

Application reference: 20/2664/FUL ST MARGARETS, NORTH TWICKENHAM WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
25.09.2020	25.09.2020	20.11.2020	20.11.2020

Site:

Car Park At St Margarets Business Centre, Godstone Road, Twickenham,

Proposal:

Erection of 4 no. residential dwellings (Class C3) with associated parking, access, and landscaping (incl. removal of existing trees).

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

APPLICANT NAME

c/o Agent
C/o Agent

AGENT NAME

Henry Courtier
10 Albemarle Street
London
W1S 4HH

DC Site Notice: printed on 01.10.2020 and posted on 09.10.2020 and due to expire on 30.10.2020

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

LBRuT Trees Preservation Officer (North)
LBRUT Transport
21D POL
LBRuT Ecology
LBRuT Non-Commercial Environmental Health Noise Issues
LBRuT Trees Preservation Officer (North)
LBRUT Environmental Health Contaminated Land

Expiry Date

09.12.2020
15.10.2020
22.10.2020
15.10.2020
15.10.2020
15.10.2020
15.10.2020

Neighbours:

80 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JX -
82 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LB -
71 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LE -
72 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LB -
6 Broadway Avenue, Twickenham, TW1 1RH -
10 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JX -
23 Sidney Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JP -
11 Sidney Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JP -
36 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JX -
39 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY -
57 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY -
16 Northcote Road, Twickenham, TW1 1PA -
3 Westmorland Close, Twickenham, TW1 1RR -
65 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY -
161 Amyand Park Road, Twickenham, TW1 3HN -
61 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LE -
46 Heathfield North, Twickenham, TW2 7QW -
87 LINKFIELD ROAD, ISLEWORTH, TW7 6QW -
"-
2 Amyand Cottages, Amyand Park Road, Twickenham, TW1 3JA -

38 Moor Mead Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JS -
 36 Northcote Road, Twickenham, TW1 1PA -
 52 The Grove, St Margarets Road, Twickenham, TW1 1RB -
 73 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY -
 81 Winchester Road, Twickenham, Tw11la -
 1 Amyand Cottages, Amyand Park Road, Twickenham, TW1 3JA -
 160 Amyand Park Road, Twickenham, TW1 3HY -
 77 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY -
 37 Teddington park road, Teddington, Tw11 8NB -
 79 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY -
 Flat 11,6 Old Lodge Place, Twickenham, TW1 1RQ -
 45 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LE -
 5 Sidney Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JP -
 93 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LA -
 2 Broadway Avenue, Twickenham, TW1 1RH -
 18A Sidney Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JR -
 Maisonette First And Second Floor, 118 St Margarets Road, Twickenham, TW1 2AA -
 18 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JX -
 3 Beaconsfield Road, Twickenham, TW1 3HX -
 13 Broadway Avenue, Twickenham, TW1 1RH -
 89 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LA -
 82 Kenley Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JU -
 7 Greville Close, Twickenham, TW1 3HR -
 16 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JX -
 3 Kenley Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JT -
 84 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JX -
 3 Sidney Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JP -
 14 Bridge Road, Twickenham, TW1 1RE -
 34 Moor Mead Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JS -
 23 Broadway Avenue, Twickenham, TW1 1RH -
 24 Beaconsfield Road, St Margarets, Twickenham, TW1 3HU -
 84 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LB -
 52 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JX -
 96 St Margarets Grove, Twickenham, TW1 1JG -
 55 Beaconsfield Road, Twickenham, TW1 3HX -
 14 Broadway Avenue, Twickenham, TW1 1RH -
 4 Beresford Avenue, Twickenham, TW1 2PY -
 4 Bridge Road, Twickenham, TW1 1RE -
 5 Cole Park View, Twickenham, TW1 1JW -
 25 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY -
 7 Bridge Road, Twickenham, TW1 1RE -
 57 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LE -
 15 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY -
 7 Drummond Place, Twickenham, TW1 1JN, - 01.10.2020
 6 Drummond Place, Twickenham, TW1 1JN, - 01.10.2020
 5 Drummond Place, Twickenham, TW1 1JN, - 01.10.2020
 4 Drummond Place, Twickenham, TW1 1JN, - 01.10.2020
 3 Drummond Place, Twickenham, TW1 1JN, - 01.10.2020
 2 Drummond Place, Twickenham, TW1 1JN, - 01.10.2020
 1 Drummond Place, Twickenham, TW1 1JN, - 01.10.2020
 95 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LA, -
 101 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LA, -
 98 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LB, -
 96 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LB, - 01.10.2020
 5 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY, - 01.10.2020
 3 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY, - 01.10.2020
 102 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LB, -
 100 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LB, -
 99 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LA, -
 97 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LA, -
 15 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY, - 01.10.2020
 13 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY, - 01.10.2020
 11 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY, -
 9 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY, -
 8 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JX, -
 7 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY, - 01.10.2020

6 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JX, - 01.10.2020
 4 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JX, -
 2 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JX, -
 1 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY, - 01.10.2020
 139 Richmond Road, Twickenham, TW1 3AT -
 21 Marble Hill Close, Twickenham, TW1 3AY -
 65 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LE -
 26 Broadway Avenue, Twickenham, TW1 1RH -
 76 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LB -
 43 Moormead road, St Margarets, Tw11js -
 70 Craneford Way, Twickenham, TW2 7SQ -
 Community Centre, 13 Rosslyn Road, Twickenham, TW1 2AR -
 30 Sidney Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JR -
 32A Sidney Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JR -
 27 Moor Mead Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JS -
 85 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LA -
 164B Amyand Park Road, Twickenham, TW1 3HY -
 64 Kenley Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JU -
 Flat 12, Caradon Court, 1A Ellesmere Road, Twickenham, TW1 2DN -

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

Development Management

Status: PCO Application: 20/2664/FUL
 Date: Erection of 4 no. residential dwellings (Class C3) with associated parking, access, and landscaping (incl. removal of existing trees).

