

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 MAY 2008

08/0307/FUL
361-367A ST MARGARETS ROAD
TWICKENHAM

ST MARGARETS AND NORTH TWICKENHAM WARD
Contact officer
B staff



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames LA 100019441[2008].'- Do not scale '

Proposal: Redevelopment of the site to provide a 3-storey building comprising 17 private units (11 - 1bedroom and 6- 2bedroom) and 10 affordable units (3-1bedroom for shared ownership and 2- 3bedroom, 4-2bedroom and 1-1bedroom for social rent), basement parking for 20 vehicle and 27 cycle parking spaces, refuse and recycling storage and communal amenity space.

Applicant: Cunnane Town Planning LLP for Beachview Properties Ltd.

Application received: January 2008.

Main development plan polices:

UDPF 2005 - ENV 7, 9, 34, 35, 39, IMP 3, BLT 2, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 30 TRN 2, 4 HSG2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 18, 19.

Sustainable Construction Checklist SPD

Design Quality SPD

Small and Medium housing Sites SPD

Affordable Housing SPD

Design for Maximum Access SPG

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 MAY 2008

Recycling for New Developments SPG

Planning Obligation Strategy SPG

London Plan Policies - .1, 3A.3, 3A.5, 3a.11, 3C.1, 3C.17, 3C.22, 3C.23, 3D.15, 4A.3, 4A.4, 4A.7, 4A.9, 4A.10, 4A.11, 4A.12, 4A.13, 4A.14, 4A.33, 4B.1, 4B.2, 4B.5 and 6A.5.

Present use: Vacant residential (13 flats)

SUMMARY

The proposed scheme would be acceptable providing a suitable mix of small units and affordable housing in a building which is of a modern and sustainable design (compliant with the sustainable construction checklist) without prejudice to neighbour amenity, nearby trees, the street scene and local parking/traffic conditions.

The scheme would pass both the sequential and exception tests related to PPS25 in terms of flood risk.

The applicant has agreed to enter into a legal agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing monies towards facilities and infrastructure and a grampian condition is recommended to be imposed.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Site, history and proposal

1. The application site, roughly rectangular in shape comprises an undistinguished part three storey, part two storey building and ancillary brick sheds. The three storey element is set back from the street aligning with, and beyond the rear main walls of the adjacent dwellings. The two storey section is set forward of the main building yet significantly back from the street's established front building line. The area between the building and highway is dominated by a car park and garden.
2. The street scene is characterised by two storey terrace and semi detached dwellings of various designs and architectural merit. The site is adjacent to the St Margarets Conservation Area and there are no immediately adjacent listed buildings or BTMs.
3. The proposal is to erect a three storey building comprising 27 flats with basement parking for 20 vehicles and 27 cycle spaces. The building would be modern in design with a flat 'green' roof set back from the main facade. The proposed footprint would be set forward of the existing building footprint to align with the existing building line.
4. The scheme would employ solar panels to reduce carbon emissions.

Public and other representations

5. **Thames Water** - no objection with regard to sewerage and water infrastructure subject to an informative regarding pressure and flow rate and advice regarding surface water drainage.
6. **Environment Agency** - no objections subject to conditions
7. **London Borough of Hounslow** - no objection raised.
8. Nine Letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 MAY 2008

- Design and scale out of keeping (flat roof, long frontage, ugly, more akin to an office block)
- Impact on the conservation area
- Overbearing and destroying the building line
- Insufficient social housing
- The building lacks any architectural features
- Overlooking
- Loss of light
- Inadequate parking or visitor parking
- Traffic congestion, width of access and proximity to the bend in the road
- Density
- Demands on infrastructure and services
- Non-planning matters (construction noise and disturbance, damage from piling and building works).

