The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2019

by Mrs H Nicholls MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/W/18/3219397
Land at and adjoining 97 and 98 Harvest Road, Englefield Green TW20 0QR

- 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 Danehurst Developments Limited against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
- The application Ref RU.18/1122, dated 12 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2018.
- The development proposed is demolition of existing buildings and construction of five buildings providing purpose built student accommodation in cluster flats and studios for 166 students with associated vehicular and pedestrian access, bin stores, car and cycle parking and external landscaping.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing buildings and construction of five buildings providing purpose built student accommodation in cluster flats and studios for 166 students with associated vehicular and pedestrian access, bin stores, car and cycle parking and external landscaping at Land at and adjoining 97 and 98 Harvest Road, Englefield Green, TW20 0QR, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref RU.18/1122, dated 12 July 2018, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the appeal application was determined, the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') has been updated. As none of the policies relevant to the appeal have significantly changed, I have had regard to the Framework of 2019 in consideration of the appeal and do not consider that either party is prejudiced by me doing so.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:

   - the character and appearance of the area and Area of Landscape Importance;
   - the setting of the locally listed building, 'Our Lady of the Assumption Roman Catholic Church'; and
   - the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA).

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is located on Harvest Road within the built up area of Englefield Green. The site is a short distance from the main campus of the Royal Holloway University of London (RHUL) and is also within an extensive Area of Landscape Importance.

5. The appeal site has an area of about 0.6 hectares and is formed of part of the land adjoining the 'Our Lady of the Assumption Roman Catholic Church' (hereafter referred to as the Church) and the 'Jurgens Centre'. The other part of the site is currently occupied by two detached bungalows (Nos 97 and 98 Harvest Road) and a large single storey garage. Notwithstanding the Church and its associated buildings and that 'The Happy Man' public house is situated opposite the site on Harvest Road, the surrounding area is primarily residential in nature, comprising predominantly two-storey dwellings in the immediate vicinity and blocks of student residences to the south.

6. The appeal proposal relates to the demolition of the existing dwellings and garage and removal of a belt of trees and the redevelopment of the site to provide five blocks of purpose-built student accommodation for 166 students.

7. In 2009, the Council published the 'Runnymede Borough Council Urban Character Appraisal' (UCA). Specific to the appeal site, this document identifies the key characteristics of the two adjoining areas which the appeal site straddles; the 'Central' area and the 'South' area. The adjoining Church and Jurgens Centre fall within the 'North east' character area. The frontage of the appeal site is located on the edge of the area where the dwellings are generally two storeys, laid out in a mixture of short terraces, detached and semi-detached pairs with narrow frontages of late 19th century and early 20th century era. However, the frontage dwelling (No 97) and No 98 actually better fit the profile of the 'North east' character area.

8. The middle and rearward parts of the site are defined in the UCA as being outside of the historically developed area and are instead closely related to the post-war two storey low density housing at St Cuthbert's Close and to the RHUL campus with its much larger three and four storey blocks of student housing, 'George Elliot Halls'. The three storey blocks in 'George Elliot Halls' assimilate with the residential properties further north of the site on South Road and Harvest Road. The four storey buildings are located to the rear.

9. The site has a narrow frontage onto Harvest Road and would incorporate a similar approach to the 'George Elliot Halls'. Block A would be sited on the Harvest Road frontage and would be two storeys high with the appearance of two adjoining gable fronted dwellings, similar to No 15 Harvest Road. The remainder of the site's frontage would be occupied by the site's access, the retained Oak tree and an area of landscaping with new boundary wall.

10. The other proposed blocks of accommodation (Blocks B, C, D and E) would increase in height with the increase in distance from Harvest Road. The three and four storey blocks would be broadly level with the front building line of the Jurgens Centre and would be set back further into the site than any building within the adjoining 'George Elliot Halls' development. The Council has suggested that the higher density of the appeal proposal is considered to be

less sensitive to the setting of the locally listed building and village character that exists further from the RHUL campus with the 'George Elliot Halls' development being at the 'upper limit'.

