed redevelopment of number 24. It is only in the late evenings of summer and at the winter equinox that shadows will be long enough to reach the garden of number 20 and then only the half furthest away from the house and it is likely that even at these times any shadows cast will come from the existing boundary fences and landscaping.

Neutral representations were also received which stated that no objections were raised so long as the drawings are correct and the summer daylight survey submitted is accurate. It is requested that all side windows and doors be finished with obscure glass.

The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas raised objections to the proposal stating that it is of poor design and massing, of excessive bulk, contrary to Policies BE1 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Technical Comments

No technical objections are raised from a highways perspective.

The Conservation Officer commented:

"The existing house is of 1950s construction and makes no real contribution to the CA in terms of its architectural style, so I raise no objection to its demolition subject to a suitable replacement.

The proposed house would be more conspicuous than the existing house in the streetscene due to its height and projecting gables but nonetheless I believe the design recognises the existing context and is a big improvement on the previous designs. The gables clearly reference other houses on the road and whilst the twin gables are slightly more assertive than some of the older houses the impact is lessened by having one slightly set back and the site is set very low on that side of the road which also lessens the impact. The rendered finish would also reference existing finishes but would no doubt be sharper and more modern in its execution.

The side space is sufficient and in CA terms will be generally read at first floor level and above so there will be no feeling of being cramped."

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following Unitary Development Plan policies:

- BE1 Design of New Development
- BE12 Development in Conservation Areas
- BE14 Trees in Conservation Areas
- NE7 Development and Trees
- H7 Housing Density and Design
- H9 Side Space
- T3 Parking
- T18 Road Safety

Supplementary Planning Guidance of relevance to the application comprises:

- SPG1: General Design Principles
- SPG2: Residential Design Guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance for the Downs Hill Conservation Area.

Emerging Bromley Local Plan

The Council is preparing a Local Plan. It is anticipated that submission of the draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State will occur in 2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Draft Policy 4	Housing Design
Draft Policy 8	Side Space
Draft Policy 30	Parking
Draft Policy 32	Road Safety
Draft Policy 37	General Design of Development
Draft Policy 41	Conservation Areas
Draft Policy 43	Trees in Conservation Areas
Draft Policy 73	Development and Trees

The London Plan

Policy 3.5	Quality and design of housing developments
Policy 7.3	Designing out crime
Policy 7.4	Local character
Policy 7.6	Architecture
Policy 7.8	Heritage assets and archaeology

Housing SPG

`Sustainable Design and Construction SPG

National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 is a material consideration in the assessment of the proposal.

Paragraphs 56 and 60 of the NPPF emphasises the importance of good design and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment. Paragraph 64 states that permission should be refused for poorly designed development that fails to take the opportunity to improve the character of an area and the way it functions.

Chapter 12 relates to "Conserving and enhancing the historic environment."

Para. 131 states, inter alia, that local planning authorities should take account of "the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness." Para. 133 relates to considerations to be taken into account where a development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset and Para. 134 relates to the need to consider public benefits of a

proposal when dealing with development proposals that would lead to less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset.

Conclusions

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

- Principle of development
- Impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the conservation area
- Impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties

With regards to the highways/traffic impacts of the proposal it is noted that there are no technical concerns regarding the proposal.

Principle of development

The National Planning Policy Framework (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.

Policy H7 of the UDP advises that new housing developments will be expected to meet all of the following criteria in respect of; density; a mix of housing types and sizes, or provides house types to address a local shortage; the site layout, buildings and space about buildings are designed to a high quality and recognise as well as complement the qualities of the surrounding areas; off street parking is provided; the layout is designed to give priority to pedestrians and cyclists over the movement and parking of vehicles; and security and crime prevention measures are included in the design and layout of buildings and public areas.