Professional comments

Land use

9. There is no objection to the demolition of the existing building given its limited architectural and historic quality and the principal of development is acceptable given that there would be a substantial housing gain and development of a brown field site.
10. The existing development has a density of 72 units per hectare and therefore does not maximise the potential of the site.
11. The proposed scheme would result in a density of 150 units per hectare where the London Plan envisages a density of 50-95 units/ha where sites are in a suburban location with a PTAL of 2-3. The scheme would result in a density of approximately 378 habitable rooms per hectare and above that set out in the London Plan. However a high density is not necessarily a reason to withhold permission unless there is demonstrable harm that would result from it in terms of amenity, parking, massing etc.
12. Eleven of the 17 market flats would be small units, thereby equating to 65% and well above the 25% set out in HSG11.
13. Three of the flats are to be built to mobility standards thereby exceeding the 10% set out in HSG 7.
14. It is understood that the building was in use as accommodation by police officers and whilst this may be seen as a loss of rented key worker accommodation, no planning history exists for this site and as such no conditions or planning control restricting the type or tenure where such accommodation could be sold over the free market.

Affordable housing

15. Ten units would be affordable housing, which equates to 37% of the development, however the proportion of floor space set aside for these units would equate to 40%. 7 of the flats would be for social rent whereas the three small units would be available for shared ownership representing a 70/30 split where SPG recommends a split of 75/25.
16. As the scheme would provide a majority of larger units for the affordable elements particularly in the social rent sector (6 would be 2-bedroom 3 person units and above) the scheme is considered acceptable in terms of policy HSG6 when assessing the whole housing package.

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 MAY 2008

Siting and design

17. The design has adopted a strong and contemporary approach which in principle is supported by the Unitary Development Plan (policy BLT 11) and the current Design Quality SPD which encourages distinctive and original designs including those whose form is dictated by ecological design principles, so long as they are of a high standard and are compatible with the scale and character of existing development.
18. The building would be moved closer to the highway yet aligning with the building line established by the dwellings to the north and south. The proposal would fill the 'void' created in the street scene by bringing the building closer to it and thereby creating a streetscape with a greater sense of enclosure, continuity and opportunities of passive surveillance. The proposal is therefore seen as providing a positive contribution to the locality and street scene in terms of design and siting where the existing building is at odds with the prevailing architecture and building line.
19. The facade has been broken up in part with stair-cores, glazing, a set back of the 2nd floor, detailing at a number of intervals and strong features such as the two storey bays which would relate to the rhythm of the bays on the adjacent properties all of which effectively breaks up the visual massing. The set back to the entrance area further delineates the different building typologies in a simple, acceptable fashion where the building becomes 3 storeys.
20. While basement parking can sometimes lead to a void being presented at street level, the provision of gates helps to mitigate this concern. The rest of the site is free from parking requirements and so additional communal green space is possible which should be welcomed overall in design terms.
21. The roof of the proposed building would be lower in height than the existing building's roof ridge and would be lower than the ridge line of the adjacent properties although it is recognised that there is greater bulk at a higher level due to the receding nature of the traditional pitched roof to the existing building. A fairly consistent eaves line currently exists along the road which is then punctuated by roofs of different pitches, including gable ends and dormer windows at upper level. The proposed building follows this concept with a strong parapet and the introduction of bays in a modern style.
22. The physical presence of the 2nd floor would be reduced given the recess, different use of materials and set in from the flank elevation adjacent to the boundaries with no. 359 and 377 thereby allowing a visual break between the built mass and adjacent dwellings. A number of the 2nd floor windows would be partially screened behind the parapet wall thereby reducing the vertical emphasis of this floor and allowing strong horizontal sections which are in turn broken up due to the recess of the facade.
23. The first floor windows would align with those on the adjacent dwellings and as such it is considered that the proposal would respect the scale of development in the street scene.
24. It is thus considered that the scheme is compatible with the general scale of this part of St Margarets Road (which now includes the development within the Richmond Lock site) and would preserve the character, setting and appearance of the adjacent conservation area.

Traffic and parking

25. Given the volume of traffic on St Margarets Road it is not considered that the proposal would attract a volume of traffic that places an unreasonable pressure on traffic or congestion within the area. At the entrance there is sufficient space in front of the entrance gates for a vehicle to wait should another be exiting the basement parking area.