Development Management

Status: INV Application: 20/3063/OUT
 Date: Outline application for single structure, suitable for internal subdivision into up to 3nr independent commercial (Class E(g) units, for storage and workshop space, with offices at first floor/mezzanine level, to provide employment space. Access, layout and scale to be considered. Appearance and Landscaping to form part of the Reserved Matters

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 86/0689
 Date: 08/08/1986 Release of condition (j) attached to consent 82/457 to allow the use of the two adjacent units by one occupant.

Development Management

Status: REF Application: 86/0843
 Date: 08/08/1986 Use as class 10 warehouse (release of condition 63 attached to consent 82/0457).

Development Management

Status: REF Application: 86/0975
 Date: 22/07/1986 Release of Condition 56 attached to town planning consent no. 82/0457 (Restriction on working hours).

Development Management

Status: PCO Application: 20/2664/FUL
 Date: Erection of 4 no. residential dwellings (Class C3) with associated parking, access, and landscaping (incl. removal of existing trees).

Enforcement

Opened Date: 02.07.2018 Enforcement Enquiry
 Reference: 86/00025/EN

Enforcement

Opened Date: 05.07.2018 Enforcement Enquiry
 Reference: 93/00027/EN

Enforcement

Opened Date: 05.02.2019 Enforcement Enquiry
 Reference: 19/0064/EN/BCN

20/2664/FUL

Car Park At St Margarets Business Centre, Godstone Road Twickenham

Site Description

The St Margarets Business Centre is located in St Margarets and East Twickenham Village within a protected view from Ham House to Orleans House. The site can be accessed from Drummonds Place which is located on the south-eastern edge of the site. It is currently a wholly industrial site consisting of 7 industrial units constructed in 1988 and has been designated as a Locally Important Industrial Land and Business Park in the Local Plan. The scheme relates to the eastern side of the site which currently consists of a parking area associated with the use of the industrial site and falls outside the designation.

The site is not statutorily or locally listed and does not fall within a Conservation Area. However, the site does fall within the Flood Zone 2 and is potentially contaminated due to past Industrial Land Use. It is also noted to be within the St Margarets Village Character Area.

Relevant Planning History

Car park:

- 19/P0286/PREAPP – 4 residential dwellings (4 x four bed), each of these dwellings are 3-storey houses with a mansard roof at second floor. The scheme provides two car parking spaces and 8 cycle spaces on-site. Each dwelling also has a small front garden, fronting Godstone Road, with larger south-facing gardens to the rear.
- 18/P0209/PREAPP – Residential redevelopment of the site (Substantive advice, rather a discussion regarding land use principle and general site capacity to act as a 'stage one' pre-application meeting to be followed by a detailed program of further meetings).
- 16/P0287/PREAPP – Redevelopment of the site for mixed use development, comprising of office (B1a) and residential (C3) use.
- 09/P0022/PREAPP – Various scheme for re-development of the site for proposed housing for apartments (Class C3) and office units (Class B1(a)).

Unit 4 St Margarets Business Centre:

- 20/2084/FUL – Change of use from B1C (light industrial) to mixed use B1A/B1C/B8 (light industrial, office and storage and distribution) – Pending consideration.
- 19/2907/FUL – Change of use from light industrial (B1c) to storage and distribution (B8) – Refused 27/11/2019.

Proposal

Erection of 4 no. residential dwellings (Class C3) with associated parking, access, and landscaping (incl. removal of existing trees).

Main Development Plan Policies:

The proposal has been considered having regard to the policies within the National Planning Policy Framework (2018), the London Plan Consolidated with Alterations (2018), London Plan Intend to Publish (2020) and the Council's Local Plan, in particular:

Local Plan (2018):

LP 1 – Local Character and Design Quality
LP 8 – Amenity and Living Conditions
LP10 – Local Environmental Impacts, Pollution and Land Contamination
LP15 – Biodiversity
LP16 – Trees, Woodlands and Landscape
LP 20 – Climate Change Adaptation
LP 21 – Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage
LP 22 – Sustainable Design and Construction
LP 24 – Waste Management
LP 34 – New Housing
LP 35 – Housing Mix and Standards
LP 36 – Affordable Housing
LP 39 – Infill, Backland and Backgarden Development
LP 40 – Employment and Local Economy
LP 42 – Industrial Land and Business Parks
LP 44 – Sustainable Travel Choices
LP 45 – Parking Standards and Servicing

Supplementary Planning Documents/ Guidance:

Design Quality SPD
Planning Obligation Strategy SPD
Residential Development Standards SPD (Incorporating Nationally Described Space Standards)
Refuse and Recycling Requirements (2015)
Transport SPD (2020)

Public and Other Representations

The application was publicised in accordance with the Local Planning Authority's requirements as detailed in the Town and Country Planning (General Management Procedure) (England) Order. A total of 102 third-party representations have been received in objection to the application.

A summary of the following objection comments for the development includes:

- Loss of trees is unacceptable (they have a group TPO which highlights their importance).
- Loss of further trees will contribute to current climate emergency.
- Losing trees will reduce habitat/biodiversity, including for birds and bats.
- Loss of aesthetic value created from trees.
- The trees were a condition of the original planning application for the business park and cannot now be removed.
- Disagreement with the findings of the submitted tree survey.
- Proposal is contrary to policies LP15 and LP16 of the Local Plan.
- A payment toward trees elsewhere does not have the same benefit and value.
- Proposal will lead to further parking stress.
- A s106 agreement is needed to ensure future residents do not have access to parking permits.
- Increased traffic and pollution from the development.
- Reduction in highway and pedestrian safety.
- No construction management plan submitted to deal with construction traffic.
- Concern over refuse for Unit 4.
- Noise and disturbance from traffic generation.
- More residents would put pressure on schools and healthcare in the area.