The site is located in a residential location characterised by detached dwellings generally positioned in large plots. The site lies within a designated Conservation Area where Policy BE12 relating to demolition in conservation areas applies, which states that the total or substantial demolition of a building in a conservation will not be permitted where the building makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Where the proposal relates to the demolition of a building that makes little or no contribution to the area, the loss will not be resisted so long as there is a satisfactory scheme for the provision of a replacement building.

It is not considered that the existing building contributes to the character and appearance of the conservation area and therefore in principle the demolition of the existing building and its replacement would be acceptable subject to an assessment of the impacts of the proposal in particular on the character and appearance of the conservation area and the residential amenity of adjoining and future occupants.

Design, Siting and Layout

The London Plan specifies that Boroughs should take into account local context and character, the design principles (in Chapter 7 of the Plan) and public transport capacity; development should also optimise housing output for different types of location within the relevant density range. This reflects paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires development to respond to local character and context and optimise the potential of sites.

Policies BE1 and H7 of the UDP set out a number of criteria for the design of new development. With regard to local character and appearance 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 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.

Policy BE11 states that in order to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas, a proposal for new development within a conservation area will be expected to respect or complement the layout, scale, form and materials of existing buildings and spaces and incorporate in the design existing landscape or other features that contribute to the character, appearance or historic value of the area; and ensure that the level of activity, traffic, parking services or noise generated by the proposal will not detract from the character or appearance of the area.

It is not considered that the existing building contributes positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is therefore considered that subject to there being an acceptable and detailed replacement scheme the demolition of the host dwelling is acceptable.

It is acknowledged that concerns have been expressed by the Advisory Panel regarding the design, massing and bulk of the proposals and the impact on the Conservation Area. However, no objections are raised by the Conservation Officer regarding the scheme.

The Conservation Area SPG confirms that the design and use of materials vary somewhat within the area, although unifying factors can still be identified including the widespread use of bay windows and application of external white render. The area is generally characterised by detached properties set in generous plots, unified by their common age of construction and reference to neo-vernacular and

neo-Tudor elements. Dwellings in the area are not uniform in appearance, being of a variety of styles. The provision of front gables along with the use of render are common features in the locality. With regards to new development, it is stated that the Council will expect all proposals to conform to the character of the area especially in regard to scale and height of construction, location within a plot and the design and materials used.

It is considered that adequate side space is retained to either flank boundary in view of the conservation area siting of the development and taking into account the design of the dwelling to include generous side roof slopes and the setting of the building at a lower level to the adjacent street scene. In terms of flank to flank separation, a gap of 3.3m would be retained between two storey development on either side of the south eastern boundary and a separation of 4.1m would be provided between the two storey north-western elevation of the dwelling and the single storey flank elevation of No.26. The separation between the proposed dwelling and the boundary is considered acceptable and sufficient to prevent the dwelling appearing cramped within the street scene.

The overall height of the proposed dwelling would be similar to that of the neighbouring dwellings at Nos. 26 and 28 and although the proposed dwelling would be more bulky and prominent than the neighbouring dwelling at No. 20, the eaves height of the proposed dwelling would be lower than the eaves at No. 20 and on balance the proposed dwelling would not appear jarring or incongruous in the street scene. The front elevation incorporates second floor fenestration and while this is not the case at Nos. 26 and 20, it is noted that the development granted planning permission at No. 28 also provided prominent front gables with second floor windows. The front elevation of the proposed dwelling is staggered which relieves the visual impact of the dwelling when viewed from the street and in tandem with the gradient of the site with dwellings at the host site and neighbouring properties being set at lower level to the pavement, the visual impact of the proposal would be acceptable. The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

In terms of the design of the new building the elevations have been designed to have steps, gables, recesses and projections in order to provide visual interest and articulation to the elevation facades. While the design is not traditional in its format the approach is considered reflective of buildings in the locality by using a complimentary palette of materials and building design features. The proposed dwelling would incorporate staggered front gables with that to the left of the front elevation being set slightly forward of that on the right hand side. This would break up the prominence of the front elevation while complementing the appearance of other dwellings within the conservation area that incorporate a focal front gable. The rendered finish would complement the palette of materials used in the immediately locality.

Impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties

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

In view of the siting of the proposed dwelling and the characteristics of neighbouring sites it is considered that the main impact on residential amenity would relate to the neighbouring dwelling at No. 20. That dwelling lies within a smaller plot and the proposed development would be set closer to the boundary with that property than it would to the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling at No. 26 which lies in a very generously proportioned plot. The proposed dwelling would be appreciably more imposing when viewed from the rear than the existing dwelling and would occupy a deeper footprint from front to rear than the existing dwelling.

With regards to the residential amenities of the occupiers of No. 20 it is considered that in view of the orientation of the dwellings in relation to each other, with the proposed dwelling being positioned to the north west of the dwelling at No. 20 and with a limited depth of rearward projection in conjunction with the 3.3m separation to the boundary, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of sunlight and overshadowing to the neighbouring property. While it would appear more imposing than the existing dwelling, it is not considered that this visual impact would be unacceptably overbearing. The main bulk of the dwelling would be on the northern side of the rear elevation where the projecting rear gable is positioned and that gable comprises a deeply sloping pitched roof which would rise up from single storey level. That part of the dwelling closest to the boundary with No. 20 would not project significantly to the rear of the main rear elevation of the dwelling at No. 20, mirroring to an extent the staggered rear elevation of that property.

It is noted that the rear elevation of No. 20 incorporates side facing clear glazed windows, forming part of the original design concept which are positioned on the side of a projecting two storey element. These windows face towards the boundary and the flank two storey elevation of the proposed dwelling set on the other side of the boundary. The windows serve rooms which also have large rear facing windows, but concern has been expressed that the rear facing windows face north east and that the original design concept was intended to provide a dual aspect for these particular rooms, with the ground floor forming part of a largely open-plan space. Concern has also been expressed regarding the impact of the proposal on the rear facing bedroom window on the northern side of the rear elevation of the neighbouring property.

It falls to be considered whether the impact of the proposal in terms of the loss of side outlook and associated visual impact would have a significant impact that would warrant the refusal of planning permission. On balance, in view of the main aspect from the rooms being to the rear and taking into account the separation between the flank facing windows and the boundary and the quite modest rear projection of the proposed dwelling closest to the south eastern boundary it is not considered that the refusal of planning permission on these grounds would be

warranted. With regards to the impact on the daylighting to the windows and that of the rear facing bedroom window, in view of the orientation of the dwellings in relation to each other and the scale and depth of the proposed dwelling it is considered that the impact of the proposed would not be significantly adverse.

The proposed dwelling would appear more visually prominent when viewed from the rear and the overall scale of the building would be larger than that of No. 20. Concern has been expressed that the building would dominate the neighbouring dwelling. However in view of the capacity to retain adequate space to the boundary and the generosity of the size host site it is not considered that the dwelling would be of a scale disproportionate to the size of its plot. While the proposed dwelling would appreciably larger than the neighbouring dwelling, this in itself is not considered to represent strong grounds for the refusal of planning permission, taking into account the variety of building sizes within this section of the street and the height and scale of the proposed dwelling not being uncharacteristic of development in the locality.

With regards to the potential loss of privacy resulting from additional first/second floor windows at the proposed dwelling, it is noted that the proposed rear elevation closest to the boundary with No. 20 incorporates a first floor bedroom window which would be positioned approx. 2.2m from the boundary with No. 20, set deeper into the site. The three second floor windows would serve a bathroom and laundry with a narrow secondary bedroom window positioned approx. 8m from the side elevation of the proposed dwelling. The existing dwelling incorporates a first floor bedroom window which is positioned approx. 6.5m from the boundary. Taking into account the field of vision from the proposed first floor bedroom window it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant increased potential for overlooking and loss of privacy to the rear garden at No. 20. The application site is located within a suburban area within which some mutual overlooking of rear gardens is characteristic, and in view of the position of windows in relation to the boundaries of the site opportunities for direct and unneighbourly overlooking would be limited.

