

## Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 8 December 2016

Site visit made on 8 December 2016

**by JP Roberts BSc(Hons), LLB(Hons), MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/16/3155059**

**Queen Mary House, Manor Park Road, Chislehurst BR7 5PY**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Your Life Management Services Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
  - The application Ref DC/15/05237/FULL1, dated 26 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2016.
  - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing building and redevelopment to form 52 Assisted Living apartments (C2 use) including communal facilities, parking and landscaping.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing building and redevelopment to form 52 Assisted Living apartments (C2 use) including communal facilities, parking and landscaping at Queen Mary House, Manor Park Road, Chislehurst BR7 5PY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/15/05237/FULL1, dated 26 November 2015, subject to the conditions set out in the Annex to this decision.

### Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made at the Hearing by Your Life Management Services Ltd against the Council of the London Borough of Bromley. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### Procedural matter

3. A planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 was submitted by the appellants at the hearing. The obligation offers a financial contribution towards health services and sets out who may occupy the apartments. It also provides an operational management plan which sets out how the apartments are proposed to be used and managed. I shall refer to this again below.

### Main Issue

4. Whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Chislehurst Conservation Area.
-

## Reasons

5. The appeal site is occupied by a two and three-storey building erected in the 1960s, which was last used as a home for retired governesses. It is set well back from Manor Park Road and only parts of it can be seen from that road in between the extensive tree and shrub planting. Its grounds are extensive and there is a significant undeveloped area on the eastern side of the site, where there is generous tree and shrub cover.
6. The Chislehurst Conservation Area is a very large one, some 6 sq. km<sup>1</sup> in area, and has varied attributes of open land, not least the commons around which the town has developed, woodlands, recreational space, and the dozens of listed and locally listed buildings, as well as others which contribute to the significance of the area, found in 17 sub-units as identified in the Council's SPG.
7. There is some uncertainty as to in which sub-unit the appeal site lies. The Council says that it is in a part of the conservation area identified as "*Sub-unit 12: Manor Park, Prince Consort Drive and subsidiary streets*" in the Council's Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). It says that these streets, and those branching from them, are characterised by large contemporary houses on spacious plots set amongst mature trees. However, many of the houses along Manor Park Road are not contemporary, and it goes on to say that these streets are not through routes, whereas Manor Park Road is a local through route.
8. A plan showing sub-areas seems to suggest that the site lies within "*Sub-unit 2 Around and close to the Commons*", the description of which better suits that appeal site. It says that all properties fronting the commons and adjacent main routes are very important to the character and appearance of Chislehurst and that the buildings are generally positive contributors to these qualities, whilst the generosity of trees, hedges and gardens strongly reinforces the sense that a wooded environment with scattered housing lies beyond the commons. I agree that this assessment applies to this part of Manor Park Road.
9. Clearly not all buildings in this sub-unit are positive contributors to the conservation area. The Council accepts that the building does not make a positive contribution to the area's character and appearance, and saved Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Policy BE12, which deals with the loss of such buildings, has not been referred to in the Council's reason for refusal.
10. However, the Council contends that the existing building has a neutral impact on the significance of the conservation area, but I disagree. Although the building is generally well-screened from public views, it can still be seen from a number of public and private viewpoints. The architecture of the building is very much of its time; flat roofs, metal windows, shallow roof pitches and bland elevations do not accord with other local architectural features and are at odds with those buildings which contribute to the significance of the conservation area. Its uniform elevations give the impression of an institutional building which again contrasts with the smaller scale of residential development around

---

<sup>1</sup> According to the Chislehurst Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