- Loss of visual amenity.
- Proposal will result in overdevelopment of the site.
- Adverse impact on the street scene and nearby Conservation Area.
- Proposed units are not in keeping with surrounding houses.
- Loss of light/overshadowing impact on neighbouring properties.
- Overlooking/loss of privacy.
- The site should be redeveloped into a green space for locals.
- The Council should take control of the land and give it to local residents who need to use it for parking.
- The proposal is not for social or affordable housing.
- Proposal would have no benefit to the local community.
- Disappointing the proposal is not included in the Locally Important Industrial Land and Business Parks under the Local Plan.
- The existing car park is still needed to support the business park, and the proposal is contrary to Policy LP42 of the Local Plan due to the lack of a two year marketing exercise.

Internal consultations

Policy – Objection due to loss of ancillary industrial land and lack of affordable housing. Comments summarised below.

Ecology – Objection due to loss of important wildlife habitat (trees), comments summarised below.

Trees – Objection due to loss of trees with amenity value and lack of onsite replacements, comments summarised below.

Transport – Objection due to lack of onsite car parking, comments summarised below.

Environmental Health – No objection subject to standard contaminated land condition.

Amendments

Following submission of the application, the applicant provided confirmation that all proposed dwellings will meet M4 (2) accessible and adaptable dwellings. The Design & Access Statement was amended to reference this (at paragraph 5.7.1), along with minor adjustments to the internal configuration and inclusion of dimensions on the floorplans (Dwg No. P-001 Rev D) including door widths, future ground floor shower location if required.

A Biodiversity Net Gain Matrix and Calculations, and a CAVAT assessment were also submitted after discussions with the Council's Ecology and Tree officers.

Professional Comments

The main issues for consideration in the assessment of the development proposals are as follows:

- Principle of Development;
- Housing Standards;
- Design and Siting;
- Sustainability;
- Highways, Parking & Refuse;
- Residential Amenity of Neighbouring Properties;
- Affordable Housing;
- Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage;
- Land Contamination;
- Trees;

- Ecology;
- Air Quality

Principle of Development

Loss of industrial land/employment space

London Plan Policy 4.4: Managing industrial land and premises; and Intend to Publish London Plan Policy E4: Land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function; and Policy E7: Industrial intensification, co-location and substitution states that Richmond is one of the 'retain capacity' boroughs in terms of the management of industrial floorspace capacity and there is a presumption against loss of industrial land.

Local Plan policy LP40 seeks to retain land in employment use in order to support a diverse and strong local economy in Richmond. There is a presumption against the release of any employment land or stock in the borough to other uses. It is imperative that sufficient well-located employment land is retained or redeveloped to meet modern business needs and support a strong sustainable economy.

Policy LP42 seeks to protect and enhance the existing stock of industrial premises in the borough and introduces a presumption against loss of industrial land in all parts of the borough. This policy also identifies 'locally important industrial land and business parks' of which St Margaret's Business Centre is one. The Council will seek to retain land, sites and buildings which were last used for employment purposes, in employment use. This is particularly important in relation to industrial land/floorspace as the Borough has a very limited supply of industrial land/floorspace to meet the high demand in the Borough as such the criteria of Policies LP40 and LP42 will need to be addressed before the loss can be accepted.

The site of 0.06ha is located at the corner of Drummonds Place and Winchester Road, and is bound by Godstone Road to the north. The land was formerly used as an "overspill" car park associated with the St Margarets Business Centre, which adjoins the site to the south-west. St Margarets Business Park is designated as a Locally Important Industrial Land and Business Park within Policy LP42. Whilst the parcel of land to which this application relates does not form part of the designated land, its lawful land use remains as an industrial use and is ancillary to the use of the business park. Policy LP42 relating to employment sets out how to deal with non-designated existing employment land. Paragraph 10.3.1 sets out that land which is considered to contribute to the reservoir of industrial land in the borough, for example uses which support, contribute to, or could be drawn upon to meet the demand for industrial land, will also be protected in line with the policy.

The proposal is for 4 x 4-bed, 6 person, open market houses. Policy LP42 states that there is a presumption against the loss of industrial land in all parts of the borough. Loss of industrial space (outside of the locally important industrial land and business parks) will only be permitted where:

1. Robust and compelling evidence is provided which clearly demonstrates that there is no longer demand for an industrial based use in this location and that there is not likely to be in the foreseeable future. This must include evidence of completion of a full and proper marketing exercise of the site at realistic prices both for the existing use or an alternative industrial use completed over a minimum period of two continuous years in accordance with the approach set out in Appendix 5; and then
2. A sequential approach to redevelopment or change of use is applied as follows: a. Redevelopment for office or alternative employment uses. b. Mixed use including other employment generating or community uses, and residential providing it does not adversely impact on the other uses and maximises the amount of affordable housing delivered as part of the mix.

The term 'industrial land' referred to throughout this policy covers land used for general industry, light industry, warehouses, open storage, self-storage, distribution and logistics and other similar types of employment, as well as any other uses which fall within the B1c, B2 or B8 Use Classes or are considered to be Sui Generis. Land which does not fall within these use classes but is considered to contribute to the reservoir of industrial land in the borough, for example uses which support, contribute to, or could be drawn upon to meet the demand for industrial land, will also be protected in line with the policy. This borough has a very limited supply of industrial land, with only 17.3 hectares of general and light industrial space (B2 and B1(c)), and 8.1 hectares of warehousing and storage (B8) facilities; this is amongst the lowest of all the London boroughs. Any loss of industrial space will only be permitted if the applicant can demonstrate that there is no demand for such space and that there is not likely to be in the foreseeable future. This must include evidence of completion of a full and proper marketing exercise of the site at realistic prices both for the existing use or an alternative industrial or other such employment use completed over a minimum period of two continuous years.

A full and proper marketing exercise for the whole site (in accordance with Appendix 5 of the Local Plan) should be undertaken advertising the site for its current use, or for acceptable alternative employment uses. In the absence of satisfactory evidence to justify the loss of existing employment uses to other employment uses, there will be a presumption against any development resulting in the loss of existing use. Given there is no marketing exercise submitted in accordance with the Council's policies, there is an in-principle objection to the application for a residential led scheme.

