

---

## Appeal Decisions

Inquiry opened on 17 June 2014

Site visits made on 11 November 2014 and 24 April 2015

**by C J Ball** DArch DCons RIBA IHBC

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 24 June 2015**

---

### **Former People's Centre, High Street, Feltham, London TW13 4AH**

The appeals are made by Messrs Doble and Gooch and Thamesview against the decisions of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.

#### **Appeal A: APP/F5540/A/13/2209615**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
  - The application Ref 00609/AB/P12 is dated 7 July 2013.
  - The development proposed is the demolition of all the existing buildings on the site and the erection of a 7 storey building comprising ground floor gym [465 sq m] and 42 x two-bedroom residential dwellings above and a 3 storey building comprising 4 x one-bedroom and 4 x three-bedroom residential dwelling; creation of new vehicular access, 15 no. parking spaces, landscaping and children's play space.
- 

#### **Appeal A Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of all the existing buildings on the site and the erection of a part 6, part 7 storey building comprising ground floor gym [437 sq m] with 2 x 1-bed and 37 x 2-bed residential dwellings above and a 3 storey building comprising 4 x 1-bed and 4 x 3-bed residential dwelling; creation of new vehicular access, 15 no. parking spaces, landscaping and children's play space at the former People's Centre, High Street, Feltham, London TW13 4AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00609/AB/P12 dated 7 July 2013, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in Schedule A.
- 

#### **Appeal B: APP/F5540/E/13/2209617**

- The appeal is made under sections 20 and 74 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for conservation area consent.
  - The application Ref 00609/AB/CA4, is dated 7 July 2013.
  - The demolition is proposed of all the existing buildings on the site.
- 

#### **Appeal B Decision**

2. The appeal is allowed and conservation area consent is granted for the demolition of all the existing buildings on the site at the former People's Centre, High Street, Feltham, London TW13 4AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00609/AB/CA4 dated 7 July 2013, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in Schedule B.

### **Appeal C: APP/F5540/A/13/2209892**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant an application for the extension to the time limit for implementing a planning permission.
  - The application Ref 00609/AB/P11, dated 20 April 2012, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2013.
  - The development proposed is the demolition of the former Peoples Centre and the erection of a building ranging in height from one to six storeys for D1 use providing an education skills training and community space, with roof top plant room, roof top recreation space, vehicle access, parking and landscaping.
- 

### **Appeal C Decision**

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the former Peoples Centre and the erection of a building ranging in height from one to six storeys for D1 use providing an education skills training and community space, with roof top plant room, roof top recreation space, vehicle access, parking and landscaping at the former People's Centre, High Street, Feltham, London TW13 4AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00609/AB/P11 dated 20 April 2012, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in Schedule C.
- 

### **Preliminary matters**

4. The inquiry opened and was immediately adjourned on 17 June because the appellants' counsel was ill. The inquiry was resumed on 11 November but was again adjourned because of illness. I carried out an accompanied site visit on 11 November and resumed the inquiry on 13 November. Because of continuing illness and lack of time the inquiry was adjourned without hearing evidence on 14 November to 22 April 2015. I ruled that no further evidence should be submitted unless it related to the progress of the emerging Local Plan or details of any further agreed matters. In the event, no further matters were agreed, although updates on the development plan position and emerging policy were submitted.
  5. The inquiry resumed on 22 April and sat for 3 days on 22-24 April. During the second adjournment I was advised that, at the 11 November site visit, the Council wrongly identified the windows in the neighbouring building it considered were affected by the proposed development. I therefore undertook another site visit on 24 April specifically to consider this.
  6. The inquiry was adjourned on 24 April with closing submissions to be made in writing. Following receipt of the closing submissions and other agreed documentation I closed the inquiry in writing on 7 May.
  7. The Appeal A scheme was amended during the application stage, including alterations to the number and size of dwellings. The amended scheme was considered by the Council and the development description was altered to: the demolition of all the existing buildings on the site and the erection of a part 6, part 7 storey building comprising ground floor gym [437 sqm] with 2 x 1-bed and 37 x 2-bed residential dwellings above and a 3 storey building comprising 4 x 1-bed and 4 x 3-bed residential dwelling; creation of new vehicular access, 15 no. parking spaces, landscaping and children's play space. I have considered the proposal on that basis.
-

