

Subject to  
S106

**PLANNING REPORT**

Printed for officer by  
Mrs Helen Donnelly on 30 July 2015

**Application reference: 15/3072/FUL**  
**TEDDINGTON WARD**

DCM

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
15.07.2015	15.07.2015	09.09.2015	09.09.2015

**Site:**

Christ Church, Station Road, Teddington,

**Proposal:**

Conversion, extension and alteration of the existing church building to provide for 6 x 2 bedroom flats over four levels together with 6 off-street car parking spaces, motorcycle parking, garden amenity areas and refuse, recycling and cycle parking areas.

Status: Pending Consideration (If status = HOLD please check that all is OK before you proceed any further with this application)

**APPLICANT NAME**

Mr C, O, W & M Hamilton  
6 Park Road  
Hampton Hill  
Middlesex  
TW12 1HB  
United Kingdom

**AGENT NAME**

Mr Sati Panesar  
Cervantes  
Ellesmere Road  
Weybridge  
Surrey  
KT13 0HQ  
United Kingdom

**DC Site Notice:** printed on 30.07.2015 and posted on 07.08.2015 and due to expire on 28.08.2015

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**

**Consultee**

Thames Water Development Control Department  
LBRUT Transport  
14D Urban D  
LBRuT Ecology  
14D POL

**Expiry Date**

20.08.2015  
13.08.2015  
13.08.2015  
13.08.2015  
13.08.2015

**Neighbours:**

Miles Morris, 56 West End Lane, Esher, KT10 8LF - 30.07.2015  
8 Christchurch Avenue, Teddington, TW11,, - 30.07.2015  
11D Station Road, Teddington, TW11 9AA - 30.07.2015  
9 Station Road, Teddington, TW11 9AA, - 30.07.2015  
Asquith Day Nursery, 16 Cedar Road, Teddington, TW11 9AL, - 30.07.2015  
6 Cedar Road, Teddington, TW11 9AL, - 30.07.2015  
11 Bridgeman Road, Teddington, TW11 9BL, - 30.07.2015  
5 Station Road, Teddington, TW11 9AA, - 30.07.2015  
5A Station Road, Teddington, TW11 9AA, - 30.07.2015  
14 Christchurch Avenue, Teddington, TW11 9AB - 30.07.2015  
1 Teddington Business Park, Station Road, Teddington, TW11 9BQ, - 30.07.2015  
Scout Hut, Station Road, Teddington, TW11 9AA, - 30.07.2015  
Flat 7, 3 Bridgeman Road, Teddington, TW11 9BL, - 30.07.2015  
Flat 6, 3 Bridgeman Road, Teddington, TW11 9BL, - 30.07.2015  
Flat 5, 3 Bridgeman Road, Teddington, TW11 9BL, - 30.07.2015  
Flat 4, 3 Bridgeman Road, Teddington, TW11 9BL, - 30.07.2015  
Flat 3, 3 Bridgeman Road, Teddington, TW11-9BL, - 30.07.2015  
Flat 2, 3 Bridgeman Road, Teddington, TW11 9BL, - 30.07.2015  
Flat 1, 3 Bridgeman Road, Teddington, TW11 9BL, - 30.07.2015

