

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

19th January 2011

Nikolas.smith@hounslow.gov.uk

References: P/2011/2123 00731/B/P3

Address: Manor Court, Manor Gardens, Chiswick, London, W3 8JX.

Ward: Turnham Green

Proposal: Erection of an additional floor to the existing building to provide four flats, erection of bin enclosures adjacent to front entrance, provision of new fencing including front gate and cycle storage

Drawing numbers: 1744/PL301D, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306A, 307A and 308 and Design and Access Statement received 25/07/2011

Application received: 15/08/2011

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 Planning permission was refused for a similar development at this site in 2009.
- 1.2 It was refused because it would result in the loss of existing open space and trees at the site that would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would fail to provide an adequate level of garden space for future occupiers.
- 1.3 An appeal was lodged against this refusal. The Inspector felt that the development would cause no harm to the Conservation Area, that existing parking at the site would be adequate and so increasing the number of spaces at the expense of existing garden space and trees was not necessary and that a shortfall in amenity space provision could be mitigated by a financial contribution towards nearby Gunnersbury Park.
- 1.4 The differences between that application and this one was that the previous proposal included five additional car parking spaces that took the place of 77m² of existing landscaping that included two trees. It is no longer proposed to increase the number of car parking spaces or to decrease the existing level of landscaping.

- 1.5 Nonetheless, the Inspector dismissed the appeal because of inadequacies in the drafting of the legal agreement that would facilitate that financial contribution. He found all other matters to be satisfactory and had the legal agreement been properly drafted, would have granted planning permission subject to conditions.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The site contains a three-storey block of flats with an 'L' shaped footprint that contain 24 flats. To the west is Gunnersbury Avenue, to the east is a sport ground and to the south is a wooded area. The site is at the southern end of Manor Gardens, which is a residential street with two-storey terraced houses. Parking and landscaping is to the north and west of the block.
- 2.2 The existing building is in two main blocks, which are attached to each other in the southeast corner. Each block has two entrances. Flats 1-6 and 7-12 are on the block with its front elevation facing west. The block with its front elevation facing north contains No's 13-18 and 19-24. As well as the front entrances, each block has external metal staircases on the rear elevation.
- 2.3 The building has a flat roof and measures 9.4m high and 9m wide. The west-facing block is 30.6m long and the north-facing block is 30.4m long. A crittal window design was used for the original building. The style remains but the original windows have been replaced by uPVC versions.
- 2.4 There is around 700m² of amenity space behind the existing buildings that is used by ground floor flats.
- 2.5 The site area is 0.35ha. The existing density for 24 flats is 69units/ha and the site is within a suburban location.
- 2.6 There are 27 car parking and 12 cycle parking spaces at the site. It is within a Controlled Parking Zone.
- 2.7 The site is within Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area and has a Public Transport Accessibility Level of 1b (very poor).

3.0 HISTORY

- 3.1 Building Control records indicate that the 24 flats were built circa 1939.
- 3.2 00731/B/P1 Erection of an additional floor to the existing building to provide four flats, erection of bin enclosures adjacent to front entrance, provision of new fencing and cycle storage sheds and alterations to the existing parking layout.
- Withdrawn 19.11.09.
- 3.3 00731/B/P2 Erection of an additional floor to the existing building to provide four flats, erection of bin enclosures adjacent to front entrance, provision of new fencing and cycle storage sheds and alterations to the existing parking layout.

Refused: 23/06/2010

Appeal dismissed: 16/03/2011

4.0 DETAILS

4.1 This proposal is different from that for which planning permission was refused (and dismissed at appeal) in the following ways:

- There would be five fewer parking spaces (27 rather than 33) and this would be in direct response to the Inspector's comments in the appeal decision who felt that the existing provision at the site would be acceptable.
- A 77m² area of existing landscaping that includes two trees would not be removed.

4.2 This proposal is for a mansard style roof extension on both blocks to provide a total of four additional flats. It would increase the existing number of flats from 24 to 28.

4.3 The existing bin store would be increased in size to include 1 x estate frame, 1 x 1100ltr cardboard bin, 1 x 1100ltr plastic bin and 5 x 1100 litre Euro bins to cater for both existing and proposed units.

4.4 The development would increase the height of the building to 12.5m. The proposed extension on the west facing elevation would be 26.3m long and 6m wide. The front and rear elevations of the roof extension would be set in 0.97m from the existing walls. It would be finished with zinc cladding for the external appearance and grey UPVC window frames. Matching brickwork is not specified but would be required by condition. Windows are proposed on the front and rear elevations of the roof extension. There would also be one window on the flank elevation of proposed flat No.4.