8. Just prior to the inquiry the appellants submitted amended drawings HSF/PA12/10 Rev B and HSF/P13/08 Rev B to rectify a minor discrepancy between the submitted plans and elevations. This does not affect the nature of the Appeal A proposal and I have taken the revised plans into account.
9. On Appeal B, the existing buildings on the site include No.1 High Street and the former People's Centre. From 1 October 2013, the separate system of conservation area consent for the demolition of unlisted buildings in a conservation area was abolished by the coming into force of the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013. Since the application for consent to demolish was made on 7 July 2013, before that Act came into force, I shall consider this appeal under the statutory provisions in force at the time.
10. For Appeal C, the original planning permission, Ref 00609/AB/P10, was granted on 16 June 2009. The permission was extant at the time of the application to extend the time limit. The application is made in accordance with DCLG's '*Greater flexibility for planning permissions – Guidance*', originally issued in 2009 but updated in 2010. That indicates that applications to extend the time limit can only be made where permission was granted before 1 October 2010. That is the case here. Thus, although the *Guidance* was cancelled due to natural expiry following the launch of the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on 6 March 2014, it still applies to this case.
11. The Council's original planning witness has left its employ and his evidence was adopted and given by his replacement as Deputy Planning Manager for the Central Area Planning Team. At the inquiry the appellants' architect witness was unable to appear so I have taken his evidence as a written submission.
12. The appellants view the Appeal C scheme as providing a key reference point in the consideration of the Appeal A and B schemes. Since I consider the outcome of Appeal C to be potentially an important material consideration in Appeals A and B, I shall consider Appeal C first.

### **Application for costs**

13. Before the inquiry resumed in November the appellants submitted a skeleton application for an award of costs against the Council. By agreement I received the final application, the Council's response and the appellants' final comments in writing after the inquiry was adjourned on 24 April. That application is the subject of a separate decision.

### **Agreed matters**

14. Although Appeals A and B are against non-determination, the Council gives putative reasons for refusal; on the Appeal A scheme they relate to (1) the impact on the conservation area and the setting of a listed building, (2) the loss of light and outlook in the adjacent flats; (3) the loss of community use, (4) the safety of the vehicular access, (5) the impact on street parking, (6) outdoor amenity space, (7) lack of affordable housing and (8) lack of contribution to educational facilities. On the Appeal B scheme the single putative reason relates to the absence of acceptable development and the impact of demolition on the conservation area. For that reason I shall consider Appeals A and B together.
15. On the Appeal C scheme the reasons for refusal relate to (1) the impact on the conservation area and the street scene, (2) the loss of light and outlook in

the adjacent flats; (3) the loss of community use, (4) highway safety, (5) the lack of a Travel Plan and (6) failure to reduce CO2 emissions.

16. Prior to the inquiry the Council confirmed that it would not be pursuing objections to Appeal A on grounds of outdoor amenity space or affordable housing and to Appeal C on energy grounds so that putative reasons for refusal 6 and 7 of Appeal A and reason 6 of Appeal C were withdrawn. At the inquiry the Council confirmed that it had withdrawn its objections to the lack of an education contribution so that putative reason 8 of Appeal A was withdrawn.
17. At the first resumption of the inquiry the Council and the appellants submitted an agreed statement of common ground. The statement gives a description of the site and local area, sets out the planning history of the site and indicates relevant development plan and emerging Local Plan policies. The statement confirms agreement that the former People's Centre is derelict and beyond economic repair, that the Appeal C scheme is capable of making a full contribution to reducing CO2 emissions through the imposition of a suitable condition and that the standard and quality of external amenity space available to future residents is acceptable.
18. The statement also confirms agreement that there is no significant overnight parking stress in the surrounding residential streets, that no s106 contributions, including affordable housing and education contributions, could be viably delivered as part of the Appeal A scheme and that the s106 Unilateral Undertaking by West Thames College is not attached to the original Appeal C permission. The statement also helpfully sets out matters which are the subject of specific disagreement. As a result of the various agreements the appellants withdrew their witnesses intending to give evidence on sustainability/energy and viability.
19. At the inquiry the Council tabled lists of suggested conditions for each case. They were discussed but it became apparent that the lists would benefit from further discussions between the parties, and I asked for agreed lists to be submitted with the closing submissions.