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 MAY 2008

26. In respect of off street car parking provision, the relevant policy in the UDP, First Review, is TRN 4 which refers to maximum standards being set for all types of development. This proposal provides 20 off street parking spaces (including 3 mobility spaces), which is 7 less than the maximum set for this development in the Council's adopted parking standards. Policy TRN 4 allows for a provision that is less than the maximum set providing there would not be an adverse impact on amenity, road safety or emergency access in the surrounding area, or a generation of unacceptable overspill of on street parking in the vicinity of the site.
27. The existing site has a lay by/servicing area with an in-out driveway which would have allowed three vehicles to park parallel to the highway however it is noted that when occupied, vehicles (approximately 6) were parked at right angles to the road resulting in the unauthorised movements over the pavement to access these spaces and reversing onto the highway. The 13 flats would have required a maximum parking allowance of 13 spaces resulting in a shortfall of between 6-10 spaces when occupied and more than the proposed development. As such the proposal would be an improvement on the former situation resulting in fewer vehicles parking on the highway and reducing unauthorised and dangerous manouvres over the public footpath.
28. Site visits reveal that parking opportunities on St Margarets Road and surrounding roads are limited. The site is served by a bus route linking to St Margarets and Richmond Train Stations and in close proximity to local shops and other amenities although this on its own it is not considered to justify a short fall in parking provision. Transport planners have expressed concerns that there would be a shortfall in parking provision.
29. Whilst it is recognised that on street parking in the vicinity is limited, this could, in line with advice set out in PPG13 encourage the use of sustainable transport and reduce the need to travel by car. The limited parking facilities on site and difficulties in on-street parking can assist in achieving this objective.
30. The applicants have submitted compelling survey data from Paragon (which incorporates Richmond upon Thames Churches Housing Trust) which demonstrates that car ownership amongst those in rented accommodation within the Borough of Richmond was at 37.9% whereas those in shared ownership is 1 space per unit. This information is consistent with similar data set out in the Richmond Upon Thames Local Housing Assessment 2006 wherein over half of all households in social rented housing have no access to a car or van, this compares with only 10.9% of owner-occupied (with mortgage) households. The average household has 1.08 cars; this figure varies from 0.45 in RSL accommodation to 1.30 for owner-occupiers with a mortgage.
31. Given the above data it is considered appropriate to condition the consent to ensure 17 spaces are allocated to the market units, leaving 3 spaces for the affordable units. Given that 60% of those within rented accommodation (7 units) are unlikely to own a vehicle, the expected parking requirement for the affordable units is 6 spaces (3 for social rent and 3 for shared ownership) leaving a shortfall of 3 spaces. Whilst it is appreciated that there are limited spaces within the locality it is not considered that this shortfall would result in harm to the free flow and safety of traffic or result in an unreasonable extra pressure for on street parking.
32. With respect to the objections received there is no requirement for visitor parking set out in the UDP's parking standards.
33. Provision has been made for 27 cycle spaces within the basement compliant with the minimum standards and a significant improvement to the existing building where no provision exists.

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 MAY 2008

34. Transport planners consider the ramped access, traffic management lighting system and car park layout to be acceptable.
35. There would be adequate facilities for both refuse and recycling and these would be stored in the basement.