11. However, in my view, this calculation does not reflect that the 'George Elliot Halls' development appears to have been designed to leave significant spaces around the protected trees within the site and forming part of its boundaries. Consequently, the 'George Elliot Halls' scheme appears high density and there are few trees on the Harvest Road or Egham Hill frontages to soften its urban character. Therefore, whilst the proposal would be of a high density relative to the existing nearby Victorian and post-war housing, it would still appear to be of a similar density to the 'George Elliot Halls' development.

12. The proposal would retain the significant Oak tree on Harvest Road, and trees within the southern boundary of the site which separate it from 'George Elliot Halls'. Other smaller specimens of trees would be retained to the rear of Nos 96 and 96a Harvest Road and new tree planting would form a large component of the scheme to mitigate against the loss of the belt of trees which currently form part of the boundary of the Church and associated buildings.

13. In respect of the scale of the proposal, a comparison has been drawn between the height of those in the 'George Elliot Halls' development with the proposed buildings being higher in some cases. The proposed buildings have been designed to be deliberately different and their scale and proportions would still be suitably accommodated within the site despite the height differentiation. The 73.58m AOD datum height of the Church's ridge would not be exceeded by any of the four storey buildings, and the campanile of the Church would still be the highest built element in the immediate vicinity at 78.87m AOD. The appeal proposal, whilst also incorporating sizeable blocks, would also have a greater degree of visual permeability from Harvest Road, with the blocks spaced back from the road and with a central planted courtyard area. This would enable the proposal to better utilise the retained trees to minimise its impact.

14. The proposal would also reference the heights of existing trees on the southern and eastern boundaries that help to minimise its impact on the character of the wider area. It would safeguard the important trees protected by TPO and include extensive new landscaping. The siting, scale and design of the proposal would also maintain the Area of Landscape Importance which is an extensive local landscape designation relative to the size of the appeal site.

15. Whilst the proposal would be a new introduction into an area with a village character and appearance, its Harvest Road frontage element would assimilate sufficiently well into this without appearing to create a further extension of the RHUL campus in terms of mimicry of its design and appearance. The larger buildings would be sufficiently spaced from Harvest Road to minimise any potential for visual dominance or the creation of a harmful sense of enclosure.

16. When viewed from within or at the access to the proposed development, it would appear grand in scale and relatively urban. It would contain design references to some of the nearby Victorian housing, but its building heights, scale and the flatted nature would be more aligned with the RHUL campus. Given the topography, existing buildings, intervening distance and scale of the proposal, it is not anticipated that it would be obtrusive from Victoria Street.

17. The much closer distance from St Cuthbert's Close to the closest part of the proposal would mean that it would be much more visible. However, St Cuthbert's Close has a spacious quality about it and already lies within close proximity to the sizeable Church building and the Jurgens Centre. The proposal would maintain a degree of separation from St Cuthbert's Close and glimpsed views of the visible respective parts thereof would not appear visually obtrusive anymore than the Church is in similar views.

18. In conclusion on this main issue, the proposal would alter the streetscene on Harvest Road from wider viewpoints but due to its scale, design and appearance, would not be overly harmful in this regard. The proposal would not be harmful to the wider Area of Landscape Importance and would therefore comply with Local Plan Policy NE8.

19. In terms of impact on the character and appearance of the area, the proposal would better assimilate with the adjoining RHUL campus than the residential dwellings of predominately Victorian period. However, that is not to say that for the proposal to be seen in context with it would erode, or fail to respect this prevalent character. The character of the area would still be capable of being appreciated for its essential qualities and the proposal would form a high quality, contemporary urban addition alongside it. For these reasons, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy BE2 of the Local Plan, which, amongst other things, requires that proposals are respectful to townscape character.

Impact on locally listed church

20. In respect of the impact of the proposal on heritage assets, my assessment is limited to its effect on the setting of the locally listed Church. The Church by Joseph Goldie dates back to the 1930's and is considered to be a striking Byzantine-style building inspired by works of greater significance by the architect's father. Its external noteworthy features include its campanile and large rose window which have been unaltered. However, it is a late and restrained building of its style and the quality of its internal features is inconsistent due to numerous renovations. As such, Historic England opted not to formally 'list' the Church.

21. Although the building is locally listed, in terms of the Framework, it is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. Paragraph 197 of the Framework states that in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset.