- it. I therefore find that the building has a negative impact on the significance of the conservation area.
11. It is the planting within the site, which largely screens the existing building from public view, and the wider sense of openness, which makes the more significant contribution to the attractiveness of the conservation area. The planting comprises a wide mix of tree and shrub species, and some trees are of a considerable height, which are capable of being seen from some distance outside of the appeal site.
  12. The proposed building would be well articulated through the use of differences in height, elevational and roof treatments. The building would use a varied palette of materials and architectural features found in the locality. I consider that the proposal would represent a significant improvement in architectural terms over the existing building, and this would at least preserve the area's character and appearance.
  13. The proposal would represent a substantial increase in size compared to the existing building. The floorspace increase would be about 72%, but the footprint increase would be nearer to double that of the existing building. The layout of the proposed building would also involve bringing part of it nearer to Manor Park Road than the existing building. There would also be some loss of tree and shrub planting which would open up the site to view from Manor Park Road.
  14. The extensive planting across the site frontage would prevent the building being seen in its entirety from any one viewpoint, and the articulated design, to which I have referred above, would ensure that the individual components of the building that could be seen in any one vista would not appear as monolithic. Although parts of the proposed building would be more visible from Manor Park Road than the existing one, and one element would be closer to it, it is nevertheless the case that buildings hidden from public view are not typical of the conservation area. Rather, they are nearly all close to the roads that they front and are in public view to a greater degree than is the case with the appeal proposal.
  15. Thus, even though the appeal proposal would be larger and more visible than the existing building, it would not be out of character with the buildings in the area which contribute to the area's significance. Nor would it have any material effect on the setting of Manor House, a Grade II listed building on the opposite side of Manor Park Road from the access into the site. The significant degree of separation and the intervening landscaping would leave its setting unchanged.
  16. The proposed apartments would have a site coverage of about 23%, leaving much of the site open. There would still remain a very large area of landscaped grounds, which would be supplemented by additional planting of almost 100 trees, providing considerably more than would be removed. The site has one of the largest curtilages of any building in the area, and the proposal would not materially change the overall picture of a large building in a spacious and generously landscaped plot.
  17. The proposed building would be mostly closer to the boundaries of the houses along St Paul's Cray Road than the existing building but there would be a substantial distance between the building and the rear elevations of these

houses. In any event, the significance of these buildings, some of which are listed, lies mainly in their front elevations, whilst the rear elevations are of lesser importance to their heritage significance. Moreover they have long rear gardens, and in the main they are screened by boundary planting. Prior to the erection of the current building on the site, there was a terrace of dwellings even closer to the boundary. I am satisfied that that the proposal would have no adverse impact on, and would preserve the listed buildings, their setting and their special features, and would not harm the significance of the conservation area.

18. The building would be considerably closer to the houses to the east at The Pinfold and Goddington; however, there would remain a substantial landscaped gap between these properties and the nearest part of the site. There would be a broadly similar relationship between the proposed apartments and the neighbouring houses on the western boundary as currently exists.
19. Taking all these considerations together, I find that the proposal would at least preserve the character and appearance of the Chislehurst Conservation Area, and would not conflict with saved UDP BE1 or BE13, which respectively deal with the design of new development and conservation areas.

### **Other matters**

20. A number of adjoining residents and the Chislehurst Society expressed concerns about privacy and overlooking. The Council did not refuse the application on this ground, and officers concluded that that there would not be a significant loss of privacy due to the considerable separation between habitable rooms and the nearest boundaries on the north, south and east boundaries. I broadly agree with this assessment. I noted on my visit that there is a small oriel window in the end elevation of the swimming pool building near the end of the garden of Warren House, St Paul's Cray Road, but the window is small and the distance between it and any overlooking windows would be sufficient to ensure that living conditions would not be materially harmed.
21. In respect of the impact on 6 Walnut Tree Close, which I also visited, I recognise that there would be some overlooking of the garden, but the part of the façade nearest to the house would have no windows in it. Windows and balconies would face the part of the garden further away from the house, but the combination of distance and boundary screening would ensure that there would be no significant degree of overlooking in relation to the potential for overlooking that results from the existing building.
22. The proposal would provide 44 car parking spaces. The rate of car ownership amongst residents is predicted by the appellants as being low based on experience in other similar developments. Given that the average age of occupiers on entry is said by the appellants to be early 80s, and that people would only be likely to move such apartments if they were in need of the care that is provided, I consider that the 25 spaces proposed for residents would be adequate to meet the needs, and that the remaining 19 spaces would be sufficient for staff and visitors. Even if any overspill parking were required, whilst I am aware that Manor Park Road is heavily parked at times, especially around school drop off and pick-up times, I am not convinced that a small increase in on-street parking on an occasional basis would materially affect highway safety.