## **Main issues**

20. The main issues that remain to be considered are therefore:

### **For Appeal C**

- whether development plan policies and other material considerations have changed significantly since the original grant of permission.

### **For Appeals A and B:**

- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Feltham Conservation Area, including the setting of the grade II listed St Catherine's Spire;
- The impact of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring building, with particular regard to loss of daylight and outlook;
- The effect the proposal would have on the safe and convenient use of the public highway, including on-road parking; and
- The impact on the borough of the loss of a community facility.

## Policy background

21. Since the inquiry was first opened, there have been some changes to the development plan. The *Further Alterations to the London Plan 2015* (FALP) has been adopted, replacing the *Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan* (REMA). The saved policies of the Hounslow Unitary Development Plan (UDP) are still in force and, since they are generally consistent with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, carry due weight.
22. The emerging Hounslow Local Plan (EHLP) is currently under examination. There are unresolved problems in some areas, particularly housing supply, so the draft housing policies carry limited weight. Other relevant policies, while not carrying the weight of the adopted development plan, carry weight according to the degree of consistency with the policies in the Framework.
23. Other material considerations include the Feltham Vision Concept Masterplan, an initial capacity study to help inform the emerging Local Plan. While it is not an adopted planning document, so carrying limited weight, the Vision document shows the Council's 'direction of travel' and is intended to provide guidance on the future form and type of development in the town centre.

## Reasons

24. The site is located in the town centre, fronting the eastern side of the High Street. It lies between the generally 5-storey New Chapel Square, a residential development to the south, and the man-made Longford River, which forms its northern boundary. Beyond the river is the remaining tower and spire of St Catherine's church, grade II listed, with a 4-5 storey office building attached. The main town centre facilities lie on the western side of the High Street, with The Centre of up to 10 storeys and Azalea House, immediately opposite the site, of 8 storeys. The railway station is just to the north and, with ready access to High Street bus stops, the site has a PTAL rating of 5. In terms of accessibility and access to town centre facilities the site is in a highly sustainable location.
25. The site with its existing buildings, originally a hotel then public house, was acquired by the Council in the 1990s. It operated as a community centre until about 2009, when planning permission was granted for an educational building. In the event that did not materialise and the site was sold to the appellants. The existing buildings are currently vacant and beyond economic repair. The site accommodates up to 32 parking spaces, accessed by a pavement crossover from the High Street. No.1 High Street, a small separate building, projects well forward creating a pedestrian pinch point on the busy pavement.

## Appeal C

26. Planning permission was granted in 2009 for the demolition of the former Peoples Centre building and the erection of a building for D1 use, providing an education, skills, training and community space. This became known in short form as 'The Skills Centre'. The building consisted of a 6/7 storey block, the width of the site, fronting, but set back from, the High Street. A single storey block extended to the rear. A forecourt, with what was intended to be separate 'in and out' accesses, would provide cycle parking spaces and limited car parking. The building occupied most of the site, with a narrow landscape strip to accommodate the river freeboard. No.1 High Street was not part of the site at that stage and remained in place, in separate use.

***Whether development plan policies and other material considerations have changed significantly since the original grant of permission.***