Flat 2,8 Cedar Road,Teddington,TW11 9AL, - 30.07.2015  
 Flat 1,8 Cedar Road,Teddington,TW11 9AL, - 30.07.2015  
 11C Station Road,Teddington,TW11 9AA - 30.07.2015  
 11B Station Road,Teddington,TW11 9AA - 30.07.2015  
 11A Station Road,Teddington,TW11 9AA - 30.07.2015  
 Cairns House,10 Station Road,Teddington,TW11 9AA, - 30.07.2015  
 11 Christchurch Avenue,Teddington,TW11 9AB, - 30.07.2015  
 9 Christchurch Avenue,Teddington,TW11 9AB, - 30.07.2015  
 7 Christchurch Avenue,Teddington,TW11 9AB, - 30.07.2015  
 5 Christchurch Avenue,Teddington,TW11 9AB, - 30.07.2015  
 2 Christchurch Avenue,Teddington,TW11 9AB, - 30.07.2015  
 7 Bridgeman Road,Teddington,TW11 9BL, - 30.07.2015  
 5 Bridgeman Road,Teddington,TW11 9BL, - 30.07.2015  
 1 Bridgeman Road,Teddington,TW11 9AJ, - 30.07.2015  
 12 Cedar Road,Teddington,TW11 9AL, - 30.07.2015  
 14 Cedar Road,Teddington,TW11 9AL, - 30.07.2015  
 10 Cedar Road,Teddington,TW11 9AL, - 30.07.2015  
 Park House,Station Road,Teddington,TW11 9AD, - 30.07.2015  
 11E Station Road,Teddington,TW11 9AA, - 30.07.2015  
 7 Station Road,Teddington,TW11 9AA, - 30.07.2015  
 9 Bridgeman Road,Teddington,TW11 9BL, - 30.07.2015  
 12 Christchurch Avenue,Teddington,TW11 9AB, - 30.07.2015  
 10 Christchurch Avenue,Teddington,TW11 9AB, - 30.07.2015  
 6 Christchurch Avenue,Teddington,TW11 9AB, - 30.07.2015  
 4 Christchurch Avenue,Teddington,TW11 9AB, - 30.07.2015  
 3 Christchurch Avenue,Teddington,TW11 9AB, - 30.07.2015  
 1 Christchurch Avenue,Teddington,TW11 9AB, - 30.07.2015

**History: Development Management, Appeals, Building Control, Enforcements:**

Development Management

Status: REF Application:13/4094/DEMPN  
 Date:11/12/2013 Proposed demolition of Christ Church

Development Management

Status: RNO Application:14/T0165/TCA  
 Date:07/03/2014 T1-Front of Church - Leyland Cypress - Fell to ground level and grind down stump to 300mm below ground level and replant

Development Management

Status: WDN Application:14/0108/VOID  
 Date:29/05/2014 DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING VACANT AND DERELICT CHURCH (USE CLASS D1) AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BUILDING INCORPORATING A NEW CHURCH, SEPARATE HEALTH CENTRE (USE CLASS D1) AND ANCILLARY PHARMACY (USE CLASS A1), AND RESIDENTIAL (SEVEN FLATS) INCLUDING HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING, 21 CAR PARKING SPACES AND CYCLE PROVISION.

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:15/3072/FUL  
 Date: Conversion, extension and alteration of the existing church building to provide for 6 x 2 bedroom flats over four levels together with 6 off-street car parking spaces, motorcycle parking, garden amenity areas and refuse, recycling and cycle parking areas.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 15.08.2003 Refurbishment of toilets in Church hall, to include disabled toilet and shower. Removal of part of existing wall between toilets. Provision of new mains pressure hot water system.

Reference: 03/1640/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 02.04.2014 New mixed use development consisting of healthcare centre, Church and residential units

Reference: 14/0712/IN

Enforcement

Opened Date: 23.03.2015

Enforcement Enquiry

Reference: 15/0156/EN/EOP

---

**Recommendation:**

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer-delegated-powers= YES / NO

**I therefore recommend the following:**

- 1. REFUSAL
- 2. PERMISSION
- 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE

subject to S106

This application is CIL liable

YES\*     NO  
(\*If yes, complete CIL tab in Uniform)

This application requires a Legal Agreement

YES\*     NO  
(\*If yes, complete Development Condition Monitoring in Uniform)

This application has representations online (which are not on the file)

YES     NO

This application has representations on file

YES     NO

Case Officer (Initials): *[Signature]*

Dated: 19/09/16

**I agree the recommendation:**

Team Leader/Development Control Manager

Dated: .....

This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Development Control Manager has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

Development Control Manager: *[Signature]*

Dated: .....

19/09/16. SUBJECT TO S106.

<b>REASONS:</b>
<b>CONDITIONS:</b>
<b>INFORMATIVES:</b>
<b>UDP POLICIES:</b>
<b>OTHER POLICIES:</b>

The following table will populate as a quick check by running the template once items have been entered into Uniform

## SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES

---

CONDITIONS

---

---

INFORMATIVES

---

Dec DWG NOS  
~~Ch Susan~~  
~~Stob Susan~~  
~~Helen email~~

**15/3072/FUL**

**Christchurch, Station Road, Teddington**

**Site, history and proposal**

The application site comprises a roughly rectangular plot of land which is occupied by Christchurch, which is identified as a Building of Townscape Merit and located within the High Street Teddington Conservation Area. The site is located on the eastern side of Station Road, at the junction with Christchurch Avenue. It is within walking distance of the High Street and has the 6 storey Travelodge and Teddington Business Park opposite. To the south lies Teddington mainline railway station.