23. Deliveries and waste collection would take place via the existing access and towards the rear of the site. Whilst this would be fairly close to the boundaries of properties on Manor Park Road and Walnut Tree Close, given that an existing access and turning lie in this position, I am satisfied that it would not result in material harm to neighbours' living conditions.
24. I was alerted to the possible presence of a badger sett on the eastern edge of the site. The habitat survey undertaken on behalf of the appellants dated 31 July 2015 found no evidence of a badger sett or record of badgers within 1 km of the site. Even if a sett were to exist, it would be well clear of the site of construction work. The protection afforded under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992 does not extend to their wider habitat, and I consider it unlikely that there would be any interference with, or harm to, badgers and their setts
25. The proposal would bring undisputed benefits in meeting social needs. Whether or not the Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land is not crucial to my decision, as I find no material harm would arise from the proposal. Meeting housing needs generally is one of the core planning objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, which also identifies a need to address housing for older people. The Planning Practice Guidance says that the need to provide housing for older people is critical given the projected increase in the number of households aged 65 and over accounts for over half of the new households. The proposal would contribute to the London Plan target for Bromley of 205 units of specialised housing for older people per annum, a target which is well short of being met. The proposal would also be likely to free up a considerable number of under-utilised houses in the borough, releasing them onto the market. These social benefits attract significant weight.
26. There would also be financial benefits of the scheme, arising from the construction of the apartments, an increase in local spending, the payment of over £0.5 million over 6 years from the New Homes bonus and staff employment on the site. These economic benefits are significant. These benefits reinforce my conclusion that the appeal should be allowed.

### **Obligation and conditions**

27. The planning obligation submitted by the appellants provides a mechanism for determining who will be eligible to occupy the apartments, and to control the way in which the apartments would be managed. It also undertakes to make financial contributions towards health care facilities made necessary by the additional burden on existing facilities. I consider that all of these provisions are necessary and otherwise meet the tests set out in Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.
28. A number of conditions were put forward by the Council and discussed at the Hearing, where the council agreed that some could be deleted or amended. I have considered them in the light of that discussion and national guidance, and where necessary I have altered or amended them in the interests of necessity, precision, conciseness or enforceability.
29. Compliance with the submitted Construction Management Statement is needed in the interest of highway safety and the protection of residents' living conditions. I consider that the more detailed protection included in the

- demolition methodology statement is appropriate and I have amended the requirements accordingly.
30. Provision for parking during construction is needed in the interests of highway safety and to protect the living conditions of neighbours. A condition dealing with contaminated land is needed to protect the health of construction workers and occupiers of the proposed apartments.
  31. The submission of samples of materials and details of paving and boundary enclosures is required in the interests of the appearance of the conservation area. Pre-commencement conditions are unnecessary, but they should be submitted and approved prior to the carrying out of development to which they relate. Conditions relating to external lighting and refuse storage are also needed for the same reason, and to protect neighbours' living conditions.
  32. Details of the means of ventilation and fume disposal are needed in the interest of appearance and to protect the living conditions of occupiers and nearby residents. Conditions relating to tree protection and landscaping are required in the interests of appearance and to comply with the duty under s.197 of the Act. A condition relating to ecological inspection and reporting is needed to protect and promote biodiversity. A condition relating to measures aimed at encouraging wildlife is also required for the latter reason.
  33. Conditions restricting to the occupation and use of the apartments are needed as otherwise the development would not be acceptable on other planning grounds, including parking and the need for affordable housing contributions.
  34. A condition regarding wheelchair accessible units is required to meet varied housing needs. Compliance with the submitted drainage details is needed to ensure that the site is adequately drained.
  35. A condition to secure the provision of parking spaces and the blocking up of the redundant access is needed in the interest of highway safety. Conditions to secure parking for bicycles and the submission and implementation of a Travel Plan are needed to promote alternatives to the travel by private car.
  36. Conditions imposing controls on external structures are needed in the interests of appearance. Although the appellants say that no piling is intended, should it become necessary to do so, it is important that infrastructure is protected
  37. London Plan Policy 61.3 says developments in all parts of London must ensure that 1 in 5 spaces (both active and passive) provide an electrical charging point to encourage the uptake of electric vehicles. The appellants say that occupiers are unlikely to take up new forms of technology, and are more likely to give up car ownership altogether, and therefore seek only 5% active provision. However, parking for occupiers would only account for 55% of the parking spaces, with the remainder being for staff and visitors, for whom the 20% standard would still be necessary. As an appropriate balance, I shall therefore amend the suggested condition to require 5% active provision for occupiers' spaces, 20% for the remainder and 30% passive provision.
  38. I consider that the development would be unlikely to generate significant servicing and delivery movements, and that further controls would be unnecessary.