Housing standards

Housing mix

Policy LP35(A) states that development should generally provide family-sized housing outside of town centres and Areas of Mixed Use, and that the housing mix should be appropriate to the location. All of the proposed units would be fairly expansive in their size, and would incorporate 4 bedrooms. As such, the Council is satisfied that these units would provide appropriate family-sized accommodation in line with the interests of Policy LP35(A) of the Local Plan.

Internal space standards

Policy LP35 requires that all new housing complies with the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). The minimum standards are outlined below:

- *A double bedroom should be 11.5sqm and 2.75m wide*
- *Head height should be at least 2.3m for a minimum of 75% of the gross internal floor area (However please note the London Plan suggests a minimum head height of 2.5m for new dwellings within London to mitigate the 'heat island' effect)*
- *Suitable storage space to be incorporated into units*
- *Communal gardens to be sheltered from roads and not overlooked from habitable rooms.*

Table 1 - Minimum gross internal floor areas and storage (m²)

Number of bedrooms(b)	Number of bed spaces (persons)	1 storey dwellings	2 storey dwellings	3 storey dwellings	Built-in storage
1b	1p	39 (37) *			1.0
	2p	50	58		1.5
2b	3p	61	70		2.0
	4p	70	79		
3b	4p	74	84	90	2.5
	5p	86	93	99	
	6p	95	102	108	
4b	5p	90	97	103	3.0
	6p	99	106	112	
	7p	108	115	121	
	8p	117	124	130	

The proposal is for four 4 bedroom, 6 person, 3 storey dwellings. The standards set out in the above table set a minimum gross internal floor area of 112sqm this type of dwelling. The proposed dwellings range from 126.6sqm to 167.6sqm and therefore will exceed the relevant standards.

External amenity space

The requirements of Policy LP35 and the Residential Development Standards SPD continue to apply to external amenity space. For flats a minimum of 5sqm of private outdoor space for 1-2 person dwellings should be provided and an extra 1sqm should be provided for each additional occupant.

Policy LP35 states that amenity spaces should be:

- a. private, usable, functional and safe;*
- b. easily accessible from living areas;*
- c. orientated to take account of need for sunlight and shading;*
- d. of a sufficient size to meet the needs of the likely number of occupiers; and*
- e. accommodation likely to be occupied by families with young children should have direct and easy access to adequate private amenity space.*

Amenity space standards are not specified for houses within the above standards. However south facing rear gardens are located to the rear of each proposed dwelling reflecting the development pattern of the locality which is acceptable. No objection is therefore raised in relation to this part of the scheme, and it is likely to comply with Policy LP35.

Inclusive Access

Since 1 October 2015, 90% of new housing in a development is expected to meet Building Regulation Requirement M4(2) 'accessible and acceptable dwellings' and 10% is expected to meet Building Regulation Requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair-user dwellings'. This is set out in Policy LP35(E). Both M4(2) and M4(3) require step-free access, the use of wheel chair lifts to provide access to upper floors may also be required for multi-storey development proposals.

Following submission of the application, the applicant provided confirmation that all proposed dwellings will meet M4 (2) accessible and adaptable dwellings. The Design & Access Statement was amended to reference this (at paragraph 5.7.1), along with minor adjustments to the internal configuration and inclusion of dimensions on the floorplans (Dwg No. P-001 Rev D) including door widths, future ground floor shower location if required.

As such, the proposal accords with Policy LP35 of the Local Plan.

Amenity of future occupants

It is considered that the fenestration associated with all of the units would provide prospective occupants with an adequate amount of outlook, daylight and ventilation which is acceptable.

A Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application which concludes that the reradiated noise due to the nearby train tracks would not contribute to the overall airborne noise level experienced within the properties, and that the vibration levels from the train activity are below the threshold of human perception. The proposed mitigation includes a glazing specification, which is considered to be acceptable.

Design and Siting

The NPPF attaches great importance to the design of the built environment, stating that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute positively to making places better for people. It stresses the need to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings and smaller developments. Whilst it states that LPAs should not impose architectural styles or particular tastes, it reinforces that it is important to consider local character and distinctiveness.

Local Plan Policy LP1 states new development must be of a high architectural quality based on sustainable design principles. Development must respect local character and contribute positively to its surrounding based on a thorough understanding of the site and its context. In addressing design quality, the Council will have regards to the following:

- *Compatibility with local character including relationship with existing townscape and frontages, scale, height, massing, proportions and form*
- *Sustainable development and adaptability, subject to aesthetic considerations*
- *Layout and access*
- *Space between buildings and relationship to the public realm*
- *Detailing and material*

The Council does not wish to encourage a particular architectural style or approach but expects each scheme to be justified as a result of a sound understanding of the site and its context. The Council will generally be opposed to any development or re-development that will be out of scale with existing surrounding development. The policy is intended to encourage analysis and sympathy with existing layout and massing, while respecting important historical styles.

Within the Local Plan Policy LP 39 states in (A) that “All infill and backland development must reflect the character of the surrounding area and protect the amenity and living conditions of neighbours. In considering applications...the following factors should be addressed [inter alia]:

1. *Retain plots of sufficient width for adequate separation between dwellings;*
2. *Retain similar spacing between new buildings to any established spacing;*
4. *Respect the local context, in accordance with policy LP 2 Building Heights;*
5. *Enhance the street frontage (where applicable) taking account of local character;*
6. *Incorporate or reflect materials and detailing on existing dwellings, in accordance with policy LP 1 Local Character and Design Quality;*
8. *Result in no unacceptable adverse impact on neighbours, including loss of privacy to existing homes or gardens, in accordance with policy LP 8 Amenity and Living Conditions;*
9. *Provide adequate servicing, recycling and refuse storage as well as cycle parking;*
10. *Result in no adverse impact on neighbours in terms of visual impact, noise or light from vehicular access or car parking.”*

The application site largely comprises hardstanding with substantial boundary trees and vegetation

used for vehicle parking associated with the St Margaret's Business Centre, and can therefore be considered as previously developed land. The proposed dwellings and associated gardens and car parking would replace the hardstanding, and therefore is not considered to result in the loss of garden or amenity space in accordance with Policy LP39. The plot widths are also considered to be of sufficient width to accord with the established spacing of dwellings along Godstone Road, to which they would face. Loss of trees and vegetation will be discussed in later sections of this report.