4.5 Access to the flats would be through the existing internal stairwells.

4.6 Additional amenity space for the proposed flats is in the form of balconies for two of the proposed units. Flat 2 would have 19.87m² of balcony space and flat 3 would have a balcony of 15m².

4.7 The proposed density would be 80units/ha, or 2.9 habitable rooms/unit or 234 habitable rooms/ha.

4.8 Proposed flats 1 and 2 (to the north) would be two-bedroom flats and would have a net internal floor area of 69m². Flat 3 would have three bedrooms and would have an internal floor area of 90m² and flat 4 would be a two-bedroom unit and have an internal floor area of 54.7m².

4.9 No additional car parking spaces would be provided.

4.10 **Tables showing internal floor area breakdowns.**

4.11 Flat1

Room	Proposed floor area	SPG 1997 minimum floor area
Bed 1	14.4m ²	12m ²
Bed 2	13m ²	10m ²
Bathroom	4.4m ²	3.7m ²
Kitchen/Lounge	24.6m ²	16m ²

4.12 Flat2

Room	Proposed floor area	SPG 1997 minimum floor area
Bed 1	13m ²	12m ²
Bed 2	13.4m ²	10m ²
Bathroom	5m ²	3.7m ²
Kitchen/Lounge	25m ²	16m ²

4.13 Flat 3

Room	Proposed floor area	SPG 1997 minimum floor area
Bed 1	13.4m ²	12m ²
Bed 2	12.5m ²	10m ²
Bed 3	14.4m ²	10m ²
Bathroom	6m ²	3,7m ²
Lounge/Kitchen	24.2m ²	16m ²

4.14 Flat 4

Room	Proposed floor area	SPG 1997 minimum floor area
------	---------------------	-----------------------------

Bed 1	12.3m ²	12m ²
Bed 2	9.3m ²	10m ²
Bathroom	5m ²	3.7m ²
Kitchen/Lounge	21.4m ²	16m ²

4.15 Amenity space

Flat No.	Proposed amenity space	SPG 1997 minimum amenity space provision
Flat 1	None.	25m ²
Flat 2	21m ²	25m ²
Flat 3	14.5m ²	30m ²
Flat 4	None	25m ²

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 31 neighbouring residents were notified on 15/08/2011. Press and site notices were received. Five replies were received. The comments made and the responses should be read in the context of the outcome of the last appeal, where the Inspector found the scheme to be acceptable but felt that the legal agreement was flawed.

Comment	Response
The application form says that there are 28 parking spaces at the site but there are only 27.	There are 27 spaces at the site and the application has been assessed on that basis. The number of spaces has not changed since the Inspector's decision.
The plans do not show existing trees and so they might not be protected. Works to the cycle sheds could result in harm to a nearby tree.	The applicant has indicated that no trees would be removed and consent would be required because of the Conservation Area. An informative making this clear is recommended.
Landscaping would be lost at	The proposal at the east of the site

the front of the site because of a reorientation of parking spaces and the introduction of pedestrian footpaths.	would be the same as the previous application and the Inspector found this acceptable. The parking spaces would move further in to the central parking area rather than towards the flats and in to the landscaped area.
The bin store arrangements could result in cars getting scratched.	It is more likely that bins would be emptied at the opening near the entrance of the site rather than between parked cars.
The existing drainage system is already stretched and drainage problems are causing subsidence.	The building would need to obtain Building Control approval, when this issue would be considered.
There are already parking problems in the area. A resident noted that a disability made parking far away from their home especially problematic.	The Inspector felt that the existing parking provision at the site would be adequate. It is proposed to ensure that new residents of the four flats would not be eligible for Resident's Parking Permits within the surrounding CPZ.
The development would result in overshadowing at near by houses.	The Inspector felt that no harm would be caused to living conditions nearby and the scheme would be the same as that one.
The provision of a new building and fencing would be welcomed.	Noted.
There would be considerable disruption caused during construction.	There would be disruption during the construction period that is largely unavoidable. A condition controlling construction hours would seek to minimise this.