27. The permission was extant at the time of the application to extend the time limit and the application was made in accordance with DCLG's '*Greater flexibility for planning permissions – Guidance*'. As that guidance points out, in considering the application the Council should take a positive and constructive approach towards applications which improve the prospect of sustainable development being taken forward quickly.
28. By definition this scheme was judged to be acceptable when it was granted planning permission in 2009. The reason for approval attached to the permission confirms compliance with a range of development plan policies relating to the provision of educational facilities, design and massing and the conservation of heritage assets, the living conditions of neighbours, parking, traffic movement and road safety. The parties agree that the scheme represents sustainable development.
29. As the DCLG *Guidance* makes clear, in deciding the application to extend the time limit, Councils should focus their attention on development plan policies and other material considerations which may have altered significantly since the original grant of permission. Applications may be refused where such alterations indicate the proposal should no longer be treated favourably.
30. Although FALP has since been adopted, the parties agree that there have been no relevant alterations to the development plan since the permission was granted. It therefore remains in compliance with all the saved UDP policies listed in the permission notice.
31. One major change in material circumstances since the original application was approved is the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework in 2012. At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. As Framework 12 says, in determining proposals, Councils should apply that presumption, approving development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan; proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.
32. The Council argues that the original decision was finely balanced and hinged on the identity of the applicants, West Thames College. Subsequently the College, unable to find funding, did not take the scheme forward and the Council, who owned the site, sold it to the current applicants. The Council considers that the change in the identity of the applicant is a significant alteration in material considerations sufficient to justify refusal of the application to renew the permission.
33. That seems to me an erroneous view. First, planning permissions run with the land; there is nothing in the permission notice or elsewhere by agreement to reserve or restrict the permission to the College, so the permission runs for the benefit of whoever owns the land. Second, while there was a normal balancing of positive and negative considerations in assessing the proposals, there was a clear overall conclusion that the proposal complied with the development plan. The Council did not conclude, as it could have, that the proposal was in conflict with the development plan but that the nature of the applicant was a material consideration of such weight that it overcame the conflict.

34. In these circumstances I consider that the change in identity of the applicant is not material to the renewal of the planning permission. I conclude that development plan policies and other material considerations have not changed significantly since the original grant of permission so there is no justification for a refusal to renew it. I find that permission should be renewed under the terms of the DCLG *Guidance*.
35. The description of the development includes reference to the provision of community space. The Council argues that this would be lost. The approved plans show that there would be no separate provision so the intention was evidently to allow access to shared spaces, perhaps outside teaching hours. While facilities can be provided, actual community usage cannot be required or enforced and would remain a matter for discussion between interested parties. The space would be physically provided so the terms of the permission would be met.
36. I also note that it was intended that, in implementing the permission, the College would be bound by a s106 planning obligation to secure, among other things, the implementation of a Green Travel Plan. In the event, the unilateral undertaking was not executed and permission was granted without it. The permission thus stands unencumbered. The intended planning obligation has no standing in law but it is clear that the approach to parking and servicing the site was predicated on the operation of an effective Travel Plan and that such a Plan remains necessary. It is therefore appropriate to add a condition requiring the submission, implementation and operation of a Travel Plan.
37. I have considered the other conditions suggested by the parties; while they have been updated to accord with current guidelines, they reflect the original conditions imposed on the 2009 permission and with some redrafting I consider them reasonable and necessary to the grant of a new planning permission.
38. For the reasons given above I conclude that Appeal C should be allowed.

### **Appeals A and B**

39. It is agreed that, although it is vacant and unused, the current lawful use of the site is as a community centre, with parking space and vehicle access to the High Street. The building is beyond economic repair (although that does not necessarily rule out its use for community purposes) but the current lawful use seems to me to be the starting point in considering this application.
40. The extant permission for a Skills Centre is also an important material consideration. The Council argues that it does not represent a fall-back position as, since the College withdrew, there is no prospect of the permitted scheme being built. However, the EHLP seeks educational facilities in the town centre, for which this site is eminently suitable, and I heard that there may be some interest from those promoting Free Schools or Faith Schools. Thus, while the prospect of the Skills Centre, or something like it, being built may be limited, it cannot be ruled out. Furthermore, the permission gives an indication of the size and form of building found acceptable for the site which, in the interests of consistency, provides a useful reference point in assessing other proposals.
41. I note too that, when the Council decided to sell the site, it gave illustrations of its potential which showed buildings similar in size to, and indeed larger than, the permitted scheme – up to 9 storeys. The Vision document, intended in part

to illustrate the capacity of the town centre to accommodate more housing, also shows the appeal site at the heart of the area identified for intensification of residential development, with the indicative layout showing what seems to be the form and mass of the 2009 consented scheme. An update shows the building brought forward to the edge of the pavement as now proposed. The site is identified in the Council's Feltham Context and Character document as lying within the town centre character area N, characterised as of moderate uniformity of scale, density and layout where there is some suitability for tall buildings. It is considered an Opportunity Site. I conclude from all this that redevelopment of this site is clearly central to the Council's vision for Feltham town centre and that there is no real objection in principle to a sizeable building on the site.