Residential amenity

36. The proposed ground floor and parapet to the 'terrace' of the 1st floor would project beyond the rear main wall and extension of no. 359 by 10.9m and 5.5m respectively and set in from the boundary by 2.7m. The proposed 1st floor and parapets to the 2nd floor would project 7.3m and 2.2m beyond the rear main wall and extension to no. 359 respectively whereas the 2nd floor would project 0.8m and 6m beyond the rear extension and rear main wall respectively, set in 4m from the boundary.
37. Given the mass and siting of the existing building where the front main wall aligns with the rear wall of the extension with a depth of 8.1m and set in of 2m from the boundary it is not considered that the proposal would appear unreasonably overbearing or intrusive compared to the existing building. It is noted that the proposed building would not project beyond the rear wall of the existing building and where this would be so it would be set in 9m from the boundary.
38. BRE tests confirm that the proposal would not result in a material loss of light to the bedrooms to the rear of this dwelling or the ground floor living room within the single storey rear extension. The kitchen has a small flank window which would suffer some loss of light (given that it is north facing) however it is noted that the kitchen and rear living room are open plan where the kitchen benefits from borrowed light via large French doors, roof lights and a roof lantern. The roof light is not a main window to the living room but does allow light to access the kitchen and would benefit from more daylight than a vertical window. Furthermore there is no mechanism within the BRE guidance to calculate light levels to a roof light given.
39. As a result of the recent extension to this property (2005) and subsequent loss of light, a kitchen window was approved as part of the application however notwithstanding the levels of borrowed light the relatively new window should not be allowed to prejudice the development of this site. A different view would be taken in the case of a long established window to a habitable room.
40. It is noted that the existing building has windows in the flank and front elevations that affords views into and over no. 359. The proposal would have windows in the flank elevation, however those at 1st floor level would be fixed and obscure glazed. Of the windows in the 2nd floor flank elevation, one would front the flank wall of no. 359 whereas the other would be set marginally beyond the rear main of this property where views into the house and garden itself would be extremely difficult given the angles involved, distance from and height of the parapet wall.
41. The terrace to the first floor and second floor flats would not be used as a balcony and access is to be restricted via balustrades across French doors in addition to imposition of a relevant condition. Communal overlooking of gardens is commonplace from 1st and 2nd floor windows and it is not considered that the proposed windows in the rear elevation would result in material harm warranting refusal.
42. The proposed ground floor would be set 4.35m from the boundary with no. 377, projecting 6.15m beyond the rear main wall of this dwelling. The 1st floor would project 1m beyond the rear main wall set off the boundary by 1.15m. The proposed development would not impinge on a 45-degree line taken from the windows on the rear elevation of no. 377 and given the distances mentioned above,

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 MAY 2008

boundary vegetation and existing structure it is not considered that the proposal would appear overbearing or intrusive.

43. The nearest 1st floor flank window (above the access ramp) could be fixed and obscure glazed whereas the other would be set 11m from this boundary. No access is proposed to the flat roof over the 1st floor and is restricted to the front which would not compromise privacy.
44. There are two small ground floor windows on the flank elevation of no. 377 and these appear to serve non habitable rooms given their size and frosted glazing.
45. At its nearest point the proposed building would be set 10.4m from the boundary with no. 12 Halliburton Road and marginally closer (200mm) to these boundaries than the existing building and as such it is not considered to appear overbearing or intrusive. No balconies or terraces to the rear elevation would be accessible and there would be a separation in excess of 25m between rear facing windows and those within the rear elevations of dwellings in Haliburton Road. The proposal would also be BRE compliant and as such is not considered to materially harm outlook, light or privacy to these properties.

Flooding and drainage

46. The development lies within an area of flood risk (Flood Zone 3A) and therefore falls to be determined in accordance with national planning guidance in PPS25: Development and Flood Risk. The guidance requires that a Sequential Test be carried out when determining planning applications and, subsequent to that, an Exception Test be applied to any sites considered for 'more vulnerable uses' such as dwellings within Flood Zone 3 (PPS 25, Table D.3).
47. The Sequential and Exception tests have been applied by the Council in accordance with the Environment Agency table setting out the information required as evidence from Local Planning Authorities and agreed by the Environment Agency.
48. The FRA demonstrates that any residual risk is acceptable and the development makes a positive contribution to reducing or managing flood risk and the Environment Agency have, subject to conditions no objections to the scheme.

Planning Obligation Strategy

49. As the scheme would provide more than 10 units, a contribution is required for the provision of improvements to Health, the Public Realm/Open Space/The River Thames and Transport and thereby the creation of sustainable communities. These contributions total £58,529.05 and the breakdown is shown below.
 - Transport - £40,096
 - Play - £13,702
 - Health - £2,962.05
 - Education - £1,769 (affordable housing)
50. The applicant has agreed to make all the necessary contributions as required through a S106 obligation or similar agreement.

Sustainability

51. The sustainable construction checklist requires that development to reduce the predicted CO2 emissions by at least 10% through the use of renewable energy. The applicant has proposed evacuated tube solar water heating systems which would be positioned on the roof of the building.

