

<b>SITE PLAN ATTACHED</b>
---------------------------

**06. LAND FORMERLY KNOWN AS NV TOOLS ST JAMES ROAD BRENTWOOD ESSEX**

**REDEVELOPMENT FOR 45 FLATS, LANDSCAPED AMENITY DECK AND ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING.**

**APPLICATION NO: 15/01084/FUL**

<b>WARD</b>	Brentwood West	<b>8/13 WEEK DATE</b>	25.11.2015
<b>PARISH</b>		<b>POLICIES</b>	NPPF NPPG CP1 CP2 CP3 CP4 H6 H8 H15 E2 T3 T4 T5 T7 LT5
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Caroline McCaffrey	01277 312603	

**Drawing no(s) relevant to this decision:** 1284-113 /P6; 1284-120 /P3; 1284:050 P1; 1284:051 P1; 1248:100 P6; 1248:101 P6; 1248:102 P6; 1248:103 P6; 1248:104 P4; 1248:105 P3; 1248:106 P3; 1248:107 P3; 1248:110 P4; 1248:111 P4; 1248:112 P5; 1248:114 P4; 1248:123 P2; 1248:124 P1; DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT updated 06.11.15; PLANNING STATEMENT updated 06.11.15;

**1. Proposals**

Introduction

This application has been submitted following the refusal of permission for a similarly described development on 20 August 2015 under reference 15/00142/FUL. In most respects this proposal is the same as that the subject of the refusal; however it has been amended in two key respects to address the reasons for refusal.

The two reasons for refusal of application ref 15/00142/FUL were:-

1) The site is within an area that is already subject to a high demand of on-street parking. The proposed density of the development would be likely to result in further pressure on the surrounding road network and have an adverse impact on road safety and the ability of emergency vehicles to access other properties within the vicinity of the site, in particular St James Road. The proposed development would

therefore not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 17) Policy CP1 (criteria iv and v).

And

2) The flank elevation positioned adjoining Brunel House would be likely to give rise to unacceptable overshadowing of the neighbouring properties within the upper floors of that building, resulting in harm to the amenity of those occupiers. This would be in conflict with the aims and objectives of the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CP1 (ii) of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan.

This report sets out a description of the proposal identifying the differences between this proposal and the refusal and then focuses on the effects of those changes. For the Committee's convenience and to avoid duplication a copy of the report relating to the previous application is appended to this report. Unless otherwise indicated in this report officer views remain as expressed in the original report.

The application site comprises a roughly rectangular area of land at the junction between St James Road and Station Road. The site was cleared many years ago in anticipation of the redevelopment of the former NV Tools site. Brunel House, a residential development to the west, forms part of that redevelopment and the main body of the current application site would complete the development. The land falls from St James Road towards the railway land to the south. The application site is separated from the railway car park by the industrial units in Kings Eight. The site lies on the edge of the commercial area around the station with premises to the east and south being in business use with those to the north and west being residential. The application site includes a narrow strip of land north of the railway west of Warley Hill.

Permission is sought to develop the land for residential flats. 27 two bedroom and 18 one bedroom flats are proposed to be built over six floors. It is indicated that 16 units (35%) would be affordable housing with the tenure split to be agreed with the Council and the preferred Registered Social Landlord (RSL). The application indicates that ten would be "affordable" with a further six being "intermediate".

The proposal includes 34 on-site car parking spaces on two levels with access being gained to the upper level from St James Road and the lower level from Station Road. This compares with 27 in the refused application. The extra spaces would be created by increasing the area of the lower ground floor by additional excavation towards St James Road and re-arranging the plant rooms. Six spaces are proposed to be allocated disabled spaces. As before 50 cycle parking spaces and 5 motor cycle spaces are identified within the parking areas. The application indicates that an additional 12 car parking spaces will be available at the station car park through the provision of permits secured through a planning obligation.

The main entrance to the building is proposed at the apex of the junction where an entrance hall would provide access to the staircase and lift to upper floors. Two flats are proposed at ground floor level one of which would be fully accessible with level access directly from St James Road. The first and second floors would each accommodate 10 flats including 5 affordable units (3 one-bed and 2 two-bed) with a further 10 flats on the 4th floor. The 5th floor would have three flats within the tallest part of the building nearest to the junction. The "intermediate" flats are indicated to be provided on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors - two on each floor.