13/4094/DEMPN-proposing the demolition of Christchurch was refused on the following grounds:-

1. Part 31 A.1 (b) provides that development is not permitted where the demolition is 'relevant demolition' (which includes the demolition of an unlisted building in a conservation area). This proposal involves the demolition of an unlisted building in a conservation area and so Part 31 permitted development cannot arise in this case; and

2. If (which is not accepted) the applicant contends that the building is unsafe or uninhabitable then Part 31 A.1 (a) provides that development is not permitted, where the building is unsafe or uninhabitable by reason of the inaction of the owner. The Council is of the view that the existing condition of the building arises by reason of the inaction of the owner and so Part 31 permitted development cannot arise in this case."

This application relates to the main church building and does not include the church hall, which is situated to the rear of the main church nor does it include the scout hall building, which is situated to the south of the main church. These have been retained by the church. Permission was recently granted under 16/2043/FUL for extensions and alterations to the church hall at the rear.

The proposed development would involve the conversion, extension and alterations of the existing church building to provide for 6 x 2 bedroom flats over four levels together with 6 off-street car parking spaces, motorcycle parking, garden amenity areas, refuse, recycling and cycle parking areas.

The ground and first floor accommodation would comprise 4 no. 2 bedroom split level flats, the second floor level would contain a 2 bedroom flat and the third floor level roof level would also contain a 2 bedroom flat. The proposed accommodation would be achieved by increasing the height of the existing towers, the creation of window and door apertures and the insertion of dormer and velux windows.

The tower on the western corner would be raised with pinnacles, new stained glass windows, louvred windows and buttresses to be above the existing spire height. The tower on the eastern/southern elevation would also be increased in height with a new first floor and a slate pitched roof over. Its overall height would remain below the main ridge of the church. New dormers and conservation roof-lights are also proposed in the main roof and in the roof of the single storey side wings.

The proposed conversion would maintain the two existing pedestrian and vehicular points off Station Road and would form a sweeping driveway arrangement in a one way direction. This would enable the provision of 5 angled car parking spaces behind the front boundary wall and one car parking space along the northern side boundary. The areas around the church would allow for the provision of landscaping and garden amenity areas to serve each of the proposed flats.

The application is accompanied by a design and access statement, scoping report for structural investigations, Breeam Domestic Refurbishment report, Bat building assessment reports and Viability Statements.

### **Public and other representations**

Neighbours- letters have been received from 5 neighbours, supporting the conversion but also raising the following concerns/observations:-

-insufficient parking which will put pressure on Christchurch Avenue. There is capacity in the church to create more parking. A condition should be attached that no residents of the development should be allowed to apply for residents parking permits.

- potential loss of light and overshadowing for houses on the Station Road end of Christchurch Avenue resulting from the proposed main tower.

-overlooking and loss of privacy from the size and number of windows in the north elevation roof. If these cannot be removed they should be conditioned to be opaque glass.

-design is dominant and out of keeping with the character of the conservation area. The existing spire adds to the visual amenity of the area and any design with a tower higher than this spire would detract from it to the detriment of the character of the area.

-planning condition that materials should match existing

-boundary wall should be retained to protect residents of Christchurch Avenue

-a condition should be attached requiring 3 mature trees fronting Christchurch Avenue to be retained in accordance with the arboricultural report. A TPO may be considered more appropriate.

-parking for construction traffic should be shown

-a proposal for the erection of 2 houses would be supported as family sized accommodation is preferred.

Non-planning matters relating to noise from the building works.

One letter of support has been received from Rev Stockford who ran the Church stating that although it is sad that the church can no longer run the old church building, it is pleasing to see the proposal which makes the most of the building and adds to it. The building will look more finished and attractive-externally, enhancing the area.

-Representations have been made expressing concerns about the possible loss of the Scout Group HQ on the adjoining site and the loss of this as a community facility and whether a condition/S106 can be enforced to retain this facility and the community hall at the rear as a community facility.

3rd Teddington Scout Group- a valuable community facility could be lost and a thriving scout group made homeless. Whilst the individual details of the Scouts' lease agreement fall outside the remit of the Local Planning Authority, the Church's action demonstrates a lack of any meaningful commitment to provide affordable community facilities for the Scout Group and that there is a need for the Council to ensure that the commitments in the planning application to maintaining D1 space on the neighbouring church site are enforced.