22. In this case, the proposal would indirectly affect the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, through altering its setting and the way in which it is experienced. I note that the Council's Conservation Officer did not find that the proposal would harm the setting of the Church. Whilst my attention has been drawn to the purchase of the appeal site and the way in which the sale proceeds could fund repair works to the Church, this transaction has not been structured in such a way that would enable it to be attributed weight in the planning balance as a form of 'enabling' development.

23. The setting of the Church includes its large car park, the Jurgens Centre and land adjacent to it up to the tree-lined southern boundary. The dwellings in St Cuthbert's Close and backs of Nos 94 – 97 Harvest Road also form part of

the enclosure of the setting, along with the many visible trees. Due to the local topography and its relatively modest scale, the Church is not easily visible from surrounding viewpoints. The access point from Harvest Road is one of the limited viewpoints from which it is experienced in its wider context, otherwise it is well-contained within its enclosed setting. As such, the Church cannot be said to be the most prominent local building. Rather, the Grade I listed Founders building of the RHUL is the most prominent. Its uppermost parts are visible from many surrounding streets and it has significantly influenced the development of the surrounding area.

24. The tree-lined southern boundary and the area of lawn that would be removed and subsumed within the proposal do not contribute more than modestly to the significance of the Church. They provide a spacious and verdant quality to its setting but have a degree of detachment due to their siting in relation thereto. The loss of some of the spaciousness would not be harmful and nor would it affect the operational usability of the Church or the Jurgens Centre.

25. The loss of the tree-lined boundary and the construction of the sizeable buildings would have the greatest impact on the setting. Whilst the Church has little primacy amongst buildings in a wider context due to its distance therefrom and enclosed setting, the introduction of buildings of competing scale within its initially denuded setting would be noticeably urbanising.

26. The replacement of the trees would make a notable difference to the softness and separation of the proposal from the setting of the Church, however, these would take a particularly long period of time to fully establish. The impact on the setting beyond the trees' maturity, with the upper storeys of the buildings still estimated as being visible above the canopies, would still result in a degree of harm to the setting of the Church. The weight I attribute to the landscaping measures is also moderated by the inability to fully guarantee that they would establish in the manner envisaged.

27. Local Plan Policy BE13 sets out that proposals that detrimentally affect the character or appearance of a locally listed building, or its setting, will not normally be acceptable. My conclusions above indicate that there is a finding of harm to the setting of the locally listed building in that it would urbanise its currently verdant setting and thus there is tension with Local Plan Policy BE13. In terms of the Framework, this indirect harm would be at the lower end of the spectrum of harm which necessitates a balanced judgement, to which I return below.

SPA and Appropriate Assessment (AA)

28. From the evidence, it appears that the site is approximately 6km away from the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which is designated in accordance with the Habitats Directive as transposed in the UK by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 ('Habitats Regs'). The SPA comprises a network of heathland sites which support internationally important numbers of bird species: Dartford Warblers. Woodlarks and Nightjars. These birds nest on or near the ground and as a result they are very susceptible to predation of adults, chicks and eggs (particularly by cats, rats and crows) and to disturbance from informal recreational use, especially walking and dog walking. Any proposal which by reason of its proximity of the SPA, within a 'Zone of Influence', that may result in additional recreational disturbance is likely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA.

29. The SPA 'Zones of Influence' set out in the Runnymede Borough Council Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) (amended 2009) extend to up to 5km from the SPA. It is not disputed that the appeal site lies outside of this range at approximately 6km away from the SPA. However, Natural England have recently indicated that the characteristics of proposals for new dwellings and C2 student accommodation, coupled with their proximity to the SPA within 5km to 7km from the SPA, present an increased risk of disturbance to its qualifying features in a similar manner to other proposals within the originally defined Zones of Influence. This risk is due to increased visitor pressure arising from the increase in residents. As a consequence, it is necessary for me to undertake an AA.

30. The conservation objectives for the SPA are to "*Ensure that the integrity of the site is maintained or restored as appropriate, and ensure that the site contributes to achieving the aims of the Wild Birds Directive, by maintaining or restoring the extent and distribution of the habitats of the qualifying features; the structure and function of the habitats of the qualifying features; the supporting processes on which the habitats of the qualifying features rely; the population of each of the qualifying features, and, the distribution of the qualifying features within the site*." I have had regard to these objectives in undertaking my duties in accordance with the Habitats Regs.