42. The proposed development consists of 2 elements - a tall block A fronting the High Street and a low block B facing the Longford River. They would provide a total of 47 apartments. Shared parking and amenity spaces lie between. Block A consists of 6 storeys of apartments above a ground level gymnasium, including a smaller top storey set back from the edge. The gymnasium is brought forward closer to the pavement to reflect more the original building line and to provide a sense of enclosure to the street. The design, form and mass of the 6-7 storey block closely follows that shown in the sales illustrations, and would be similar to, although somewhat lower than, the permitted Skills Centre. The lower 3 storey block B would be stepped along the river freebord. That part of the proposal does not appear to be controversial, with the Council's objections largely centring on the taller block.
43. While the Council was reluctant to confirm it at the inquiry, it is clear from the evidence that it cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites. As a result, as indicated in Framework 49, current policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date. The Council is clearly taking steps to address the housing shortfall but, in accordance with Framework 14, the current policy position means that planning permission should be granted for this scheme unless any adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
44. Framework 49 makes it clear that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development; with that in mind I go on to consider the adverse effects of the proposal argued by the Council before coming to a balanced overall view.

***The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Feltham Conservation Area, including the setting of a grade II listed building***

45. Feltham Conservation Area extends in a linear fashion, mostly along the eastern side of the High Street. It is primarily characterised by its mix of old and new buildings along the street, with the key open space of the green and its pond at the centre. Its significance as a heritage asset lies largely in the contrast of this somewhat rural feature with the more built-up area of the town centre shopping areas on the west side of the High Street. On the site, the Peoples Centre building, formerly the Railway Hotel, has some historic interest but is much altered, and fairly derelict, and makes a neutral contribution to the character of the conservation area. Its loss and replacement by a taller building



has already been found acceptable by the Council as indicated by the grant of planning permission for the Skills Centre. No.1 High Street, a small relic of an original group of shops, is now so entirely without context as to appear out of place. It too makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

46. Towards the northern end of the conservation area lies the grade II listed tower and spire of the former Church of St Catherine. The body of the Church has been replaced by a modern office building but the spire is a tall and prominent landmark, visible from many directions. The setting of the tower and spire extends to the High Street, where views of the spire contribute to its significance as a heritage asset.
47. In considering these appeals I am required by s16, s66 and s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
48. The longer, open views of the tower and spire are primarily from the western side of the High Street, with its presence gradually more imposing as it is approached from the south. An observer would be aware of the proposed new building but, like the Skills Centre, it would not particularly intrude into or obscure views of the tower and spire from this side of the High Street. On the eastern pavement, within the conservation area, views of the spire are almost entirely obscured by existing buildings. It is not until the approach to New Chapel Square that views of the spire become apparent, partially screened by buildings and trees until close to the site. Block A would be set back so as not to interrupt these views. In views from other directions the spire would remain clear and dominant. In my judgement the proposed development would not significantly impair the ability to properly appreciate the listed tower and spire in its setting.
49. In a similar manner to the Skills Centre the taller building on the site, block A, has been designed to give it a presence on the High Street, reflecting the mixed character of the surrounding buildings. Its stepped height would relate well to New Chapel Square and would provide a punctuation mark which, with Azalea House opposite, would effectively enclose and define the northern end of the shopping street. Removal of No.1 High Street would dramatically improve pedestrian flow on the west side of the street, and the projecting gymnasium frontage would bring a more active frontage, thus improving the overall attractiveness of the shopping area. The smaller block B would reflect the scale of the buildings beyond the High Street, and the landscape treatment of the site would substantially improve the setting of the Longford River, adding to the quality of the conservation area.
50. One of the core principles of the Framework is the conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. Bearing in mind the established impact of the approved Skills Centre, the proposed development has been carefully designed so that it would not undermine the significance of the conservation area and would maintain the significance of High Street views of the listed building. I consider that the designated heritage assets would be appropriately conserved so the proposal would meet Framework conservation

objectives and comply with the aims of FALP policies 7.4 and 7.8 and UDP policies ENV-B1.1, ENVB.2.2 and ENV-B.2.8.