5.2 POLICY

Determining applications for full or outline planning permission

- 5.3 When determining applications for planning permission, the authority is required to have regard to the development plan, so far as is material, and

to any other material considerations. In addition, the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan

- 5.4 The Development Plan for the Borough comprises the Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP), Employment Development Plan Document, Brentford Area Action Plan and the London Plan. The London Plan was adopted on 22 July 2011.

The emerging Core Strategy

- 5.5 On 12 July 2011, the Council's Cabinet approved that the Core Strategy "Preferred Strategy" should go out to consultation. As emerging policy, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) considers that the emerging Core Strategy is capable of being a material consideration. Given that the emerging Core Strategy is still in the consultation stages, the LPA considers that very limited weight can be given to it at this stage.

The draft National Planning Policy Framework

- 5.6 The draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published for consultation on 25 July 2011. The NPPF is a consultation document and, therefore, potentially subject to amendment. Nonetheless, as emerging policy, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) considers that the NPPF is capable of being a material consideration. As the Planning Policy Statements, Guidance notes and Circulars remain in place until cancelled and given that the NPPF is still in the consultation stages, the LPA considers that very limited weight can be given to the NPPF at this stage.

Determining applications for Conservation Area consent

- 5.7 In considering whether to grant planning permission with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Determining applications in respect of Listed Buildings

- 5.8 In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- 1997 Supplementary Planning Guidance
- Draft Conservation Area Appraisals
- Residential Extensions Guidelines

Conservation Area Character Appraisals

- 5.9 This appraisal was created as a response to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which required that the current UDP be replaced by a Local Development Framework, which is group of policy documents, including conservation area character appraisals. The current UDP contains saved policy on (insert) Conservation Area, as detailed in the

paragraph above. The appraisal was also a response to Section 71 of the Planning and Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990, which requires that conservation area appraisals be reviewed. English Heritage is also encouraging Councils to provide up-to-date management guidance for every conservation area.

5.10 Hounslow Council began this process in reports to Area planning committees in January 2006, which included appraisals for all the borough's conservation areas, the effects of designation and draft management guidelines. The appraisals for each document were adopted at Committee on 21/03/06. Public consultations with interested groups and local residents are taking place over three years to finalise the management guidelines for the various conservation areas.

5.11 **National Policy**

PPS1	Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS3	Housing
PPS5	Planning for the Historic Environment.

5.12 **London Plan**

3.3	Increasing Housing Supply
5.2	Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
7.8	Heritage Assets and Archaeology

5.13 **Unitary Development Plan**

ENV-B.1.1	New development.
ENV-B.2.2.	Conservation areas
H.4.1	Housing standards and guidelines
T.1.4	Car and cycle parking and servicing facilities for developments.
T.4.3	Traffic implications of new development

5.14 **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

SPG 1997	Chapter 10 – Private Amenity Space
SPG 1997	Chapter 12 – Internal Space Provision

6.0 PLANNING ISSUES

6.1 The main planning issues to consider are:

- The acceptability in principle
- The impact on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
- The impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.
- The standard of accommodation for future residents
- Traffic and parking
- Sustainability

6.2 The acceptability in principle

6.3 The proposal to increase the number of units at the site by four was established as acceptable by the Inspector at the time of the last application. The Inspector's only concerns were that the additional five parking spaces at the site were not required and that the landscaping that they would have replaced should be retained. The Inspector felt that this issue could have been addressed by the submission of amended drawings through a planning condition but that the submitted legal agreement was flawed.

6.4 The impact on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area

6.5 The Inspector found that the appearance of the development would have been acceptable and this design is no different to that proposal. He concluded that *'the remodelled roof form has been sensitively designed to respect the architectural detail and influences of the existing building'*.

6.6 The proposed roof extension is considered to have been designed to harmonise with the existing building. It would have windows aligned with the windows on the floors below and they would have a matching critical style that is in keeping with the original character of the building. It would be set in from the front and rear elevations by 1m and would be set in from the northern elevation by 2.5m and the addition of an extension with a mansard form rather than adding another storey with the same design as the lower floors would ensure the extension complements the original building. The height is not considered excessive and it is considered to relate well to the existing building in terms of scale for these reasons.

6.7 The developer has proposed the use of zinc cladding with a matt finish, which is considered to be appropriately high quality. The external materials would be secured by condition to ensure an appropriate appearance is achieved.