31. The proposal is not directly connected with or necessary for the management of the protected site. It is clear that the proposal, given its scale, nature and distance from the protected site, would be likely to have significant effects either alone, or in combination with other projects. The only way of avoiding adverse effects on the integrity of the protected site without seeking an alternative solution would be to secure appropriate mitigation. The parties agree that the mitigation measures are necessary to avoid the likelihood of significant effects.

32. The parties also agree that an appropriate Avoidance Strategy which involves the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and a financial contribution towards the SPA wide Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) project would be necessary and sufficient to address the impacts from the proposed development.

33. The contribution for the SAMM which is ordinarily calculated with reference to the SPG has been discounted by Natural England due to the increased distance from the SPA (outside of the 5km Zone of Influence). The payment amount sought is £2756.25. The appellant has provided a Unilateral Undertaking to secure this payment and the Council has agreed that the form and wording of the undertaking is suitable to sufficiently bind the land and ensure that it is put towards the funding of access management and monitoring the effects of mitigation measures across the SPA. I am satisfied that the specified contribution is not towards the provision of infrastructure, as defined in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010, as amended) (CIL Regulations), and is therefore not affected by the pooling restrictions therein. The contribution is necessary, directly related to the development and fair and reasonable in scale and kind to the development proposed. I am therefore satisfied that it meets the appropriate tests and is therefore an obligation I can take into account.

34. It is understood that one of the Council's own areas of SANG would be provided to offset the impacts of the proposal on the protected site. The SANGs are already in existence but a contribution would be sought to permit access to the residents of the proposed development thereto. The Council considers that there is sufficient capacity within its SANGs to mitigate any harm from the appeal proposal. However, such a contribution falls outside the ambit of CIL Regulations. As such, the Council has resolved with Natural England to govern access to the SANG by means of a Land Transaction under its general Local Government powers. In this case the Appellant is willing to enter into a Land Transaction agreement in respect of a SANG contribution of £8,750.

35. The parties recognise that it is exceptional to use a Grampian style condition in this context. However, in the circumstances of this appeal, they agree that there would be no legal bar to use a condition in this way and it would not conflict with the general advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.

36. On 9 July 2019 a consultation with Natural England was undertaken in accordance with the Habitats Regulations. The response from Natural England confirms its opinion that the proposed SAMM mitigation secured by a Unilateral Undertaking is acceptable. Natural England also confirms that subject to the Grampian style condition being enforced that the SANG mitigation, secured by the Land Transaction agreement, is also acceptable to address the anticipated effects of the development. This response is consistent with Natural England's earlier consultation response provided for the appeal application.

37. Having had regard to the views of Natural England, I am satisfied that the mitigation described above can be appropriately secured and that it would be sufficient to prevent harmful effects on the integrity and interest features of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. As such, there would be no conflict with the Habitats Directive and the Habitats Regulations. The proposal also complies with Policy NE16 of the Local Plan[1], the SPG and the provisions of the Framework.

Other Matters

38. The Council cite that the proposal would appear to be an extension of the RHUL campus other than by RHUL itself, extra to the RHUL masterplan proposals. There does not appear to be any policy that specifically prevents speculative proposals for purpose-built student accommodation by other developers and nor has the Council included a reason relating to the principle of development. My attention has also been drawn to another scheme approved by the Council for a similarly speculative proposal outside of the RHUL campus which suggests that this aspect does not conflict with the Development Plan.

39. I also note the Council's reference to the absence of a nomination agreement from RHUL, although a condition could adequately address the occupancy of the proposed buildings in any event.

40. I am mindful that the proposal would intensify the amount of student accommodation in the area. The proposed development in combination with the adjacent RHUL campus would result in a sizeable student presence within this part of Englefield Green. However, the university is an integral part of the

[1] Runnymede Borough Local Plan, Second Alteration (2001)

town and there is nothing of substance to support the fears that the proposal would unbalance the existing population or harm the area's social well-being.

41. I have taken into account all other matters raised including the representations from interested persons, many of which relate to the impact on the area which I have dealt with under the main issues. A number of residents have expressed concerns regarding the anti-social behaviour associated with some students living within the area. I note the fears that the proposal could exacerbate this situation. However, not all students behave in this way and anti-social behaviour is not limited to the student population. Separate legislation exists to deal with such behaviour and a planning condition is suggested to ensure adherence to a Management Statement to deter anti-social behaviour. Whilst I am not unsympathetic to these concerns, this reason does not justify withholding planning permission.