There are no in-principle objections to the continuation of the terrace along Godstone Road. The proposed dwellings will be two storeys in height with accommodation in the roof space, a common feature of the surrounding environment. In terms of design and scale, although the proposal is half a metre taller than the adjoining terrace at No. 2 Godstone Road, the height does relate to elements of surrounding buildings, such as Nos. 1-3 Godstone Road on the opposite side which is the same height. Given this slight variation in height in the surrounding area, it is not considered that the proposed buildings would be out of keeping with the context.

The proposed building features gable ends and rear dormers. The gables are in keeping with the adjoining terraces to the north and east on Winchester Road. In addition, there are a number of dormer extensions in the area, and the proposed dormers are set well within the rear roof space and feature attractive pitched roofs. The double storey front gables with pitched roofs are reflective of a number of properties along both Godstone Road and Winchester Road. The proposal features traditional sash windows with centre bars to the front, side and first floor of the rear elevation, which is considered to appropriately reflect the surrounding context, particularly along Winchester Road.

The roofing material along Godstone Road is characterised by red clay tiles whilst there is a mix of red clay tiles and grey slate along Winchester Road. All buildings are predominately clad in brick. The proposal predominately comprises red clay facing brick with timber window joinery, and tile roofing. This is considered to be appropriate to the surrounding context.

The boundary treatment to the front and side of the application site is proposed to be in a low brick wall. There is a mix of treatments in the surrounding context including low picket fences and various forms of brick walls, and the proposal is considered to reinforce the streetscape. High timber fences are proposed to the rear, and although this will be highly visible from Drummonds Place and Winchester Road, it is considered appropriate to provide a sense of privacy to the rear gardens of the proposed units. Parking spaces are limited to 3 spaces to the rear of the site, which is considered an appropriate solution, noting that the proposal replaces an entire car park.

However, the two storey rear annexes to the proposed dwellings are considered excessively bulky and prominent in this location. Their visual massing, as part of the overall development, is not sufficiently broken down by the proposed design which does not allow them to be seen in public views as 'pairs of annexes'. The lack of proper physical gaps between the annexes at first floor level as can be observed elsewhere in this neighbourhood results in their visual massing coalescing and this is considered to give rise to an awkward appearance which is both prominent, incongruous and out of keeping with the local context and Winchester Road street scene, including elevated views from the footbridge.

In light of the above, the proposal is not considered to fully comply with Policy LP1 of the Local Plan and associated SPD guidance. The proposal would also result in the loss of significant amount of trees and vegetation along the boundary of the site which will be discussed under the Ecology and Trees section of the report.

Sustainability

Policy LP22 states that development will be required to conform to the Sustainable Construction

Checklist. The London Plan (5.7) requires that all new development should achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide emission of 35% from on-site renewable energy generation. Development proposals of 1 dwelling unit or more will be required to reduce their total carbon dioxide emissions. Part C of Policy LP22 indicates that the target should be achieved following the Energy Hierarchy:

1. Be lean: use less energy
2. Be clean: supply energy efficiently
3. Be green: use renewable energy

A Sustainable Construction Checklist is submitted with the application and achieves a score of 49.5 which is a 'B' rating which indicates that the proposal helps to significantly improve the Borough's stock of sustainable developments.

An Energy Statement has been submitted demonstrating that the proposal follows the be lean, be clean and be green principles required by Council policies, and would provide a 45% reduction in CO2 emissions. The proposal secures the required 35% reduction beyond Building Regulations requirements. This scheme is therefore compliant with Policy LP22.

Policy LP22 also emphasises that new residential development will be required to incorporate water conservation measures to achieve maximum water consumption of 110 litres per person per day. The submitted Sustainability Statement confirms that the proposal would meet this requirement.

Highway, Parking and Refuse

Car Parking

Local Plan Policy LP45 states that new development should provide appropriate cycle access and sufficient, secure cycle parking facilities. In accordance with the London Plan, the minimum cycle parking requirement for 1-bed units is one space, with two spaces required for all other dwellings.

In accordance with policy LP45 developments and redevelopments have to demonstrate that the new scheme provides an appropriate level of off street parking to avoid an unacceptable impact on on-street parking conditions and local traffic conditions. For developments in areas with a PTAL of 0-3; 1-2 bedroom dwellings are required to provide 1 no. off-street parking space, and 3 bedroom dwellings are required to provide 2 no. off-street parking spaces as set out within appendix 3 of the Local Plan. Whilst the Council's parking standards are set to a maximum, these standards are expected to be met unless it can be shown there would be no adverse impact on the area in terms of street-scene or on-street parking. This is reiterated in the parking standards set out in the London Plan which specifies that in outer London areas with low PTAL, borough should consider higher levels of provisions, especially to address overspill parking pressures.

The off-street vehicular parking standards set out Appendix 3 of the Borough's Local Plan state that a development proposal in an area with a PTAL score of 2 must provide two spaces per 4 bed dwelling. 4 parking spaces are proposed and as such there would be parking shortfall of 5 below Council's standards.