51. I therefore find that the loss of the existing buildings on the site, including No.1, and their replacement by the proposed development would, on balance, enhance the character and appearance of Feltham Conservation Area and would preserve the setting of the grade II listed tower and spire.

***The impact of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring buildings, with particular regard to loss of daylight and outlook***

52. The site lies immediately to the north of New Chapel Square. The relevant side of that housing layout has been designed so that windows from principal living rooms face south into the internal square, with bedroom windows facing north towards the site. The proposed buildings have generally been arranged to safeguard daylight and outlook but, at the inquiry and on the April 24 site visit, the Council indicated concerns about 2 specific windows. These lie one above the other behind a projecting stair tower and under the connecting deck. The levels of daylight achieved and the extent of the outlook from these bedroom windows are both clearly already severely limited by design.
53. The appellants' study shows that these 2 windows in particular would suffer a significant reduction in daylight levels, principally because of the restrictions of their location. I do not consider that it can be argued that, without such restrictions, the daylight levels would be acceptable. The fact is that the occupiers of these 2 rooms would notice a distinct drop in daylight levels to well below current limited levels, and to an extent that significantly breaches established guidelines. A poor situation would be made worse. The outlook from these windows onto the back of a stairwell tower is currently very poor and, while the new building might intrude into oblique views, that would not necessarily make worse the existing poor outlook. Nonetheless I consider that, in conflict with UDP policy ENV-B.1.1, the proposal would not ensure that adequate daylight reaches the identified windows in the adjoining property. For that reason I find that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring buildings.

***The effect the proposal would have on the safe and convenient use of the public highway, including on-road parking***

54. The current lawful use of the site includes 32 parking spaces and the likelihood of a range of commercial service vehicles. The current access to the site is by way of a pavement crossover immediately adjacent to No.1 High Street. It joins the High Street within a signalised junction, next to a pedestrian-controlled crossing and at the start of a bus lane. It is by no means ideal, particularly since exiting vehicles are screened by No.1 from pedestrian view. However, the Council identifies the site as a development opportunity so that vehicular access to it will remain necessary and, given the layout of the adjacent junction, that access is most likely to be at the existing location, as shown on the illustrative sale plans. The 2009 scheme permitted a vehicular exit point in this area.
55. The proposed development would incorporate a new vehicle crossover in much the original position. It would serve as the entry and exit point for the 15 parking spaces on the site and domestic service vehicles. By its nature it would

indicate pedestrian priority. Frequency of movement would be low, with a vehicle entering or exiting about once every 7½ minutes. The removal of No.1 High Street would allow pedestrians a clear view of vehicles exiting from the building, which would be set back some 6 metres from the edge of the pavement. While exit to the High Street, particularly turning right, would require careful negotiation, there are no indications that it would be in any way unsafe or dangerous. There would be clear mutual visibility between exiting traffic and pedestrians using the crossing. While the arrangements may not entirely comply with modern standards, on a common sense approach the proposed access arrangements would represent a major improvement over the existing access in terms of visibility, levels of use and road safety. I therefore consider that a safe and suitable access to the site could be achieved, in line with the aims of UDP policies T.1.2, T.2.2 and T.4.4. For that reason I consider it acceptable.

56. The proposal would include 15 parking spaces on the site. The Council assesses the maximum number of parking spaces required for the 47 units in accordance with the UDP as 55 but recognises that, based on local levels of car/van ownership of 0.88 per dwelling, 41 would be considered a reasonable level of provision. The Council argues that, for the remaining 26, drivers would seek to park on the surrounding streets, adding to existing parking pressure. It was agreed that there would be no significant overnight parking stress in the surrounding residential streets and the appellants were able to show that there would be sufficient daytime capacity to accommodate 26 cars parked on streets within 200 metres of the site. There are also a number of public car parking areas within the area. On that basis I consider that the scheme would be unlikely to create unacceptable parking pressure on local streets so it would not necessarily conflict with UDP policies T.1.2 and T.1.4
57. Moreover, it seems to me that reliance on an average car ownership figure ignores the specific location of this site and the impact of that on the desirability of car ownership. The site is in a very accessible location, close to the railway station and bus stops. This is just the sort of site that both FALP and EHLP indicate should provide limited parking facilities. A choice of alternative means of travel would be readily available, with the result that car ownership on this site would be likely to be significantly lower than the average ownership figure. A Travel Plan would encourage the choice of a more sustainable means of travel. All that would have the effect of reducing the possibility of parking stress on local streets. In all I consider that the proposal would have no unacceptably harmful effect on the safe and convenient use of the public highway.