42. The proposal would alter the outlook for some neighbouring residents. The impact on views from some houses towards the proposal would be different to the verdant views currently enjoyed. However, it is a long established planning principle that there is no entitlement to a private view. It seems to me that the proposed buildings would not be so close or tall as to have an overbearing or oppressive impact for those living near it.

43. The imposition of an occupancy condition and careful management of the appeal scheme through implementation of a Travel Plan could deter students from bringing cars to the site and parking in the surrounding streets. The site is also conveniently located for the RHUL campus, the train station, bus services and town centre amenities and facilities. This, along with the cycle parking provision, has the potential to limit the need to travel by car. There is no technical or other cogent evidence to justify reaching a different conclusion to the Council's highways officers in this regard.

Planning Balance

44. Irrespective of any differences in rent levels, the proposal would meet a market need for student housing in the area and would increase choice and quality in the market for student accommodation. The need for student housing has placed pressure on the local housing market. The proposal would also support the University's growth and development with convenient access to the RHUL campus. This weighs heavily in support of granting planning permission.

45. The proposed development would also provide economic benefits. These include short-term benefits for the construction industry during the construction phase, as well as support for local services and facilities once the buildings are occupied. I also afford weight to these additional public benefits.

46. The proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area and the mitigation that can be appropriately secured would be sufficient to prevent harmful effects on the interest features of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. However, the absence of harm is a neutral factor in the assessment of the proposal.

47. The proposal would harm the setting of a locally listed building which raises tension with Local Plan Policy BE13. I consider that the harm to the setting of the non-designated heritage asset would be at the lower end of the spectrum. In this context, I recognise that paragraph 197 of the Framework requires that

for proposals that indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. In my opinion, the aforementioned public benefits would outweigh the anticipated harm to the setting of the non-designated heritage asset.

Conditions

48. I have considered the suggested planning conditions having regard to paragraph 55 of the Framework and advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. Where pre-commencement conditions have been used they have been agreed in writing by the appellant. I have changed the wording of the suggested conditions in some cases in the interests of enforceability and precision and have generally removed the discretionary clauses in the interests of transparency and to ensure proper compliance with the planning process.

49. In addition to the statutory time limit, a condition requiring adherence to the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. It is not necessary to include the various background documents, which have been referred to in individual conditions where appropriate (1, 2).

50. In order to ensure appropriate management of construction traffic to avoid prejudicial impacts on highway safety, a condition requiring the submission of a construction traffic management plan prior to commencement of the development is necessary (3).

51. In order to protect the health of future occupants, it is necessary to require a contamination investigation to be undertaken at the various stages of construction, beginning with site characterisation prior to commencement of construction works (4).

52. In the interests of the biodiversity value of the site, a pre-commencement condition requiring the submission of a landscape and ecology management plan is necessary (5).

53. To ensure that the scheme is provided with an adequate surface water drainage system, a pre-commencement condition requiring the details of such a scheme to be provided and implemented is necessary (6).

54. In order to ensure the protection of retained trees, the tree protection measures as specified should be provided prior to commencement of works on site and should be thereafter maintained until works are complete (7).

55. As part of a precautionary approach to ensuring the protection of protected species, it is necessary for a bat roost assessment to be undertaken and provided prior to any tree felling works being undertaken (8).

56. Similarly, in order to secure the ecological enhancements in a timely manner, it is necessary to impose a condition requiring details to be submitted to and approved by the Council (9).

57. In order to preserve any potential archaeological interests, a condition requiring an archaeological assessment is necessary prior to works below ground commencing (10).

58. In order to maintain the character and appearance of the area, a condition requiring details and samples of the materials of construction is necessary prior to their use (11).

59. In the interests of the visual and environmental qualities of the area, it is necessary to impose a condition for details of the waste storage areas to be submitted for approval and implemented in a timely manner prior to commencement (12).

60. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to impose a condition requiring details of boundary treatments to be approved (13). For the same reason, it is necessary to require details of surfacing treatments for areas of hard landscaping (14).