Thames Water-have written with regard to Waste and Water and do not raise any objections.



## Amendments

**Revised drawings have been received which show the following changes:-**

- (i) Re-location of the bin stores.
- (ii) Removal of the motorcycle parking.
- (iii) Updated drawings to indicate further detail including flat sizes and garden amenity areas.
- (iv) Detailed drawings to a scale of 1:20 in respect of the towers.
- (v) Bat survey report.
- (vi) Tracking analysis and technical note.
- (vii) Hard and soft landscaping plan.
- (viii) Viability report with costings in respect of affordable housing contributions.
- (ix) Winter garden details and perspective.
- (x) Applicant's experience of heritage projects.
- (xi) Addendum Planning, Heritage, Design & Access Statement.

## Professional Comments

### Land Use

Policies CP16 of the Core Strategy and DMS12 of the Development Management Plan resist the loss of community facilities, with the supporting text in para 8.3.4.6 of the Core Strategy recognising places of worship as important to the local community. The proposal involves the loss of the church, comprising some 405sqm of D1 floor-space. Policy CP16 acknowledges that community facilities will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the facilities are no longer needed or that the service could be adequately re-provided in a different way or elsewhere.

In previous discussions/submissions the then applicants (the Church) had set out that the congregation had reduced and the needs of the congregation were being met through the use of the Church Hall. There are clearly problems with the poor and dilapidated condition of the church (inefficient/unsafe heating, lack of facilities) and it is stated that the capital receipts from the sale of the church will be used in respect of the retained buildings, to enable improvements to enhance the offer and

attraction of local community services. An application has already been approved for improvements to the church hall at the rear. In principle, it is accepted that the evidence provided suggests that the existing facilities are no longer needed and do not meet the needs of users, in accordance with Policy DMSI2. It is evident that significant capital investment would be required to save the architectural integrity of the existing church building, a Building of Townscape Merit within a Conservation Area, which could only be achieved by a land use that will generate sufficient capital receipts, namely a residential conversion. The Church have sold the church to the applicant (in December 2014) and retained the church hall at the rear and the scout hut. Having regard to the above, it is accepted that the needs of the existing congregation and community groups can be met by the church hall, in accordance with Policy DMSI2 with the capital receipts from the sale of the church being used to enhance these facilities.

DM SI2 also requires that the potential of re-using or redeveloping the existing site for an alternative social infrastructure use has been fully considered. The site has been marketed on a freehold basis for a number of years and the submitted marketing evidence suggests that no interest was expressed in the building for a continued or alternative community use. The Planning, Design & Access Statement identifies alternative facilities in the locality, stating that many of these are under-utilised. Although no details are provided to confirm that these are under-utilised, there clearly are other churches and other community spaces which are a short distance of one another and serve the same local people, suggesting that these facilities would help to meet any outstanding community needs in the locality. It is also recognised that alternative community uses are likely to find similar funding problems.

Notwithstanding the above, the proposal is also considered to bring advantages in terms of up-grading this Building of Townscape Merit, improving its setting on this prominent site and the consequent advantages to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such the proposal is also considered to also meet the aims and objectives of policies DM HD 1 and DM HD 3 of the Development Management Plan.

The matter of the Scout Group being asked to vacate their premises is regrettable but since the scout building lies outside the application site and is not under the ownership of the applicant, there is no control or influence that the LPA or the applicant has over this matter. Should an application be submitted for the scout building, then this would be considered on its own merits.

#### **Design, appearance and impact on the Conservation Area/BTM**

The church is a major landmark building, designated a BTM which stands prominently on the junction of Station Road and Christ Church Avenue within the High Street Conservation Area, to which DM HD 1 and DM HD 3 apply.

Christ Church is a late C19 Victorian Gothic style church externally clad in rag stone with a steeply pitched roof. It is 4 bays long and has a central nave with side aisles. The interior of the church has many features of architectural and historic interest and has an impressive spatial quality. It has an interesting stained glass western window to the nave, and an impressive stained glass eastern window of particular aesthetic merit. Regrettably its north east corner tower is a mere truncated stub, which was never completed as a full tower and tall spire as per the original design concept.