39. A specific condition in relation to energy efficiency is unnecessary in the light of the Government's policy expressed in the Written Ministerial Statement of 25 March 2015. A separate condition in respect of storm water is unnecessary as it duplicates controls subject of another condition.

**Conclusion**

40. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*JP Roberts*

INSPECTOR

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

|                                           |                                       |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Rupert Warren QC                          | Instructed by The Planning Bureau     |
| Matt Shellum BA(Hons), Dip TP, MRTPI      | The Planning Bureau                   |
| Chris Styles PG Dip, IID, MAUD            | IDP Group                             |
| Henry Hyde BA(Hons), MSc                  | JLL Heritage Planning and Development |
| Patrick McConkey BA(Hons), Dip Arch, RIBA | BDB Design                            |

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

|                                     |                 |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Catherine Leadbeater                | Bromley Council |
| BSc(Hons), DipTP, MRTPI             |                 |
| Gill Slater BSc(Hons), DipTP, MRTPI | Bromley Council |

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

|                                      |                     |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Kevin Golds                          | Local resident      |
| Chris Wishart                        | Local resident      |
| Barry Oram                           | Local resident      |
| Paul Walker                          | Local resident      |
| Barry Redding BSc, MBA, FRICS, MRTPI | Chislehurst Society |

### DOCUMENTS

- 1 Letter of notification submitted by the Council
- 2 Planning obligation submitted by the appellants
- 3 Construction Method Statement submitted by the appellants
- 4 Older Persons Accommodation Evidence Base submitted by the appellants
- 5 A3 bundle of plans submitted by the appellants
- 6 Photographs submitted by the appellants
- 7 Comments on conditions submitted by the Council
- 8 Costs application submitted by the appellants

### **Document received after the hearing**

- 9 Costs response by the Council

## ANNEX

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Existing: SE-2212-03-AC-001A; PP/3096/Chislehurst/F1A, PP/3096/Chislehurst/F2A, PP/3096/Chislehurst/F3 and PP/3096/Chislehurst/F4

Proposed: SE-2212-03-AC-002C; SE-2212-03-AC- 003; SE-2212-03-AC-004B; SE-2212-03-AC-005C; SE-2212-03-AC-006D; SE-2212-03-AC-007B; SE-2212-03-AC-008B; SE-2212-03-AC-009C; SE-2212-03-AC-010C; SE-2212-03-AC-011D; SE-2212-03-AC-012D; SE-2212-03-AC-013A; SE-2212-03-AC-014A; SE-2212-03-AC-015A; SE-2212-03-AC-016A; SE-2212-03-AC-017A; SE-2212-03-AC-018A; SE-2212-03-AC-019A; SE-2212-03-AC-020A; SE-2212-03-AC-021A; SE-2212-03-AC-022A; SE-2212-03-AC-023A; SE-2212-03-AC-024A; SE-2212-03-AC-025; SE-2212-03-AC-026; SE-2212-03-AC-030-039 inclusive; SE-2212-03-AC-050-057 inclusive Levels SE-2212-03-DE-008-Levels layout