### ***The impact on the borough of the loss of a community facility***

58. The Council argues that the Peoples Centre, though currently vacant, has a lawful use as a community facility. That may be so but, now in private ownership and in poor condition, no community organisation can rely on the building being available for that use. I heard that, prior to agreeing a lease with West Thames College for the Skills Centre scheme, the Council found alternative accommodation for most of the then community users of the site. The Skills Centre scheme ostensibly included some provision for community use but, when it fell through, the Council sold the site for redevelopment without condition or encumbrance. I consider that operational use of the site as a community facility was lost then. It follows that the current scheme would not conflict with UDP

policy C.1.3 which seeks to resist the loss of community facilities, since that had already taken place.

59. In any event, EHLP policy C11 defines community facilities as including health, sports and leisure facilities. The gymnasium to be provided at ground floor level would surely meet that definition. It might be different to the type of accommodation previously available but, in policy terms, there would be a community facility on site contributing to the borough-wide range of facilities available. With all that in mind I consider that the borough would suffer no loss of community facilities as a result of the proposed development.

## **Conclusions**

60. The Appeal A scheme represents the highly sustainable development of a previously-developed town centre site. The benefits of the scheme are considerable: the development of the site would bring a prominent but semi-derelict and under-used property back into productive use as housing; the scheme would provide 47 new low-value market houses, boosting the supply of housing and contributing towards meeting the shortfall in housing provision in the borough; new residential development in the town centre would provide social and economic benefits, contributing to the vitality and viability of the local shops; and the conservation area and the street scene would be enhanced, increasing the attractiveness of the town centre. All this is effectively recognised by the Council in its vision for the town centre.
61. Against that, there would be some loss of light for 2 bedrooms in the neighbouring development. That would be unfortunate but I bear in mind that the permitted Skills Centre scheme would have a far greater impact on a greater number of windows so in that respect this scheme represents a distinct improvement. There is the potential for some low speed pedestrian/vehicle conflict around the access to the site, although again there would be an improvement on both the existing situation and the permitted scheme. There might also be some impact on street parking, although the sustainable location of the site could effectively mean that it is reduced to negligible levels.
62. On balance I consider that the adverse impacts of the scheme are nowhere near sufficient to outweigh its substantial benefits. Assessed against the local development plan and the policies of the Framework as a whole, I conclude that the Appeal A scheme should be granted planning permission. It follows that, since the Appeal B application was rejected for the single reason that there was no acceptable development proposal for the site, the scheme should also be granted conservation area consent.
63. I have considered the conditions suggested by the parties. For Appeal A, I consider them all to be reasonable and necessary to the grant of planning permission except Nos. 17 and 18 – in these cases the required sustainability standards would be met by compliance with the Building Regulations. For Appeal B it is necessary to ensure commitment to an acceptable scheme before demolition takes place to protect the character of the conservation area.

## **Overall conclusion**

64. I consider that both development proposals represent sustainable development in all its economic, social and environmental dimensions. For the reasons given above I conclude that all 3 appeals should be allowed.