Paragraph 11.2.3 of the Borough's Local Plan states that: *Developers may only provide fewer parking spaces, including car free schemes, if they can demonstrate as part of a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment with supporting survey information and technical assessment that there would be no unacceptable adverse impact on on-street parking availability, amenity, street scene, road safety or emergency access in the surrounding area, as a result of the generation of unacceptable overspill of on-street parking in the vicinity.*

No parking survey has been submitted with the application, and therefore it is unclear as to the

existing parking conditions on surrounding streets. As such, in the absence of a sufficient quality parking survey carried out in accordance with the Council's Parking Survey SPD, the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposal will not lead to undue parking stress in the surrounding area. It is noted that the Council's Highways officer reviewed the application and raised an objection on these grounds.

Construction

The transport statement sets out (page 24) sets out a very basic construction logistics approach. In order to demonstrate the development may be carried out in a safe manner, the applicant must submit a detailed Construction Management Plan for the project. A suitable condition could be secured as part of any approval and the works would thereafter need to be carried out only in accordance with the approved Management Plan.

Cycle parking

Policy LP 44 of the Local Plan seeks the provision of appropriate cycle access whilst Policy LP 45 of the Local Plan advocates that development proposals should make for the provision of sufficient and secure cycle parking facilities.

8 cycle parking spaces would need to be provided for the proposal (2 for each unit). Cycle stores are shown in the rear gardens of 3 out of the 4 units. Although a cycle store will also need to be provided for the fourth dwelling, a suitably worded condition could be included as part of any decision in order to ensure the required cycle stores are provided for each unit.

Refuse and waste

Policy LP24 of the Local Plan, the Council's Residential Development Standards SPD and the Council's Refuse and Recycling Storage SPD require that secure storage be provided on-site for refuse and recycling bins. Details of refuse storage for the new development will be required under any future planning application submitted to the Council. Specific details can be conditioned in order to safeguard the appearance of the surrounding locality and residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and to ensure compliance with Policy LP24 and the Refuse and Recycling Storage Requirements SPD. As above, refuse stores will need to be sited away from the front elevation to preserve visual amenity of the locality.

Residential Amenity of Neighbouring Properties

Policy LP8 state in considering proposals for development, the Council will seek to protect adjoining properties from unreasonable loss of privacy, pollution, visual intrusion, noise and disturbance. The Council will generally seek to ensure that the design and layout of buildings enables sufficient sunlight and daylight to penetrate into and between buildings and that adjoining land or properties are protected from overshadowing in accordance with established standards.

1. ensure the design and layout of buildings enables good standards of daylight and sunlight to be achieved in new development and in existing properties affected by new development; where existing daylight and sunlight conditions are already substandard, they should be improved where possible;

4. Ensure that proposals are not visually intrusive or have an overbearing impact as a result of their height, massing or siting, including through creating a sense of enclosure;

5. Ensure there is no harm to the reasonable enjoyment of the use of buildings, gardens and other spaces due to increases in traffic, servicing, parking, noise, light, disturbance, air pollution, odours or vibration or local micro-climatic effects.

The main properties to consider in relation to this proposal are 2 Godstone Road to the west, 98 and 99 Winchester Road to the east, and 100/102 Winchester Road and 1 Godstone Road to the north.

The proposed units would be constructed along the shared boundary but separated by approximately 2.5m from the dwelling at No. 2 Godstone Road. The front section of No. 2 constitutes a brick wall with no windows, however it is noted that a planning application was recently granted at No. 2 Godstone Road (Ref. 16/4818/FUL) for the demolition of existing garden shed and erection of single storey side/rear extension. The rear of No. 2 Godstone Road is partially disguised behind a high boundary wall, although it is noted that the above permission for an extension has been implemented. A Daylight and Sunlight Assessment was submitted with the application which concluded that the proposed development would have an imperceptible impact on the skylight of 25 out of the 28 windows assessed and would have a noticeable impact on the skylight of 3 of the 28 windows assessed. All 3 windows were located at No. 2 Godstone Road, however justification is provided for each of the relevant windows. Overall, the report concludes that the proposed development's impact on the skylight of existing surrounding dwellings should be considered acceptable. This report is considered to provide adequate justification for the loss of daylight/sunlight to the windows of No. 2 Godstone Road, to adequately justify the proposal. Furthermore, due to the nature of the existing mature trees and boundary wall between the two properties, it is considered that the level of outlook from the rear extension to No. 2 is limited. Given the existing situation, it is not considered that the proposal will appear visually intrusive or result in a sense of enclosure on this property. Finally, in relation to privacy, there are no side facing windows proposed which could overlook the dwelling at No. 2 or its garden.

Policy LP8 of the Local Plan advises that a minimum distance of 20m between habitable rooms within separate developments should be achieved in order to maintain privacy, or 13.5m for non-habitable rooms. The proposed development would be located a minimum of approx. 20m from the adjoining dwellings to the east on Winchester Road, and therefore complies with this policy. In relation to the properties at 100/102 Winchester Road and 1 Godstone Road to the north, these would fall slightly short of the required 20m separation distance being separated by approx. 17m from the front windows of the proposed development. However, given these windows are already highly visible from Godstone Road, it is not considered that the proposal will adversely impact the existing level of privacy enjoyed by these properties.

In light of the above, the proposal is not considered to result in undue impacts to the amenity of neighbouring properties. As such the proposal complies with Policy LP8 and associated SPD guidance.

Affordable Housing

Local Plan Policy LP36 states some form of affordable housing contribution will be expected on all new housing sites. The Council will seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on private residential schemes, further details are set out in the Affordable Housing SPD.

Policy LP36 expects at least 50% on-site affordable housing provision on all former employment sites. Given any proposed change of use, in accordance employment policies, any residential use replacing employment floorspace should be in the form of affordable housing, and comply with the tenure split required by Policy LP36 and relevant housing strategies. As per policy requirements, the provision of affordable housing should be discussed with the Council's Housing Development Manager and Registered Providers who are interested in exploring opportunities and maximising funding opportunities. This point has not been addressed in the application, which continues to suggest the site should not be treated as employment land and therefore suggests a financial contribution is sought, rather than recognising the policy requirement to explore on-site provision.