The proposal incorporates the provision of a terrace which would be surrounded by balustrading/railings and which would project by 2m beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling, wrapping around the projecting rear gable to provide a deeper area for sitting out between that gable and the south eastern boundary. The site slopes down from the front to the rear as a consequence of which the terrace would be raised relative to the immediate adjacent ground level although it is noted that the terrace is set at a lower level than the front part of the house. The level of the terrace is shown on the submitted rear elevation to be at a lower level than the existing dwelling. In view of the retention of the side boundary treatments and the existing landscaping to either side boundary it is not considered that this terrace area would result in significant loss of privacy to either side.

The neighbouring property at No. 26 lies to the north west of the application site and incorporates a large raised terrace area which provides valuable amenity in terms of sitting out. The applicant has submitted a sunlight report which suggests that the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring terrace resulting from overshadowing would not be significant, which takes account of the separation

between the property and the boundary and the orientation of the dwellings in relation to each other.

On balance while it is acknowledged that the development would be visible from neighbouring sites and that the development would be bulkier than the existing dwelling it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant detrimental impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties such that would warrant the refusal of planning permission on this basis.

Summary

While the building would bear little resemblance to the existing dwelling on the site, that building is not considered to positively contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area and therefore its replacement would be acceptable. It is considered that the proposed replacement dwelling would complement the form, materials and layout of development within the conservation area and would sit quite comfortably within the street scene and in the context of the dwellings to either side of the property. The proposed dwelling would appear more visually imposing, but in view of the design of the house incorporating features that complement the unifying features of dwellings in the locality, including gables and a rendered finish and with adequate space retained about the building, it is considered that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

It is acknowledged that the building would be visible from the flank facing windows at the neighbouring dwelling and that these windows form part of the original design concept of that house. In view of the separation to the boundary and the lack of impact of the proposed building on the retained rear facing windows at the neighbouring property it is not considered that the refusal of planning permission on the basis of impact on the north facing windows at No. 20 would be warranted. On balance it is considered that the impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties would be acceptable.

With regards to conditions, it is noted that the proposal incorporates flank facing windows at ground floor level which serve either as secondary windows to habitable rooms or serve storage/utility areas. No first floor flank facing windows are proposed and roof lights on the flank roof slopes would serve again a secondary function. It would not be unreasonable to impose a condition requiring these windows to be obscure glazed. It is noted that conditions have been suggested in the representations received relating to the construction management and hours of construction. With regards to hours of construction, these are controlled via separate legislation but if planning permission is granted an informative attached to the permission could advise regarding this matter and the highways engineer has recommended a condition requiring the submission of a construction management plan. Conditions relating to external materials and windows in view of the conservation area siting of the development would be appropriate, if permission is granted.

as amended by documents received on 19.04.2017
RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

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

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

- 2 Details of the 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

- 3 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.

- 4 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 (England) 2015 (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.

- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) no building,**

structure or alteration permitted by Class A, Class B or Class C of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the 2015 Order 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 residential and visual amenities of the area and to accord with Policies BE1 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 6 No windows or doors additional to those shown on the permitted drawing(s) shall at any time be inserted in the flank elevation(s) of the dwelling hereby permitted, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings and to accord with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 7 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied the proposed window(s) in the flank elevations of the dwelling 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 order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

- 8 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include measures of how construction traffic can access the site safely and how potential traffic conflicts can be minimised; the route construction traffic shall follow for arriving at and leaving the site and the hours of operation, but shall not be limited to these. The Construction Management Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timescale and details.

Reason: In 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.

- 9 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: In order to secure a satisfactory means of surface water drainage.

You are further informed that :

- 1 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**

- 2 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.