61. A key component of the scheme in order to maintain the character and appearance of the area is the tree planting and landscaping, the main detail of which is approved as part of the approved drawings. Condition 15 is necessary to ensure that a timetable for landscape implementation is submitted, approved and adhered to as set out.

62. For the reasons set out in the main issue, condition 16 is necessary to secure the SANG mitigation to protect the integrity of the SPA and its features. I do not have sufficient details in respect of the suitability or timeliness of an alternative physical provision of SANG and have deleted this option from the Council's suggested condition.

63. In the interests of the biodiversity value of the site, it is necessary to impose a condition requiring details of the lux levels of any external lighting proposed within the scheme. This will also ensure the protection of the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers (17).

64. A condition requiring further detail of the proposed new vehicular access and its pedestrian crossing is necessary in the interests of highway safety (18). For similar reasons, a condition requiring the stopping up of the existing access when the alternative is available is also necessary (19).

65. In the interests of the safety and convenience of highway users, the provision of the proposed parking spaces and their retention thereafter is required by condition 20. For similar reasons, a condition relating to the implementation and continued adherence to the approved travel plan is also necessary (21). For similar reasons and also for those relating to the social cohesion of the area, it is necessary to condition the implementation and adherence to the approved management plan (22).

66. In the interests of the living conditions of future residents, it is necessary to require additional details of external ventilation for the proposed blocks where necessary (23).

67. To ensure the completion and adequate future maintenance of the approved surface water scheme, a condition requiring a verification report and associated management details is necessary (24).

68. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, further details of the solar photovoltaic panels are required before they are installed on any buildings (25).

69. In order to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers, a condition requiring the windows in the western elevation of the first floor of Block B to be made obscure glazed is necessary prior to its occupation (26).

70. Lastly, in order to ensure that the development is only used for its intended purposes and to ensure that the SPA mitigation is effective, a condition limiting its use for student accommodation purposes and only for students of RHUL is necessary (27).

Conclusion

71. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions set out in the schedule below.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1) The development for which permission is hereby granted must be commenced not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the following approved plans:

Plan/document title	*Reference number*	*Date*
Street Scene Elevation	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-04211 Rev P2	18.10.18
Proposed Third Floor Plan	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-02213 Rev P3	19.10.18
Site Plan as proposed	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-01200 Rev P6	19.10.18
Proposed Site Elevations AA & BB	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-04210 Rev P4	14.11.18
Proposed Second Floor Plan	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-02212 Rev P3	19.10.18
Proposed Roof Plan	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-27020 Rev P4	19.10.18
Proposed Ground Floor Plan	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-02210 Rev P3	19.10.18
Proposed First Floor Plan	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-02211 Rev P3	19.10.18
Block E Floor Plans	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-02205 Rev P5	19.10.18
Block E Elevations	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-04204 Rev P6	19.10.18
Block D Floor Plans	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-02204 Rev P5	19.10.18
Block D Elevations	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-04203 Rev P6	18.10.18
Block C Floor Plans	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-02203 Rev P6	19.10.18
Block C Elevations	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-04202 Rev P6	18.10.18
Block C Basement	1140-JSA-XX-1-DR-A-02201 Rev P5	19.10.18
Block B Floor Plans	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-02201 Rev P6	19.10.18
Block B Elevations	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-04201 Rev P6	19.10.18
Block A Floor Plans	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-02200 Rev P7	19.10.18
Block A Elevations	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-04200 Rev P7	19.10.18
Planting Plan	151112-STL-XX-XX-DR-L-XXXX-09040 Rev PL06	18.10.18
Ornamental Shrub Planting	151112-STL-XX-XX-DR-L-XXXX-09041 Rev PL03	18.10.18

North boundary Elevation View – Tree Growth	151112-STL-XX-XX-DR-L-XXXX-09301 Rev PL04	18.10.18
Landscape GA	151112-STL-XX-XX-DR-L-XXXX-09002 Rev PL06	18.10.18
Topographical Survey		January 2018
Proposed external Lighting	11232-E-63-EXT rev P2	27.06.18
Location Plan	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-0-000-P1	11.07.18
Proposed external CCTV	11232-E-64-EXT-P2	27.06.18
Existing Site Plan	1140-JSA-XX-XX-DR-A-01000 Rev P1	11.07.18
Phase 2 Tree Protection Plan	159499/TPP Phase 2	25.10.18
BS5837:2012 Tree Survey		07.11.17
Tree Retention and Protection Plan – Demolition	159499/TRPP Phase 1	25.10.18

3) No development shall commence until an updated Construction Transport Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to include details of:
(a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
(b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
(c) storage of plant and materials
(d) vehicle routing
(e) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway
(f) before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused
(g) on-site turning for construction vehicles has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(h) Proposals for the bulk movement of materials to or from the site
Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development.