The building has suffered from dilapidations ; leaks in the roof, some localised structural movement in brickwork and stonework walls requiring localised repair, some of the facing stonework and stone mullions have locally failed, local settlement in the south west corner adjacent to which a tree has established itself, and there is a high level horizontal metal tie restraining outward movement in the east end of the nave. These dilapidations would benefit from urgent repair, however the fabric of the building is eminently repairable, and the overall structure appears relatively sound.

The Conservation Officer has examined the proposal and advises that whilst this is not a listed building and its interior is not protected, the proposals seek an invasive sub-division of the interior which could result in an over-intensive use of the building, leading to a loss of its internal spatial and volumetric quality which is part of its architectural and historic interest. It is also acknowledged that, externally the repair and conversion of the building to residential would secure it for the future and would help preserve & enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

It is considered that the repair and conversion of the building to residential would secure it for the future and would help preserve & enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposals do however include very significant alterations such as the raising of the main church tower on the corner of the building, and this would become a highly visible architectural feature on such a prominent corner. The proposals also include the installation of four new dormer windows on the south main roof pitch and three on the north roof pitch, a new south east tower and a connecting link to the second floor apartment, and the installation of new conservation roof-lights to the roof. The submitted drawings show the main tower, a typical dormer proposal, as well as the perspective which illustrates these features in more detail and how they relate with the architectural character of the existing church building. Most importantly high quality facing materials and craftsmanship will be required for these architectural features to be skilfully constructed to ensure the new work harmonises with the old hence the need for detailed design approval through appropriate conditions.

The garden setting and the perimeter boundary walls around the site are also very important to enhance the setting of the BTM and as such, the landscaped gardens should remain visually open as an essential part of the setting of the church. Policy DM HD 3 protects the setting of BTMs "as if they were listed buildings" by ensuring proposals for alterations which would be visible from the public street do not

adversely affect them. Views over the existing perimeter boundary walls to the BTM from the street are crucial and accordingly it would be appropriate to apply restrictive conditions to ensure no boundary fencing is erected around 'individual' front gardens for the flats and the height of the perimeter boundary walls is maintained.

### **Impact on neighbours**

Policy DM DC 5 states that in considering proposals for development, the Council will seek to protect adjoining properties from unreasonable loss of privacy, pollution, visual intrusion, noise and disturbance.

In this case, as the existing church is to be retained, the building would maintain the same relationship to the boundaries and surrounding residential properties. The additional built form relates to the increase in height of the existing towers, which would form the new stairwells.

Neighbours have generally been supportive of the proposal, welcoming that the building and site will be brought back into use. Concern has been expressed about the impact of the increased height of the main tower on properties in Station Road and Christchurch Avenue. It is however considered that given the separation distances to neighbours and notwithstanding the increased height, the benefits in 'completing' the overall appearance of the church as well as the limited increase in the width of this tower, the with-holding of permission on this ground would be difficult to substantiate.

It is also not considered reasonable to impose conditions requiring the windows in the northern flank to be obscure glazed given the distance to the windows in the nearest residential properties and

### **Transport Considerations**

The application site is in a very sustainable location with good access to the full range of convenience and comparison goods shopping and local amenities within Teddington town centre, not least the range of public transport nodes, particularly Teddington mainline railway station providing regular services to London Waterloo, and the bus services operating along High Street, which is a local distributor road providing immediate links to the neighbouring towns of Richmond, Twickenham, Whitton, Kingston and Hounslow.

The proposal is for the conversion of the building to 6 no. 2 bed flats the parking requirement for which is 6 spaces. This requirement is met as part of the current proposal as 6 spaces are shown at the front of the site.

The Council's Transport Planner has examined the proposal and raises no in principle objection subject to various conditions and clarifications which have been

addressed through the amendments. Conditions are attached relating to refuse/recycling storage, cycle stands and the need for a Construction method Statement prior to works commencing. A condition is also attached requiring the designation of an ingress/egress vehicular access to the site.

Further it is proposed that permission be granted subject to a S106 Agreement to remove access to resident/visitor permits and contracts in council run car parks for all the proposed occupiers of the flats proposed.

### **Affordable Housing**

DM HO 6 sets out that the Council will seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed-use schemes, having regard to the strategic borough-wide target and the individual circumstances of the site, in accordance with Policy CP15.

A Viability Statement was been submitted, the scope of which covers the cost of Structural Stability Works, cost of Adaptation, cost of Acquisition, and this suggests the resultant Residential Development would not be viable with an affordable housing contribution.