Amenity space is proposed in the form of balconies (12 units at the rear on 2nd, 3rd and 4th floors), terraces (for the three 5th floor units) and communal amenity decks (714 sq m in total) at roof level and above part of the basement car park.

It is proposed that the walls would be mainly finished in yellow facing brick and white render to match the existing adjacent development with feature dark blue "Hardie Plank" cladding panels on the chamfered corner as the building turns the corner at the junction. The entrance area would be fully glazed.

As compared with the previous proposal the design of the St James Road elevation has been modified where the building abuts Brunel House. To the west of the corner this north-facing elevation steps forward in small increments towards Brunel House. In the previous proposal the front wall of the building was 0.7m in front of the main front wall of Brunel House. As now proposed the western end of the front wall would step back to be in line with the front of Brunel House with the full depth of the building being off-set 0.75m from the boundary between the buildings.

## **2. Policy Context**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) came into effect on 27 March 2012 and is now a material consideration in planning decisions. The weight to be given to it will be a matter for the decision makers planning judgement in each particular case. This Framework replaces all the national planning guidance documents as stated in the NPPF, including Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Planning Policy Statements. Notwithstanding this, the NPPF granted a one year period of grace for existing adopted Local Plan policies which has now ended, but, the NPPF advises that following this 12 month period, due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the Framework, (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given). The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) is a material consideration in the determination of this application.

The site has an 'Employment - Office' allocation in the Replacement Local Plan (RLP). The following RLP policies are of relevance when considering this application:-

- o CP1 - General development criteria
- o CP2 - New development and sustainable transport choices
- o CP3 - Transport Assessments
- o CP4 - The provision of infrastructure and community facilities
- o H6 - Small unit accommodation
- o H8 - Affordable housing larger sites
- o H15 - Housing densities
- o E2 - Areas allocated for Office purposes
- o T3 - Travel Plans
- o T4 - New development and highway considerations
- o T5 - Traffic management
- o T7 - Parking (general)
- o T16 - Cycling
- o T17 - Pedestrian facilities
- o LT5 - Provision of open space in new developments

### **3. Relevant History**

#### Overview

The application site has been the subject of a number of proposals for business and mixed use development accommodated within buildings of a similar scale to that now proposed.

The site forms part of a larger site (including the now developed Brunel House). That site was the subject of a number of applications but the most relevant to this proposal was planning permission ref BRW/989/2005. The permission was for a four and five storey building containing 81 residential flats and a six storey office building together with associated parking. The residential part of that development has been built (Brunel House) but the employment element was not commenced.

The permission included a condition (condition 10) requiring the completion of the office accommodation within a fixed time period. Applications have been submitted to extend that period and permission was most recently granted in March 2014 allowing three years from that date to complete the building.

In 2011 an application (ref 11/01195/FUL) was submitted on the current application site for a mixed use development comprising 24 Residential Units, 1270 sq m of B1 office space, 547 sq m of A1 retail space and 115 sq m of D1 creche space, together with associated car parking (comprising 61 spaces) and vehicular access from Station Approach. That application was approved on 3 September 2013. The permission established the principle of residential development on this site but there remained an element of employment uses.

The most relevant proposals are:-

BRW/989/2005 - mixed use development comprising four and five storey building containing 81 residential flats, a six storey office building (2,995sq.m. net internal floor area), together with associated car parking (comprising 59 office and 43 residential car parking spaces) and vehicular access from St James Road and Station Approach - approved subject to conditions and following completion of S106 Agreement.

BRW/149/2009 - variation of condition 10 of planning permission BRW/989/2005 to extend the period for the completion of the office building from 18 months to 48 months from the occupation of the first residential flat (December 2007) – Approved.

BRW/384/2010 - proposed 71no. dwellings (32no. one bedroom flats and 39no. two bedroom flats) and associated vehicular access from St James Road, car park, cycle store and bin store. Refused.