Evidence of exploring on-site provision would need to be provided to accord with the Local Validation Checklist, before a financial contribution to off-site affordable housing would be considered appropriate. Without this, the policy does not comply with Policy LP36. It is also noted that a financial contribution would not normally be discounted to reflect the size of the scheme, as the policy requirement for a change of use from employment to residential set out in employment policies and LP36 is to maximise above normal provision (e.g. the financial contribution that would be sought would be discounted to represent 40% affordable housing where the proposal creates four units replacing former employment floorspace).

A completed pro-forma has been submitted with the application, along with a covering letter setting out valuation details, which suggests a contribution of £483,636. However, this is incorrectly submitted on the basis of 20%. The Council's Planning Viability Advisor has reviewed the open market values and identified higher open market values on the basis of comparables. On this basis, at 40%, a contribution of £1,093,500 is suggested.

However, in the absence of discussions with the Council's Housing Development Manager and Registered Providers in relation to the provision of affordable housing, and failing that with the absence of a binding legal agreement securing the necessary contribution to the affordable housing fund, the proposed scheme would not comply with the outcomes sought by Policy LP36 of the Local Plan and the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Documents.

Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage

Policy LP21 of the Local Plan advocates that all developments should avoid, or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, including fluvial, tidal, surface water, groundwater and flooding from sewers, taking account of climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

The car park site is located within Flood Zone 2, which indicates a moderate probability of flooding. In response to this, a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report has been submitted with the application. It was concluded that the residual risk of flooding to the site can be effectively managed by setting the proposed buildings ground floor levels above the predicted flood level of 6.34mAOD for the 0.1% AEP. A Surface Water Drainage Strategy (SuDS) has also been developed for the site comprising of these components, which would ensure that surface water flows are controlled. This includes the use of green roofs and soft landscaping throughout the property.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal would not lead to unreasonable risk for the site or increase flood risk to adjoining properties. As such the proposal complies with Policy LP21 of the Local Plan.

Land contamination

Policy LP10 notes that the Council promotes, where necessary, the remediation of contaminated land where development comes forward. Potential contamination risks will need to be properly considered and adequately mitigated before development proceeds.

The site and surrounding area has been subject to former potentially contaminative land uses. In response to this, the applicant has submitted a Contamination Report. The Council's Environmental Health officer reviewed the application and recommended the standard contaminated land condition be applied to any approval.

Trees

Policy LP16 states that the Council will require the protection of existing trees and the provision of

new trees, shrubs and other vegetation of landscape significance that complement existing, or create new, high quality green areas, which deliver amenity and biodiversity benefits. To ensure development protects, respects, contributes to and enhances trees and landscapes, the Council, when assessing development proposals, will resist development which results in the damage or loss of trees that are considered to be of townscape or amenity value; the Council will require that site design or layout ensures a harmonious relationship between trees and their surroundings and will resist development which will be likely to result in pressure to significantly prune or remove trees.

A Tree Quality Survey Report by Tyler Grange was submitted with the proposal documents, which the Council largely agrees with in terms of tree categorisation. Although the site largely comprises of hardstanding for vehicle parking, trees on this site (Lime, Cherry, Hornbeam and Ash) are considered to have collective merit and provide important green softening and amenity to this small industrial and residential area.

A Tree Preservation Order (T1049) was established in 2019 and remains in place for all the trees on this site. TPO T1049 is a small area order protecting all trees on the site. Most of the specimens are under mature and have not reached maximum size. The trees are considered to make a positive amenity contribution to this corner of Godstone and Winchester roads and are worthy of their TPO status.

A tree survey and impacts assessment has been submitted, prepared by Tyler Grange. This includes details of each tree as per the standard requirements. All trees are proposed for removal on this site, comprising of 5 category B trees (moderate quality), 4 category C trees (low quality) and one category U (in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees). A CAVAT assessment of the existing trees was also prepared by Tyler Grange, and suggested an amount of £80,142.

The Council's Tree officer concurred with the category values given to these trees. It was advised that individually the trees are fairly unremarkable, however their value is as a collective group. It is considered that collectively these trees make a positive greening contribution to the street scene and local area, and their loss would have a negative visual impact for the local area.

As noted above, Policy LP16 states that the Council will resist development that results in the damage or loss of trees that are of townscape or amenity value. The trees are not considered to be of townscape value but they do have amenity value. As such the Tree officer advised there is inadequate justification from a policy standpoint to support the removal of all protected trees within this site. More trees should have been retained as part of this development proposal, and provision of more amenity space for each property and potentially planting within each plot. In relation to T7 (small Prunus), a suspended pavement solution would be ideal in this location for sustainable replanting.

Furthermore, in terms of replacement planting Godstone Road offers little viable opportunity for replanting given the narrow pavement, although some opportunity may be feasible along Winchester road. These opportunities have not been demonstrated within the application.

From the consultation responses it is clear there is significant local interest in this site and opposition to the loss of trees. Given the loss of all protected trees on this site and the lack of sufficient mitigation as part of the proposal, this is not considered to comply with Policy LP16 of the Local Plan which states the Council will initially resist the loss of trees damage or loss of trees that are considered to be of townscape or amenity value.

Ecology

Policy LP15 Biodiversity states that the Council will protect and enhance the Borough's
Officer Planning Report – Application 20/2664/FUL Page 16 of 21

biodiversity, and in particular the sites designated for their biodiversity and nature conservation value, including the connectivity between habitats. Council will resist the loss of trees which are of value and encourage new high-quality landscaping and planting which reflects the surrounding environment.

The application site, whilst mainly hard surfacing, does provide a vegetation island adjacent to a wildlife corridor (the railway) and is located close to Moormead Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). The current trees and hedges, albeit some are non-native, still provide nesting and food provision for wildlife.