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 MAY 2008

52. The applicant estimates that 10% of the annual energy consumption would be 17 630kWh/year where 85sqm of solar panels are required to meet the demand.
53. The applicant seeks an 'excellent' EcoHomes rating and this has been achieved with a pass of 71.29%.
54. With regard to the checklist, these would be complied with as the following has been addressed:
- Meets Ecohomes excellent rating
 - No evidence of site contamination, this will be subject to a condition
 - No evidence to suggest the site has a high ecological value
 - Energy savings via insulation, heat recovery, passive design techniques etc
 - Renewable energies provided
 - Sustainable materials are proposed, no PVC, locally sourced and environmentally friendly materials.
 - Water saving devices employed and rainwater collected.
 - Recycling proposed.
 - Surface water run off reduced by green roof and basement parking will provide a greater area of soft landscaping.
 - Climatic impact minimal.
 - Links are available to public transport.
 - Cycle storage proposed.
 - Provision of green spaces.
 - Aims to achieve a secure by design certification.
 - Low energy light bulbs proposed and design encourages the use of natural light.
 - Ground floor levels set above the 1 in 100 and 1 in1000 flood levels.
 - Compliant with DDA requirements
 - Considerate contractor's scheme employed.

Trees

55. Subject to strict accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan, the Council's arboriculture officers raised no objection to the application.

Contamination

56. In line with current Government guidance set out in Planning Policy Statement 23, the possibility of ground contamination should always be considered, regardless of the past land use, when development is proposed involving or introducing a particularly sensitive use, in this case residential accommodation.
57. Therefore, we consider that a limited intrusive site investigation is required. This should be in the form of a phased investigation and should include:
- Limited Intrusive Site Investigation including both soil, ground gas and groundwater and a Risk Assessment relating to each,
 - Remediation (if necessary).

Conclusion

58. The proposed development would therefore make efficient use of this brownfield site with a design that is considered to be acceptable, improving its environmental credentials, design and siting whilst preserving the character and appearance of the adjacent conservation area and street scene.

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 MAY 2008

59. The scheme is not considered to harm the visual amenities of the locality or the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent residential dwellings and through the imposition of conditions would preserve the trees to be retained on and off site. The proposal would result in a shortfall of parking however given the statistical data from Paragon, it is not considered to prejudice the free flow and safety of highway traffic.
60. The scheme would therefore comply with the aims and objectives set out in SPD for small and medium housing sites, design quality, affordable housing and sustainable construction checklist.

I therefore recommend **PERMISSION** subject to the following conditions and informatives:

Standard conditions:

- AT01 - Development begun within 3 years
- BD04 - Detail to specified scale. Insert # 1:25# and #full height glazing to the stairs, cantilevered porches, railings, gates, balconies and balcony screens#
- BD12 -- Details of Materials to Be Approved.
- DS02 - Wheelchair housing
- DV02 - Boundary fencing
- DV15 - Windows Obscure Glazed and Non-Openable Insert: #first floor# and #north (1B2P flat only)#
- DV15 - Windows Obscure Glazed and Non-Openable Insert: #first floor# and #south#
- DV28 - External Illumination
- DV29C - Potentially Contaminated Sites
- DV30 - Refuse Storage
- DV33A - No Reduction Insert: #in Dwelling Units#
- DV41C - Planning conts'/obligations - Grampian Insert #affordable housing#
- DV42 - Details of Foundation - Piling
- LA11A - Landscaping Required Hard and Soft
- LA30 - Landscape Works - Implementation
- PK06A - Cycle Parking
- RS05 - air conditioning
- PK04 - Spaces for specified uses (insert 'SMR -104A)
- RD09 - Levels of thresholds
- ST03 - Highway Sightlines - Pedestrian
- ST05 - Sight lines - 2.5 X 30

Non Standard Conditions:

- NS01 - All tree protection measures, monitoring, site supervision, ecological assessment and general on site care shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the details set out in the Arboricultural Implications Report and drawing no. ACS002TPP (dated 7 January 2008). REASON: To ensure that the tree (s) are not damaged or otherwise adversely affected by building operations and soil compaction and to safeguard the important amenity value they represent.
- NS02 - The finished floor levels within the proposed development shall be set no lower than 6.58m AOD. REASON: to protect the development from flooding and in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment: FH1338 Rev 1, prepared by Fenland Hydotech Ltd.
- NS03 - The balcony balustrades and screen details preventing access to the rear and side terraces approved pursuant to condition BD12 attached to this decision notice shall be erected prior to the occupation of the flats and shall thereafter be retained in their approved positions. REASON: To protect the amenities of occupiers of nearby residential properties.