This was been passed to the Council's Planning Viability Advisor, and was the subject of an independent review to ensure that the assumptions and values are appropriate. Following this review and a protracted and detailed exchange of information between the Council's consultants and the applicant's viability advisor, including a Red Book Valuation more recently, a revised appraisal was undertaken. The outcome of this was that given the lower flat values together with the assessment of the existing use value, gives a deficit and as such the Council's consultants advise that the proposal cannot support an Affordable Housing Contribution. As such, the Council is satisfied that no contribution is viable and the proposal is considered to accord with DM HO 6.

### **Sustainability**

The applicant has submitted a sustainability and renewable energy report outlining the measures that would be incorporated into the proposed development. Even though there are limited opportunities for incorporating sustainability and re-newable energy measures as the proposal involves the retention of the existing building, which is a BTM and sited within a conservation area, the renewable energy and sustainability report submitted with the planning application achieves a 73.88% rating, which is 'BREEAM Excellent' in accordance with the BREEAM UK Domestic Refurbishment methodology, which is used for the conversion of existing buildings for residential purposes.

Since the very low energy efficiency of the existing building, the proposed measures are considered to be welcomed and comprise a substantial improvement over the existing, particularly having regard to the existing constraints identified above.

## **Residential Development Standards**

The proposed development has taken into account the Residential Standards SPG and the proposed units are considered to meet the minimum baseline figures. The proposed development would also meet the Lifetime Homes criteria.

The proposed residential is 6 x 2 bed 4 person units. From 1 October 2015 the Council is applying the nationally described space standard. This sets a minimum gross internal floor area of 70sqm for a 2 bed 4 person one storey dwelling and 79sqm for a 2 bed 4 person two storey dwelling. The unit sizes now specified range from 91sqm to 163.5 sqm and therefore exceed the national standard. However given the limitations associated with the internal subdivision /conversion of this BTM, this aspect is considered acceptable

Policy DMHO4 and the Residential Development Standards still apply to external amenity space. Some of the flats are maisonettes and I had previously raised that for 2 bed houses paragraph 5.1.25 in the Development Management Plan states 40sqm should be provided. The private amenity spaces now specified range from 16.5sqm to 96.25sqm. Each unit does have an allocated amount of space and while the minimum standards for flats are exceeded, four of the units are larger 2 bed maisonettes which could be occupied by families. Clearly the site has its limitations and since it is important that the setting of the BTM should not be adversely impacted by setting boundaries between gardens no in principle objection to the amount of amenity space and the importance of keeping this open.

## **Trees**

The Council's Arboricultural Officer has examined the proposal and raises no objection to the development, subject to the implementation of a landscape scheme.

The trees at the front of the site have been identified as being of poor form and low quality and there is no objection to their removal and replacement. The development will create an opportunity to offer a controlled and improved landscape and amenity setting for the development of the site.

The submitted detail has suggested shaped trees of a semi-mature size, the species and size of which would need to be confirmed by condition.

The approach in relation to tree protection for the on and off site trees surrounding the scheme is acceptable although details would need to be confirmed under an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS).

The ground protection for the planting area at the front of the site during the construction work is supported and will increase the likely success of any new planting.

As such there is no objection to the proposal on tree grounds and the development is considered to accord with the objectives of DM DC 4 of the Development Management Plan.

### **Ecology**

The Council's Ecology Officer has examined the proposal and advises that the the Bat Building Assessment recommendations should be fully implemented. A condition is attached accordingly

Further the integration of house sparrow or swift boxes and bat bricks into dormer design would meet biodiversity policies.

It is also recommended that any external lighting scheme must be submitted for LPA approval, including locations, specs, lux plan (vertical as well as horizontal) and spectrum of proposed lighting prior to implementation. It is recommended that there should be no upward directed lighting or spillage.

It is also recommend that any soft landscaping that is provided should be of native or non-native plants of known value for wildlife, and detailed plans showing species, location, quantities, plant sizes and details of preparation, planting and aftercare / maintenance must be submitted.

### **CIL**

The site is liable for CIL and an informative is attached accordingly.

---

**I therefore recommend PERMISSION subject to the signing of a S106 legal agreement which would limit the rights to resident permits and contracts in council run car parks for future occupiers of the development and subject to the following conditions and informatives:-**

---