4) i) Site Characterisation

No development shall commence until an assessment of the nature and extent of contamination on the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and shall assess any contamination on the site whether or not it originates on the site. The report of the findings must include:

(a) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;

(b) an assessment of the potential risks to:

- human health
- property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes
- adjoining land
- ground waters and surface waters
- ecological systems
- archaeological sites and ancient monuments

ii) Submission of Remediation Scheme

If found to be required no development shall take place until a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, an appraisal and remedial options, proposal of the preferred option(s), a timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

iii) Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

If found to be required, the remediation scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable of works.

Upon completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report (validation report) that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

iv) Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority and once the Local Planning Authority has identified the part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination, development must be halted on that part of the site. An assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Condition (i) or otherwise agreed and where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme, together with a timetable for its implementation must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the requirements of Condition (ii) in the form of a Remediation Strategy which follows DEFRA CLR11 approaches. The measures in the approved remediation scheme must then be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a validation (verification) plan and report must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with Condition (iii).

5) No development shall commence until a landscape and ecology management plan (LEMP) and a timetable for its implementation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The LEMP shall be based on the proposed impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures specified in Table 7 'Evaluation of site' of both the

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal reports dated 28.06.18 and the above referenced landscape drawing, ref 151112-STL-XX-XX-DR-L-XXXX-09002 Rev PL06 dated 18.10.18. The LEMP should also provide adequate details of the following:

- Description and evaluation of features to be managed and created including quantified measures to compensate for loss of proposed tree and hedgerow removal, including significantly enhanced native planting.
- Numbers and locations of alternative bird, bat and reptile habitat provision, including provision integral to the design of the new buildings where feasible.
- Measures to ensure the site retains adequate foraging and commuting opportunities for native UK mammals including permeable fencing.
- Aims and objectives of management
- Appropriate management options to achieve aims and objectives
- Prescriptions for management actions
- Preparation of a work schedule for securing biodiversity enhancements in perpetuity
- Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the LEMP
- Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures
- Details of legal / funding mechanisms

All elements of the LEMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetable.

6) Prior to commencement of the development details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national Non- Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDS. The required drainage details shall include:
a) Evidence that the proposed solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+40%) allowance for climate change storm events, during all stages of the development (Pre, Post and during), associated discharge rates and storages volumes shall be provided using infiltration based drainage techniques.
b) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels, and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc)
c) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.
d) A plan showing exceedance flows (i.e. during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected.
e) Details of how the applicant seeks to protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters.
The drainage scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

7) Prior to commencement of the development (including demolition and before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site), the phase 1 tree protective measures within the Tree Retention and Protection Plan Demolition (ref 159499/TRPP Phase 1, dated 25.10.18) and the Arboricultural

Method Statement (ref 159499/PRO, dated 25.10.18) shall be erected in accordance with the approved details.

Demolition works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement and phase 1 protective measures shall remain in place until demolition is complete. Phase 2 protective measures shall be erected in accordance with the details within Phase 2 – Tree Protection Plan (ref 159499/TPP Phase 2, dated 25.10.18) and the Arboricultural Method Statement prior to the commencement of construction works.

Construction shall be carried out in accordance with the Tree Protection Plans and Arboricultural Method Statement. Phase 2 protective measure shall remain in place until all works are complete and all machinery and materials have finally left the site.

No tree to be retained shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed and no works to the above or below ground parts of the trees in excess of that which is hereby permitted shall be carried out without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority until the expiration of five years from the date of completion of the development. If, within this time, a retained tree is pruned not in accordance with BS3998, removed, uprooted, damaged in any way, destroyed or dies, replacement trees shall be planted at the same place, sufficient to replace the lost value of the tree as calculated using an amenity tree valuation system. The number, size, species, location and timing of the replacement planting shall be as specified by the Local Planning Authority.

Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition nor shall any fires be started, no tipping, refuelling, disposal of solvents or cement mixing carried out and ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation or vehicular access, other than that detailed within the approved plans, be made without the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. There shall be no burning within six metres of the canopy of any retained trees.

8) Prior to the felling of any existing trees within the site, a bat roost assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. When approved, the development shall be undertaken in complete accordance with the approved details.

9) Prior to the commencement of above ground construction of the development hereby permitted further details of ecological enhancements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include provisions for enhanced native planting within the application site, proposed numbers, design and locations for the provision of bat boxes, bird boxes and reptile habitat provision and measures to retain adequate foraging and commuting opportunities for wildlife. When approved, the development shall be undertaken in complete accordance with the approved details.

10) Prior to the commencement of any works below current ground levels, the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, shall secure the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which shall be submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. When approved, the development shall be undertaken in complete accordance with the approved details.

11) Prior to the commencement of above ground construction of the development hereby permitted, further details of the external materials to be used in the external elevations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

12) Prior to the commencement of the above ground construction of the development hereby permitted, details of the siting, size and design of the refuse and recycling bin storage areas for each building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The refuse and recycling bin stores and facilities shall then be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development and retained thereafter.

13) Prior to the commencement of the above ground construction of the development hereby permitted detailed drawings of any walls, fences or other means of enclosure within or around the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

14) Prior to the commencement of the above ground construction of the development hereby permitted details, including samples where necessary, of all surfacing materials, including those to all access driveways/forecourts shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. When approved the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

15) The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in complete accordance with the soft landscaping scheme Planting Plan (ref 151112-STL-XX-XX-DR-L-XXXX-09040 Rev PL06) dated 18.10.18, Ornamental Shrub Planting (ref 151112-STL-XX-XX-DR-L-XXXX-09041 Rev PL03) dated 18.10.18 and Landscape GA (ref 151112-STL-XX-XX-DR-L-XXXX-09002 Rev PL06) dated 18.10.18. Prior to the commencement of the above ground construction, a timetable for the implementation of the landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. When approved the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed timetable.

    Any new planting hereby approved, which until the expiration of five years from the date of completion of the development, are removed, or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as practicable with others of suitable size and species, following consultation with the Local Planning Authority.

16) Prior to the commencement of the above ground construction a scheme for the mitigation of the effects of the development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall make provision for the delivery of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and be retained as such thereafter.

17) Prior to installation, details of any external lighting (including their design, positioning within the application site and a proposed lux levels plan) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The

lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and be retained as such thereafter.

18) The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until the proposed design of the new vehicular access to Harvest Road has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall also include the design of the dropped kerbs and tactile paving at the pedestrian crossing points of the access. When approved the development shall be undertaken in complete accordance with the approved plans and shall be thereafter retained.

19) The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied until the existing redundant accesses from 97 and 98 Harvest Road shall be permanently closed and any kerbs and footway shall be fully reinstated.

20) The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained for their designated purposes.

21) The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until the applicant has implemented the Travel Plan (T&PPB6966R001F0.1) dated 03.07.18. The occupation shall continue to be managed in accordance with the strategy in the Travel Plan for the lifetime of the development.

22) The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until the Management Statement for Student Accommodation dated June 2018 has been implemented. The occupation shall continue to be managed in accordance with the strategy in the Management Statement for the lifetime of the development.

23) The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until further details of the design of external ventilation to habitable rooms have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to allow a sufficient supply of ventilation to habitable rooms when windows are closed. When approved, the proposed development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved scheme before the development is first occupied and shall thereafter be retained.

24) The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls).

25) The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until further details of the proposed design and projection from the roof of the proposed photovoltaic panels upon the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

26) Block B of the development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until, the first floor windows in the western (side) elevation has been fitted with obscured glazing (at Pilkington Glass Level 4 or equivalent) and any part of the

windows that are less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be non-opening and fixed shut. The windows shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

27) The student accommodation hereby approved shall be retained as student accommodation for students of the Royal Holloway University of London only and shall not be used for any other purpose.