- 6.8 The proposed fencing would replace the existing fencing around the site and would be the same height and would also be timber construction, as is existing. Details would be secured by condition.
- 6.9 The proposed development is bound to the south by a railway line and obscured by screening in the form of trees and other vegetation here. The proposed roof extension would be visible from Manor Gardens and from Gunnersbury Avenue. However, the level of the land drops away as it extends east, away from Gunnersbury Avenue. These factors, when combined with the existing landscaped boundary means that the appearance of the development would be acceptable when viewed from the west and south.
- 6.10 The supporting guidance for Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area identifies two areas of focus, including Gunnersbury Park/Kensington Cemetery and the Gunnersbury Park residential estate opposite to the east. The site falls within the latter. The character appraisal notes that the residential estate has no relationship in style or historic development with the park. However it forms part of the eastern setting of the park and the layout was evidently an integrated estate. A consistent character has been retained. As discussed already in this report, the proposed development is considered to relate well to the appearance of the existing building in terms of scale, design, window pattern and use of high quality materials. For these reasons it is considered to preserve the character and appearance of Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area.
- 6.11 The extensions would be the same as those that the Inspector found acceptable.
- 6.12 This proposal would be different from the previous scheme in that it would allow for the retention of an existing landscaped area that had been proposed to be replaced with additional parking space. The retention of this space and the two trees that would have been lost would represent a significant visual improvement at the site when compared to the last application.
- 6.13 **The impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents**
- 6.14 The Inspector found that the last scheme would cause no harm to living conditions at neighbouring houses and this proposal is for the same development. He concluded that 'beyond the construction phase, which would inevitably cause some disturbance, the living conditions of existing residents in terms of privacy, overlooking, outlook or light interruption factors' would not be impaired.
- 6.15 Policy ENV-B.1.1 and H.6.4 both seek to ensure that new development minimises any impact on neighbouring properties.
- 6.16 Windows are proposed on the rear elevations of all four flats and flats 2 and 3 would have balconies. The opportunity for overlooking of the rear garden area would exist but is not considered to be materially different to the existing situation. At present the existing three floors all have habitable room

windows that face onto the garden areas at the rear of the block. No harm would be created in terms of overlooking. The proposal would accord with UDP policies ENV-B.1.1 and H.6.4 for this reason.

- 6.17 Whilst the proposed roof extension would add 3.7m to the existing roof height, it would be set in by 1m from the front and rear elevations. In the morning the majority of shadow would fall within the site itself and in the evening they would be cast on the railway line and tennis courts to the east. There may be some increased overshadowing to the rear garden of neighbouring properties to the north in the afternoon but this is unlikely to have an unreasonable impact due to the length of the rear gardens here. The shadows would be likely to be short in length here during the summer months when people make the most use of their outside space. The proposed set-ins combined with the level of overshadowing created by the height of the existing building mean that there is unlikely to be any unreasonable overshadowing as a result of the proposed development. The proposal would accord with UDP policies ENV-B.1.1 and H.6.4 for this reason.
- 6.18 The proposal would have no different impact to that of the previous scheme and the Inspector found that to be satisfactory.
- 6.19 **The standard of accommodation for future residents**
- 6.20 The Inspector found that internal living standards would be acceptable and this scheme would not differ in that respect from the previous proposal. The Inspector identified a shortfall in private amenity space provision but felt that a financial contribution towards Gunnersbury Park would act as acceptable mitigation for this. The legal agreement that sought to secure that contribution was inadequate and it was for that reason that the appeal was dismissed.
- 6.21 Policy H.4.1 sets out housing standards and guidelines in relation to form and design, daylight and sunlight, privacy, amenity space, noise and refuse and recycling.
- 6.22 Supplementary Planning Guidance sets minimum amenity space provision and internal room sizes for new development. Also of relevance is the internal layout to provide appropriate stacking within the development.
- 6.23 Proposed flats 1, 2 and 3 would provide internal room sizes in accordance with the minimum standards set out in SPG 1997. Whilst the proposed layout of flat 4 would result in one bedroom marginally below the Council's minimum standards, the overall internal floor area is considered acceptable.
- 6.24 The proposed amenity space is less than the minimum standards sought for each flat. Two flats would have some amenity space in the form of balconies, whilst two would have no private amenity space. The site is within close proximity to Gunnersbury Park although this would necessitate crossing Gunnersbury Lane. The applicant has confirmed that they would accept the requirement to provide a financial contribution towards enhancement of public open space within Gunnersbury Park. This is

considered an acceptable resolution to allow a recommendation for approval to be made in relation to amenity space provision.