Documents: Planning Statement and Appendices; Design and Access Statement; Transport Statement by Paul Basham Associates dated November 2015 and plan 047.0049.005; Construction Management Plan by McCarthy and Stone Rev C, dated 18/12/2016 and amended Set Up Plan SE-2212-04-AC-001C; Heritage Statement by CgMs dated January 2016; Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment by CgMs dated July 2015; Energy Statement by Focus dated Nov 2015; Arboricultural Report by Ian Keen ref AP/8913-RevA/WDC and plan tpp 8913/02 Rev B; landscaping plans SE-2212-04-LA-002; SE-2212-04-LA-004A; SE-2212-04-LA-005; Statement of Community Involvement by Focus dated October 2015; Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey by Innovation Group Environmental Services dated 31.7.2015; Bat Presence/ Absence Survey by Innovation Group Environmental Services dated 23.9.15, Flood Risk Assessment by Conisbee dated 8.10.2015 plus amending emails dated January 8th and 11th 2016 Strategic Drainage Report by Conisbee dated 22.4.16; Site Investigation Report by Crossfield dated August 2015; Noise Impact Assessment by 24Acoustics dated 24.11.2015, Primary Methodology Statement for the Proposed Demolition and dismantling Works at St Mary House, Manor Park Road, Chislehurst by Best Demolition Ltd dated 15.4.2016.

- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed timescale and details of the Construction Management Statement (CMS) dated 8 December 2016, Rev C. Notwithstanding the CMS, in respect of the control of dust, the demolition shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Primary Methodology Statement for the Proposed Demolition and dismantling Works at St Mary House, Manor Park Road, Chislehurst by Best Demolition Ltd dated 15.4.2016
- 4) Whilst the development hereby permitted is being carried out, provision shall be made to accommodate operatives and construction vehicles offloading, parking and turning within the site in accordance with details shown on plan SE 2214 04 AC 001C and such provision shall remain available for such uses throughout the course of the construction period

and shall be removed within 3 months of the first occupation of the development.

- 5) No development shall commence on site, including demolition until such time as a Demolition and Construction Noise and Dust Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and to the agreed timescale throughout the period of the works.
- 6) The development shall be carried out in full on site in accordance with the submitted Contaminated Land Report. If during any works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing by it or on its behalf. Upon completion of the works, a closure report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The closure report shall include details of the remediation works carried out, (removed from the site), the quality assurance certificates and details of post-remediation sampling. The remediation works and closure report shall all be carried out by contractor(s) approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 7) Samples of all external materials, including roof cladding, wall facing materials and cladding, window glass, door and window frames, decorative features and rainwater goods, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any work involving external materials as specified above is carried out. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 8) Prior to the laying out of any of the external hard surfaces of the development, or the erection of any boundary enclosure, details and samples of materials and the height, type and position of enclosures shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority and shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans prior to the first occupation of any of the approved units.
- 9) Prior to the commencement of development, including any demolition works, an Ecological Clerk of Works shall be appointed, at the developer's expense, to carry out a pre-site clearance inspection and the subsequent clearance of the site shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of a written Method statement to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.
- 10) Details of any external lighting within the application site shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to its installation. The lighting shall be designed to minimise light spill for foraging bats and be installed prior to first occupation of the use and in accordance with the approved details and permanently retained thereafter.
- 11) The existing eastern access onto Manor Park Road shall be stopped up at the back edge of the highway for vehicular traffic prior to the first occupation of the development in accordance with details which shall previously have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