BRW/1/2011 - variation of condition 10 of planning permission reference BRW/989/2005 in order to extend the period for the completion of the office building. Approved subject to the office building being completed within 36 months.

11/01195/FUL - Mixed use development comprising 24 Residential Units, 1270 sq m of B1 office space, 547 sq m of A1 retail space and 115 sq m of D1 creche space, together with associated car parking (comprising 61 spaces) and vehicular access from Station Approach. Approved.

15/00142/FUL – Redevelopment for 45 flats, landscaped amenity deck, and associated car parking. Refused 20 August 2015 for the reasons set out above.

#### **4. Neighbour Responses**

21 letters of objection in total (from 11 individuals):-

Councillor Ms Karen Chilvers. This development was originally meant to be an office block as part of Brunel House and these attempts to keep adding more and more residential in this area is not responsible. There is not enough parking in this area to support this development and this will add about another 100 residents to an area that is already over developed and over-populated.

Letters from 4 occupiers of Brunel House (flats) and occupiers from Damon House, Radcliffe House, Kings and Chase Road.

Parking in St James Road is already over crowded and the photos in the application do not truly represent the situation. Often public services struggle to drive down the road. The application is for 45 units with only 33 Car Parking spaces, the social housing will still require parking spaces. I note that there are 50 cycle spaces proposed however, these won't relieve the car parking strains. Realistically very few residents end up using the racks due to theft. The building will over look and shadow Brunel House blocking out further light. This space could be put to better use as local children have no close and safe areas to play. We are regularly experiencing power issues and I fear the infrastructure servicing the road cannot cope with further demands. It would turn what used to be a lovely road to live in, into quite an unpleasant living experience.

If the proposed property was the same height and profile of the adjoining property (Brunel House) I would not consider this an overdevelopment. The flank elevation positioned adjoining Brunel House would be likely to give rise to unacceptable overshadowing of the neighbouring properties within the upper floors of the building. This will reduce the quality of lives of residents.

Proposal would have 28 parking spaces for residents and 6 disabled spaces. It is unreasonable for it to be presumed that it is acceptable for only 28 out of 45 flats (62%) to have a dedicated parking space, simply because the preceding overdevelopment was allowed to; this misjudgment by the planning committee cannot be allowed to continue as a 'precedent' for the area. Visitors, for example visiting nurses and health care practitioners, need to park their car. There is no provision for this in the submitted plan. Parking is already very difficult/atrocious and the proposal will make things worse. With additional cars trying to park in St James Road, emergency vehicles will struggle to access emergencies. A photograph shows two fire engines unable to proceed due to parked cars. It is not uncommon for emergency vehicles to have to sound their horn and wait for 5+ residents to move their cars, wasting valuable time before proceeding. I sincerely hope no one dies because of these unacceptable delays in getting help to them. More cars from this application would just exacerbate the issue. The access is where HGVs stop to deliver. More traffic will make deliveries harder. There are already too many flats and not enough parking which is causing trouble.

Considering the very small development area and no adjacent land area to house construction materials and machinery, has consideration been given to the neighbourhood during the building phase and the impact it will have? Also, have considerations been made for any access to the railway car park for ongoing Cross Rail building activities.

The additional anti-social impact additional development will bring to the area concerns us. For example, the attempted arson attack on Brunel House. After previous refusals why doesn't the developer listen to residents.

## 5. Consultation Responses

- **Highway Authority:**

Given the extant consent for 24 residential units, 1,270sqm of B1 Office space, 547sqm of A1 Retail space, 115sqm of D1 Creche space and 61 associated car parking spaces, and considering the Highway Authority's position on previous application number BRW/15/00142/FUL, from a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority subject to conditions.

- **Anglian Water Services Ltd:**

We have recently been consulted on the above planning application, and upon review Anglian Water found that we do not own the sewers in the vicinity of the development. These are owned by Thames Water and you will need to liaise with them.

- **Design Officer:**

Taking account of previous permissions. No objection.

- **Thames Water Development Planning:**

With the information provided Thames Water, has been unable to determine the waste water infrastructure needs of this application. Should the Local Planning Authority look to approve the application ahead of further information being provided, we request that the following 'Grampian Style' condition be applied - "Development shall not commence until a drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works, has been submitted to and approved by, the local planning authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed". Reason - The development may lead to sewage flooding; to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to cope with the new development; and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community.