- 6.25 The stacking arrangements are acceptable. The internal layouts would also avoid any direct overlooking between the proposed units.
- 6.26 The submitted plans indicate that the required refuse and recycling facilities could be incorporated where the current refuse bins are located. A new bin enclosure would be included as part of the development. Details of the appearance would be secured by condition to ensure that it preserved the character and appearance of Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area.
- 6.27 Subject to a sound legal agreement securing a financial contribution towards Gunnersbury Park, living conditions at the flats would be acceptable.
- 6.28 **Traffic and parking**
- 6.29 The last application proposed to increase the number of parking spaces at the site by 5 from 27 to 32 by removing an area of landscaping at the front of the site. The Inspector felt that *'the site enjoys a sustainable location and is well positioned to take advantage of a wide range of public transport connections in the form of bus and both over and underground rail connections'* and that *'the remodelling of the hard standing areas to provide additional car parking is not necessary'*.
- 6.30 On that basis, it is no longer proposed to increase the number of spaces at the site.
- 6.31 UDP policy T.1.4 requires all development to provide parking and servicing facilities in accordance with Council standards.
- 6.32 UDP policy T.4.3 states that development will not be permitted if the traffic movement associated with it would increase danger, cause unacceptable noise, congestion or environmental intrusion.
- 6.33 The existing bin store area would be formalised and would be served in the same way as is currently the case.
- 6.34 Manor Gardens is a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) meaning that only cars with permits can park on the road during peak times.
- 6.35 A number of residents have raised concerns about existing parking problems in the area. To ensure that the development would not add to these problems, future occupiers of the flats would be prevented from obtaining Resident's Parking Permits.
- 6.36 Four additional cycle parking spaces would be provided that would further help to reduce demand on car parking.
- 6.37 In light of the Inspector's comments in respect to parking, the existing provision at the site is considered acceptable.

6.38 Sustainability

6.39 London Plan policy 5.2 (Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions) of the London Plan requires new development to provide a 25% improvement against the Building Regulations (2010).

6.40 A condition would require details of how it is proposed to achieve these standards and this arrangement was considered acceptable by the Inspector.

7.0 EQUALITIES DUTIES IMPLICATIONS

The Council has to give due regard to its Equalities Duties and in particular with respect to its duties arising pursuant to the Equality Act 2010, section 149. Following a relevance test, which is available at:

http://www.hounslow.gov.uk/index/council_and_democracy/equality/eias/environment_eias.htm it is considered that there will be no specific implications with regard to the Council’s duty in respect of its equalities duties and that if approving or refusing this proposal the Council will be acting in compliance with its duties.

Relevant Section of Relevance Test	Minor development
------------------------------------	-------------------

8.0 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

8.1 UDP policy IMP6.1 states that the Council will seek to ensure that a developer enters into a planning obligation to secure planning benefits related to the proposed development. A payment or other benefit offered pursuant to a section 106 agreement is not material to a decision to grant planning permission and cannot be required unless it complies with the provisions of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (regulation 122), which provide that the planning obligation must be:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Accordingly, it is mandatory that each criterion be satisfactorily addressed prior to granting planning permission subject to a section 106 agreement.

- 8.2 Government Circular 05/2005 provides guidance on the use of planning obligations, which may impose a restriction or requirement, or provide for payment of money from the developer to make acceptable development proposals that might otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations (which was adopted in March 2008) contains guidance on the imposition of planning obligations in compliance with Circular 05/2005. These obligations may offset shortfalls in the scheme or mitigate the impacts of the development.
- 8.3 The Inspector considered that a financial contribution should be secured that would mitigate the shortfall in private amenity space provided for new occupiers. Additionally, in response to local concerns about parking in the area, it is considered that future occupiers should not be eligible for Resident's Parking Permits. As such, the following heads of terms are recommended:
- A contribution of £2226 towards off-site public open space within Gunnersbury Park.
 - A restriction on future occupiers of the four flats not being eligible for Resident's Parking Permits

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 This proposal is identical to that which a Planning Inspector has found acceptable apart from the removal of five additional parking spaces that would have resulted in the loss of 77m² of landscaping at the front of the site, and these changes were suggested by the Inspector.
- 9.2 The previous appeal was dismissed because the legal agreement that would have secured a contribution towards Gunnersbury Park was flawed.
- 9.3 Subject to conditions and a legal agreement, approval is recommended.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVAL

1. That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions and securing the abovementioned planning obligations by the prior completion of a satisfactory legal agreement or unilateral undertaking made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and or other appropriate legislation, the exact terms of which shall be negotiated by appropriate officers within the Department of Environment on the advice of the Borough Solicitor.
2. The satisfactory legal agreement or unilateral undertaking outlined above shall be completed and planning permission issued by 15/03/12 or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by appropriate officers within the Department of Environment or Borough Solicitor's Office.
3. If the legal agreement or unilateral undertaking is not completed by the date specified above (or any agreed extended period), then the Director of Environment or Assistant Director - Environment Department (Regulatory & Development Services) or Development Control Support Manager is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reason that the proposal should include planning obligations required to make the development acceptable in planning terms in accordance with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, development plan policies and the Planning Obligations SPD, as described in 7 of this Report.
4. If planning permission is refused (for the reasons set out above), the Director of Environment or Assistant Director - Environment Department (Regulatory & Development Services) or Development Control Support Manager (in consultation with the Chair of SDC) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission validated within 12 months of the date of refusal of planning permission, provided that it (a) duplicates the planning application, and (b) that there has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and (c) that a satisfactory legal agreement or unilateral undertaking securing the obligations set out in the Report is completed within any specified period of time.

Reasons:

With appropriate safeguarding conditions and a legal agreement it is considered that the proposed erection of an additional floor to the existing building to provide four flats, erection of bin enclosures adjacent to front entrance, provision of new fencing and cycle storage sheds would cause no harm to the appearance of the site, would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, would provide adequate standards of living accommodation, would cause no harm to living conditions at neighbouring houses and would provide adequate car and cycle parking. The development is in accordance with London Plan policies 3.3 (Increasing Housing Supply), 5.2 (Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions) and 7.8

(Heritage Assets and Archaeology) together with policies ENV-B.1.1 (New development), ENV-B.2.2 (Conservation areas), H.4.1 (Housing standards and guidelines), T.1.4 (Car and cycle parking and servicing facilities for developments), (Traffic implications of new development) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Conditions:

- 1 A1A The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: A1R. To accord with the provisions of Section 92(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 B3 The materials to be used in the construction of the proposed parapet wall of the roof extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

REASON: B3R In order to safeguard the visual amenity of the area and building in particular.

- 3 B4 No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the hereby permitted roof extension and fencing have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In order that the Council may be satisfied as to the details of the development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to satisfy the requirements of policies ENV-B1.1 (New Development) and ENV-B.2.2 (Conservation Areas).

- 4 B5 The proposed development shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the proposals contained in the application and the plans submitted therewith and approved by the Local Planning Authority, or as shall have been otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the building is used.

REASON: B5R. To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the planning permission.

- 5 C29 No demolition or construction work shall take place on the site except between the hours of 8:00am to 6:00pm on Monday to Friday and 9:00am to 1:00pm on Saturdays, and none shall take place on Sundays and public holidays, without the prior agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON - In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining residential properties.

- 6 NSTD No occupation shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority for the external appearance of the bin enclosure.

REASON:

To preserve the character and appearance of Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area in accordance with Unitary Development Plan ENV-B.2.2 (Conservation Areas)

- 7 NSTD No development shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority for a scheme of acoustic insulation and any associated ventilation to ensure the maximum noise level to be permitted within dwellings with windows shut and any other necessary means of ventilation provided shall not exceed the "good" limits contained in BS8233:1999. These being LAeq,16hour = 30 dB in living rooms, and a night(07:00 - 23:00) LAeq,8hour = 30 dB and LAFmax = 45 dB in bedrooms, and a night LAeq,1hour = 45 dB in Kitchens, Bathrooms and Utility Rooms ". The details shall be carried out as approved.

REASON: To provide a reasonable standard of living conditions for future occupiers.

- 8 NSTD No development shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for a scheme of reducing carbon emissions from the total energy needs (heat, cooling and power) of the development by at least 20% by onsite generation of renewable energy. The details shall be carried out as approved.

REASON: To minimise the impact of the development and to contribute to meeting the renewable energy targets in London Plan policy 4A.7.

Informatives:

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval should be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building or an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of, a public sewer. Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new buildings, but approval may be granted in some cases for extensions to

existing buildings. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the options available at this site.

Please note that no works should be carried out to trees at the site without the prior written consent of the Council. Consent is needed for works to trees at the site because they are within a Conservation Area.