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 MAY 2008

- NS04 - The roofs of the building other than those shown as a balcony or roof terrace on the approved drawings shall not be used for any purpose other than as a means of escape or during the maintenance of the building. REASON: To protect the amenities of occupiers of nearby residential properties.
- NS05 - Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, details shall have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, such details to comprise features to be incorporated within the scheme as set out in the approved Sustainability Report and Pre Assessment Estimator - 2006/1.Document. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details set out within the report before the development is completed and occupied. Not less than 28 days notice shall given to the Local Planning Authority in writing prior to the completion to allow for the necessary observation, recording and confirmation that the development has been constructed in accordance with the approved details and Sustainability Statement. REASON: In the interest of sustainable construction
- NS06 - Within one month of the completion of the new development hereby approved, a post construction review shall be undertaken by a certified Ecohomes Assessor to establish whether the building has achieved the rating specified in the approved Sustainability report and Pre Assessment Estimator - 2006/1.Document. The post-construction review report and details of any changes required to achieve that rating shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and subsequently implemented as approved. REASON: In the interest of sustainable construction.
- NS07 - Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, details shall have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, such details to show the basement parking allocation and how this corresponds to the market and affordable flats and thereafter retained. REASON: To ensure that the proposed development accords with the terms of the application and does not prejudice the free flow of traffic, the conditions of general safety or amenities of the area.

Standard Informatives

- IE05A - Noise Control - Building Sites
- IH03A - Vehicle Crossover
- IH06C - Damage to Public Highway
- IL10A - Building Regulations Required
- IL12A - Approved Plans: 101 and 102 received on 25 January 2008 and 103A, 104A, 105A, 106A, 107A, 108A, 109A, 110, 111 received on 21 April 2008.
- IL16F - Relevant Policies and Plans: UDPFR 2005 - ENV 7, 9, 34, 35, 39, BLT 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 30 TRN 2, 4 HSG2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 18, 19. Sustainable Construction Checklist SPD; Design Quality SPD, Small and Medium housing Sites SPD, Affordable Housing SPD, Design for Maximum Access SPG, Recycling for New Developments SPG, London Plan Policies - .1, 3A.3, 3A.5, 3a.11, 3C.1, 3C.17, 3C.22, 3C.23, 3D.15, 4A.3, 4A.4, 4A.7, 4A.9, 4A.10, 4A.11, 4A.12, 4A.13, 4A.14, 4A.33, 4B.1, 4B.2, 4B.5 and 6A.5.
- IL22 - Planning Contributions/Obligations - Insert: Transport - £40,096, Play - £13,702, Health - £2,962.05, Education - £1,769 Affordable housing tenure 3 units (1-bedroom) shared ownership and 7 units (2-3bedroom, 1- 1bedroom and 4-2bedroom) for social rent.
- IM01 - Disabled persons
- IM09 - Disabled parking
- IT06 - Nature Conservation
- IL19 - Reasons for Approval - see summary
- IX04 - Surface Flooding
- IE06 - Piling - consult EHO

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 MAY 2008

Non Standard Informatives:

- NI01 - The applicant is advised that bats are European Protected Species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1991 (as amended) and the Natural Habitats Regulations 1994 and therefore any works effecting roosts, habitats and foraging areas will need to first be approved by DEFRA.
- NI02 - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.
- NI03 - Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to this planning permission. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.
- NI04 - In the interests of surface water run off the applicant/agent is advised that where hard standing is proposed, this be permeable and details should form part of the landscaping condition above.
- NI05 - A height restriction warning sign should be placed at the entrance to the ramp and this height should not be lower than 2.1m.

Background Papers:

Application forms and drawings
Letters of representation
Letters and e-mails from Environment Agency
Applicant's Statements