Should the Local Planning Authority consider the above recommendation is inappropriate or are unable to include it in the decision notice, it is important that the Local Planning Authority liaises with Thames Water Development Control Department (telephone 0203 577 9998) prior to the Planning Application approval.

Surface Water Drainage - 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 groundwater. 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 0800 009 3921. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

## **6. Summary of Issues**

Principle of residential development

See previous report Appendix 1. In summary:-

Taking account of the marketing evidence and the assessment by Glenny it is considered unlikely that the site would be developed in the foreseeable future to include employment uses. In the context of the current shortfall in housing land the dwellings arising from this proposal, including 16 affordable units, are of significant benefit.

The proposal would conflict with RLP Policy E2; however in the light of Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework the principle of the development must be determined in the context of the Framework as a whole. It is considered that the benefits arising from the additional housing would not be significantly outweighed by any adverse effect of not developing the site for employment purposes and therefore, in principle, residential development is acceptable.

Density of development and housing mix

No change from previous report.

Character and appearance

See previous report. The only difference between the proposal and the previous scheme is the change to the corner of the building next to Brunel House. This does not detract from the overall design and appearance of the building which is appropriate for this location.



## Living conditions of nearby residents

General - see previous report.

The top floor of Brunel House in the St James Road elevation is set back from the main front wall and the top floor flats have a narrow terrace/balcony. The relationship between the projecting flank wall of the previous proposal and the adjacent flats in Brunel House was the subject of the second reason for refusal. In that proposal the flank wall was 0.7m in front of that of Brunel House.

As a result of the set back of the corner of the building the subject of the current application its front wall, where it joins Brunel house, would be in line with that of Brunel House. However as a consequence of the set back of the top floor of Brunel House the flank wall of the proposed building would extend to the full depth of the front terrace/balcony of the adjacent top floor flat.

As now proposed the wall would be a dominant presence alongside the top floor balcony; however it would be reduced in depth by 0.7m as compared with the previously refused proposal and would not be as high or as deep as that previously permitted. The off set of about 0.75m to the projecting bay of the proposal would result in it having a reduced effect on Brunel House.

Taking account of the extant permissions it is considered that the proposal would not unacceptably detract from the living conditions of the occupiers of Brunel House. It would therefore be consistent with RLP Policy CP1 and with one of the core principles of the Framework which indicates that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of buildings.

## Living conditions of occupiers of the proposal

See previous report. The set back of the north west corner of the building would reduce the size of the lounge areas of the five corner flats by about 0.5sq m. This would have no material effect on those units.

## Highways issues and parking

The second difference between the previous refused application and this proposal concerns parking provision.

As indicated above the proposal makes provision, within the building, for 34 parking spaces (including 6 disabled). Secure space for 50 cycles is also proposed within the building along with 5 motorcycle spaces. This is an increase of 7 car parking spaces as compared with the previous scheme. In addition (and in common with the previous proposal) 12 off-site parking spaces would be made available through the purchase of parking permits to enable parking at the nearby station car park. (Note the reference to 18 spaces in the previous report is an error).

The highways authority raises no objection to the proposal as regards its effect on traffic or parking.

As indicated in the previous report parking standards for residential developments of this type require the provision of a minimum of 72 spaces plus 11 further spaces for visitors. However, the standards indicate that reductions may be considered if the development is within an urban area that has good links to frequent and extensive public transport with easy access to employment and local shops and services. The appeal site has extremely high accessibility to sustainable transport and local facilities and it is therefore considered that it would be unreasonable to insist on the full standard.

Taking account of the nature of the units and their highly accessible location it is considered that it would be reasonable to base the assessment of parking on one space per unit; which would result in a deficit of 11 on-site spaces. However this would be mitigated by the proposed 12 off-site spaces. The provision of parking for cycles and powered two wheelers is in accordance with the adopted standards.

Residents have raised concern about access into the area by emergency vehicles and in the determination of previous proposals consideration has been given to Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) being employed to extend the existing double yellow lines to restrict on-street parking in St James Road.