An Ecological Survey by Tayler Grange has been submitted with the application. The Council's Ecology officer reviewed this document and noted that it clearly shows that the existing trees and vegetation have an importance for foraging and commuting bats and also foraging and nesting birds. It is also important in that it is the only hedgerow on the site providing green landscaping and invertebrate interest and possibly hedgehogs and the report states it has Ecological importance within the site context only (last sentence para 3.16). The Ecology officer noted that it also provides a stepping stone for bird, bats and insects (and possibly hedgehogs), The River Crane, Moormead Park, the railway line and houses of the age and structure that would support bat roosting. The survey report does not contain the times of the bats recorded or a map showing which direction they were flying. This would assist the Council to ascertain if there were bat roosts close by and in which case emerging bats commonly like to feed briefly before moving on to their main feeding area and in which case this area of trees and vegetation would be very important.

In terms of the hedgerow itself it is accepted that it does not have the species or characteristics of a priority hedgerow habitat, but it does still provide foraging commuting and nesting opportunities. The proposed scheme will not provide the same function as it does now. The proposed hedges on Drummond and Godstone Road elevations are likely to be just over 1m high and narrow compared to what they are now. They will not provide the foraging, commuting or nesting characteristic they currently do. The bat species identified (the smaller common and soprano pipistrelle bats) tend to fly at about 5 - 10 metres. By introducing a three storey wall of 20metres long may require the bats to have to fly higher to go above the new buildings therefore expending more energy to get to their main feeding grounds without being able to forage on the way.

A Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Matrix by Tyler Grange has also been submitted with the application to demonstrate how the proposed habitat compares with the existing and the inclusion of net gain. The Council's Ecology officer noted the BNG calculation shows a 10.75% increase however the proposed planting (including a wait of 27 years for the trees to get to an equivocal size, nor a guarantee that this will not fail and need to be replanted) does not compare on the ground to what is already there. It discusses off-site post intervention however there are no details of this, and regardless it will not fully mitigate for the loss of habitat in this location. The recommended enhancements of green roof, bat and bird boxes will provide some habitat enhancements but they cannot mitigate for the total loss of habitat on this occasion.

In light of the above, the proposal is not considered to comply with Policy LP15 as it fails to adequately protect and enhance the Borough's biodiversity.

Air Quality

Section B of Policy LP10 states that the Council promotes good air quality design and new technologies. Developers should secure at least 'Emissions Neutral' development. To consider the impact of introducing new developments in areas already subject to poor air quality, the following will be required:

1. an air quality impact assessment, including where necessary, modelled data;

2. mitigation measures to reduce the development's impact upon air quality, including the type of equipment installed, thermal insulation and ducting abatement technology;
3. measures to protect the occupiers of new developments from existing sources;
4. strict mitigation for developments to be used by sensitive receptors such as schools, hospitals and care homes in areas of existing poor air quality; this also applies to proposals close to developments used by sensitive receptors.

An Air Quality Assessment has been submitted which concludes that the development will have no adverse effects on local air quality and does not introduce new exposure within an area of poor air quality, and therefore no additional mitigation is required.

As such, the proposal is considered in accordance with Policy LP10.

Conclusion

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF explains how the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. It is considered that the 'ordinary' balance should be applied, this means clearly identifying that the proposal complies with the development plan and the weight given to the material planning considerations. The Framework requires the approval of development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay. The presumption in favour of sustainable development requires proposals to achieve economic, social and environmental gains; as such a balancing exercise has to be undertaken to weigh the benefits of the scheme against its disadvantages.

When considered in the round, the proposal would result in some economic benefits by creating jobs during construction, however when this is not considered to outweigh overall the economic harm to the borough due to the loss of employment and industrial space. As noted earlier in this report, the Borough is in chronically short supply of industrial and employment land, with demand for space significantly outstripping available supply. Furthermore, in terms of the environmental and social realms, the proposal fails to adequately protect or enhance the existing trees and biodiversity on the site, and in the absence of adequate information to the contrary, the application also has the potential to result in undue parking stress in the surrounding area. Finally, the proposal fails to accord with the relevant policies in relation to affordable housing.

Recommendation – Refuse for the following reasons:

The proposal would result in the complete loss of existing ancillary industrial space and without adequate replacement space or a marketing exercise in accordance with Appendix 5 of the Local Plan to demonstrate there is no longer any demand for this space, this would reduce employment opportunities within the locality contrary to the aims of the Council's employment policies. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policies LP40 and LP42 of the Local Plan (2018), the GLA Industrial Land Supply and Economy Study (2015), and the Mayor of London's Land for Industry and Transport Supplementary Planning Guidance (2012).

Due to the loss of trees with amenity value to the local area, and in the absence of adequate replacement on-site planting, the proposal fails to protect, respect and enhance existing trees, biodiversity, and landscapes in the surrounding environment. This is contrary to, in particular, Policies LP1, LP15 and LP16 of the Local Plan (2018).

In the absence of satisfactory on-site parking provision or a parking survey to demonstrate that surrounding streets would be able to accommodate a shortfall of 4 no. off street parking spaces, the scheme would in all likelihood result in an adverse impact on the free flow of traffic and local parking conditions to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety. The scheme is therefore

contrary, in particular, to policy LP45 of the Local Plan (2018) and the Supplementary Planning Document: Transport (2020).

The development does not provide appropriate affordable housing, either on site or by way of an affordable housing contribution towards off-site provision, and would therefore be contrary to adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Affordable Housing' and Policy LP36 of the Local Plan (2018).

The proposed development, by reason of its prominent corner siting, excessive bulk, scale and unsatisfactory design would constitute an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development which is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the Winchester Road street scene. This aspect of the proposal would therefore be contrary to, in particular, Policy LP1 of the Council's Local Plan (2018) and the St Margarets Village Planning Guidance (2016).

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~~

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):TF.....

Dated:21/12/2020.....

I agree the recommendation: CTA

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated:21/12/2020.....

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

Head of Development Management:

Dated:

REASONS:
CONDITIONS:
INFORMATIVES:

UDP POLICIES:
OTHER POLICIES:

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

U0047851	NPPF REFUSAL- Para. 38-42
U0047852	Decision drawings