- 12) Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied details of parking for 8 bicycles shall be submitted and approved by the local planning authority and the approved facilities shall be provided prior to first occupation of the development and thereafter they shall be permanently retained.
- 13) Prior to the first occupation of the use hereby permitted, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan shall include measures to promote and encourage the use of alternative modes of transport to the car. It shall also include a timetable for the implementation of the proposed measures and details of the mechanisms for implementation and for annual monitoring and updating. The Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timescale and details.
- 14) Detailed plans of the appearance of and the equipment comprising a ventilation system which shall include measures to alleviate fumes and odours (and incorporating activated carbon filters where necessary) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval prior to first occupation of the approved development; after the system has been approved in writing by the authority, it shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the use hereby permitted first commences and shall thereafter be permanently retained in an efficient working manner.
- 15) Prior to the completion of the superstructure of the building, details of the provision of measures to encourage valued landscapes for bats, birds and reptiles in accordance with the Bat Emergence and Reptile Survey report dated August 2015 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and measures shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any of the units and permanently retained thereafter.
- 16) The apartments within the building hereby approved shall, unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority in writing, be used solely for the designed purpose of providing self-contained independent living units of accommodation for person or persons who, for the purpose of acquiring purchase or lease of any of the approved apartments, are contracted into a care package and who will have a minimum age of not less than 70 years of age as required by condition 17 of this permission. Furthermore details of the supporting staff and resources associated with the management of the site and the delivery and implementation of the individual care package(s) associated with the terms of the purchase and occupancy of each apartment, together with the occupants' permitted use of facilities provided within the approved building, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the first occupation of any of the units and the approved arrangements shall be retained as such unless agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The building shall not be used or occupied for any other purpose (including equivalent provision in Class C2 of the Schedule of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or any equivalent provision, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015) no permitted changes of use shall occur, unless express written permission of the local planning authority has been obtained.

- 17) The occupation of the apartments hereby approved shall at all times, and unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority in writing, be limited to a person aged 70 or over and any resident dependant who satisfies the requirements referred to in condition 16 of this permission. No other person shall occupy any of the approved apartments.
- 18) The development hereby permitted shall be built in accordance with the criteria set out in the following:

Building Regulations 2010 M4(2) for the units identified in the Compliance Checklist marked as non-wheelchair compliant units and shall be retained permanently thereafter, and

Building Regulations 2010 M4(3) for the units identified in the Compliance Checklist marked as wheelchair units and shall be retained permanently thereafter.
- 19) Before first occupation of the building hereby permitted parking spaces and turning spaces shall be completed in accordance with the approved plan ref: SE-2212-03-AC-002C and thereafter shall be kept available for such use and no permitted development whether permitted by the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) or not shall be carried out on land indicated or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to the said land.
- 20) The arrangements for storage of refuse (which shall include provision for the storage and collection of recyclable materials) and the means of enclosure shown on the approved drawings shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.
- 21) Prior to first occupation an electric vehicle charging point shall be provided to a minimum of 5% of car parking spaces for occupiers' spaces, and 20% of car parking spaces for staff and visitors' spaces, with a passive provision of electric charging capacity for an additional 30% of car parking spaces.
- 22) Other than structures shown on the approved plans, no other additional structures, including water tanks, plant and lift rooms shall be erected upon the roof(s) of the approved building without the written approval of the local planning authority.
- 23) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(Order) 2015, or any future re-enactment of that Order, no satellite dishes, telecommunications masts or equipment or associated structures, shall be installed on the building without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.
- 24) The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the surface water drainage scheme for the site set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (Rev 2) by Conisbee dated 8th October 2015, the Strategic Drainage Report (Rev 3) by Conisbee dated October 8th 2015, revised drawings entitled Existing Drainage, Soakaway tests, Thames Water records received by email on January 8th 2016 and email from Jean Benard dated January 11th 2016 confirming soakaway capacity of 100 sq metres. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved documents and plans prior to the first use of the

development and shall be maintained in operational order permanently thereafter.

- 25) The development shall be implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Report/Tree Protection Plan (tpp 8913/02 Rev B) submitted and approved as part of the planning application and under the supervision of a retained arboricultural specialist in order to ensure that the correct materials and techniques are employed.
- 26) The landscaping scheme, including replacement and new tree planting, as shown on the submitted drawings shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved on plan SE-2212-04-LA-002; SE-2212-04-LA-004A; SE-2212-04-LA-005 and 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.
- 27) No impact piling shall take place until a piling impact method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling statement.