This matter has been specifically raised with the highways authority who indicate that there is not a requirement for an additional TRO on St James Road. The authority indicates that this option has previously been explored and met with objections from local residents. It goes on to comment that the highway authority is satisfied that parked vehicles are unlikely to cause an obstruction to fire tenders on St James Road. Furthermore, the proposed development's site access on the south side of St James Road is likely to prevent the possibility of parked cars causing an obstruction on that side of the road. It points out that in the event of any obstruction of the highway the Police have the authority to remove that obstruction and that in the case of any emergency, there is an alternative route via Kings Chase and Chase Road to access the Wharf Road and Rollason Way area.

## Conclusion on highways and parking

Paragraph 39 of the Framework indicates that if setting local parking standards local planning authorities should take account of a number of factors including the accessibility of the development, the availability of and opportunities for public transport and local car ownership levels. On 25 March 2015 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government indicated that paragraph 39 should be read in conjunction with the following text:- "Local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards .... where there is a clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network". The preamble to that text referred to issues arising from the use of maximum standards and indicated that the market is best placed to decide if additional parking spaces are to be provided. However those comments do not appear in the Framework text.

It is considered that there is a compelling justification for the requirement to provide off-street parking in this location and local parking standards are therefore necessary. The issue for determination is the amount and method of provision of parking in this highly accessible urban area where the standard allows for flexibility.

The management of the road network is a matter for the Highways Authority and in this case that authority raises no objection to the proposal. It is therefore considered that, taking account of all factors, the parking measures proposed (including off-site provision) are acceptable.

## Public open space

See previous report

## Other considerations

Archaeology, Waste management, Energy usage,

See previous report

## Conclusion

As a consequence of the shortfall of identified housing land the proposal must be judged against the policies within the Framework. The proposed dwellings would be well designed and in a highly sustainable location. The standard of accommodation would be acceptable and the proposal would not unduly affect the amenities of nearby residents. The proposal would make a significant contribution to housing and affordable housing in the Borough. The development of the site would result in considerable investment which would boost the local economy. For all of these reasons the proposal would accord with the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

Paragraph 14 of the framework indicates that, unless any adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, sustainable development should be granted permission. Whilst in a number of respects the proposal does not satisfy the adopted local policies and guidelines it is considered that those deficiencies would not significantly outweigh the benefits and that permission should be granted.

The permission should be subject to the conditions set out below and a planning agreement in respect of:- a) the provision of 16 affordable residential units, b) the provision of 12 parking permits in the nearby railway car park.

## **7. Recommendation**

The Application be APPROVED subject to completion of a Section 106 Agreement and to the following conditions:-

### **1 TIM01 Standard Time - Full**

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

### **2 U11451**

No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:

- i. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials
- iii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- iv. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
- v. wheel washing facilities
- vi. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
- vii. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
- viii. hours of working and hours during which deliveries may be taken at the site

Reason: Taking account of the character of the area including nearby residential and business uses the method of carrying out the development is fundamental to the development permitted and the application as submitted provides insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposal would not be unacceptably harmful to the living conditions of nearby residents, the safety and convenience of highway users and the character and appearance of the area during the construction period. In the absence of a condition requiring the approval of these matters before the commencement of the development it would have been necessary to refuse planning permission.

### 3 U11452

No development above ground level shall take place until details and samples, where necessary, of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details submitted shall include:-

- o drawings showing details of proposed new windows, doors, eaves, verges and cills to be used by section and elevation at scales between 1:20 and 1:1 as appropriate.
- o a schedule of the types and colour of the materials to be used in the external finishes has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority
- o a sample panel of 1 square metre minimum shall be erected on site to show areas of new exterior walling, this panel shall indicate: - brick bond, copings, mortar mix, colour and pointing profile

The development shall be carried out in accordance with those approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy CP1 of the Brentwood Replacement Local plan 2005.

### 4 U11453

Prior to occupation of the proposed development, the first occupiers of each of the flats hereby permitted shall be provided with a Residential Travel Information Pack for sustainable transport, with information covering local public transport travel and including six one day travel vouchers for use with the relevant local public transport operator, within one month of their occupation of their dwelling. Details of the Residential Travel Information Pack shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of reducing the need to travel by car and promoting sustainable development and transport.

5 U11454

Prior to occupation of any flat the vehicle parking area, including the provision of car, motor cycle and bicycle parking facilities, shall be completed as indicated on the approved drawings. The vehicle parking area shall thereafter be retained in this form and shall not be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles associated with the residential occupation of the building.

Reason: To ensure that appropriate parking is provided in accordance with Policy CP1 of the Brentwood Replacement Local plan 2005 in the interests of highway safety and the encouragement of the use of sustainable methods of transport.

6 U11455

No development above ground level shall take place until details of the two amenity decks have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Those details shall include the layout, surface treatment, planting arrangements and any seating or other fixtures. The decks shall be laid out as approved prior to the first occupation of any flat and shall thereafter be retained as approved for use by the occupiers of the flats.

Reason - To ensure the provision of amenity space for the occupiers of the flats in accordance with Policy CP1 of the Brentwood Replacement Local plan 2005.

7 U11456

No development above ground level shall take place until a landscaping scheme to include details of all surfacing materials, measures to support climbing plants and specification of plant species on the three road frontages of the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be completed in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Any newly planted tree, shrub or climbing plant that dies, or is uprooted, severely damaged or seriously diseased, within five years of the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with another of the same species and of a similar size, unless the local planning authority gives prior written consent to any variation.

Reason - In the interests of the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy CP1 of the Brentwood Replacement Local plan 2005.

8 U11457

The building hereby permitted shall be equipped with a communal TV and radio aerial and satellite dish prior to the first beneficial use. Details of the size, external appearance and the position shall be previously submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to the installation of such systems.

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no other satellite dishes or aerials shall be fixed to the building hereby permitted without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy CP1 of the Brentwood Replacement Local plan 2005.

9 U11458

None of the accommodation hereby permitted shall be occupied until the facilities to be provided for the storage of refuse/recycling materials have been provided in accordance with the details shown on the approved drawings. Thereafter the accommodation shall not be occupied unless those facilities are retained.

Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

10DRA01A Development in accordance with drawings

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved drawing(s) listed above and specifications.

Reason: To ensure that the development is as permitted by the local planning authority and for the avoidance of doubt.

11 U11459

Development shall not commence until a drainage strategy detailing any on-site and/or off-site drainage works, has been submitted to and approved by, the local planning authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to cope with the new development; and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community. It is essential that the measures are submitted and approved before commencement because the drainage measures are likely to be implemented at the outset of the development.

12U11460

Prior to the commencement of the development details of the surface water drainage scheme to serve the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the surface water discharge from the site is not detrimental to the existing sewerage system or highway safety. It is essential that the measures are submitted and approved before commencement because the drainage measures are likely to be implemented at the outset of the development.

13U11461

Prior to occupation of the development, the east facing vehicular access as shown in Drawing no 1284:112 rev P5 shall be constructed at right angles to the highway boundary and to the existing carriageway. The width of the access at its junction with the highway shall not be less than 4.8m, shall be retained at that width for 10m within the site and shall be provided with an appropriate dropped kerb vehicular crossing of the footway. Headroom at the vehicle entrance and within the parking area shall be a minimum of 2.1m

Reason: To ensure that vehicles can enter and leave the highway in a controlled manner in the interest of highway safety in accordance with policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

14U11462

d) Prior to occupation of the development, the north facing vehicular access as shown in Drawing no 1284:113 rev P5 shall be constructed at right angles to the highway boundary and to the existing carriageway. The width of the access at its junction with the highway shall not be less than 5.1m, shall be retained at that width for 20m within the site and shall be provided with an appropriate dropped kerb vehicular crossing of the footway. Headroom at the vehicle entrance and within the parking area shall be a minimum of 2.1m.

Reason: To ensure that vehicles can enter and leave the highway in a controlled manner in the interest of highway safety in accordance with policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

Informative(s)

1 U02670

The drawing numbers listed above are relevant to this decision.



2 U02671

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the reasons for refusal and discussing those with the Applicant. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development, which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future.

*BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS*

**DECIDED:**