*Colin Ball*

Inspector

## **APPEARANCES**

### **FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:**

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| Giles Atkinson of Counsel  | Instructed by the Borough Solicitor  |
| He called:                 |  |
| Maggie Urquhart BSc        | Director, Appropriate Design Advice Ltd                                    |
| BArch PGDipLA PGDipUD RIBA |  |
| Philip Marshall CILT CIHT  | Associate Director, JMP Consultants Ltd                                    |
| Stephen Hissett BSc MSc    | Deputy Planning Manager for the Central Area<br>Planning Team, LB Hounslow |

### **FOR THE APPELLANT:**

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Simon Randle of Counsel | Instructed by Robin Harper                 |
| He called:              |  |
| Dermot McCaffery MIHE   | Highways and Transportation Consultant     |
| MIRSO                   |  |
| Ian Thody               | Director, EB7 Ltd                          |
| Robin Harper BA(Hons)   | Principal, Harper Planning Consultants Ltd |
| MSc PGDipUD MRTPI IHBC  |  |

### **INTERESTED PERSONS:**

|               |                                      |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| Andrew Barnes | Vice-Chairman, Feltham History Group |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|

## **ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY**

### **Joint documents**

|    |                            |
|----|----------------------------|
| J1 | Statement of common ground |
| J2 | Agreed lists of conditions |

### **Council's documents**

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| C1  | Two further enclosures maps for Feltham  |
| C2  | Colour copy of photo references  |
| C3  | Good Practice Guidelines: delivering Travel Plans through the Planning Process   |
| C4  | Enforcing Travel Plan targets  |
| C5  | PPG: Travel Plans, transport assessments and statements in decision taking   |
| C6  | Copy of planning statement incorporating transport statement, application relating to Bridge House, Hanworth Road, Feltham.                                  |
| C7  | Mr Hissett's proof of evidence.  |
| C8  | Policy update April 2015.  |
| C9  | Extract from Hounslow UDP: Community and Leisure Policies.   |
| C10 | Copy of the notice of planning permission dated 16 June 2009 for the demolition of the former Peoples Centre and the erection of the Skills Centre building. |
| C11 | Update of the town centre illustration in the Feltham Vision and Concept Masterplan.   |
| C12 | August update of the Council's Feltham Context and Character document.   |
| C13 | Emails Mr Harper/Mr Smith relating to design and highway matters.  |
| C14 | Draft lists of suggested conditions.   |
| C15 | Mr Atkinson's closing submissions.   |

**Appellants' documents**

- A1 Statement on emerging policies October 2014
- A2 Revised site layout 12.17-001A (Nov 14) showing amended turning and parking arrangements.
- A3 Policy update statement April 2015.
- A4 Notes of meeting appellants/Council 2 April 2015.
- A5 Mr Randle's opening remarks.
- A6 Emails Mr Harper/Mr Smith indicating the Council's concerns.
- A7 Feltham Vision and Concept Masterplan.
- A8 Enlarged version of the Feltham Vision and Concept Masterplan.
- A9 Plans HSF/PA12/09 RevA and HSF/P13/08 RevA showing the principal elevations of the proposed scheme.
- A10 Agreed refuse vehicle swept path diagram.
- A11 Committee report on the proposal for mixed use redevelopment of the former Hanworth Library, Feltham.
- A12 Correction to Mr McCaffery's parking survey tables
- A13 The Council's 10 point guide to Development Travel plans.
- A14 Schematic plans of New Chapel Square.
- A15 Typical 1-bed flat layout, New Chapel Square.
- A16 EB7's window map showing the windows of concern to the Council.
- A17 Photographs showing the windows of concern.
- A18 Mr Randle's closing submissions.
- A19 Mr Randle's comments on Mr Atkinson's closing submissions.

## **Schedule A**

Planning permission is granted for the demolition of all the existing buildings on the site and the erection of a part 6, part 7 storey building comprising ground floor gym [437 sq m] with 2 x 1-bed and 37 x 2-bed residential dwellings above and a 3 storey building comprising 4 x 1-bed and 4 x 3-bed residential dwelling; creation of new vehicular access, 15 no. parking spaces, landscaping and children's play space at the former People's Centre, High Street, Feltham, London TW13 4AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00609/AB/P12 dated 7 July 2013, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and as approved under conditions of this permission: HSF/P13/01, HSF/P13/02, HSF/P13/03RevA, HSF/P13/04RevA, HSF/P13/05RevB, HSF/P13/06RevA, HSF/P13/07RevA, HSF/P13/08RevB, HSF/P13/11RevA, HSF/P13/14, HSF/P13/15, HSF/P13/20, HSF/P13/21, HSF/P13/22, HSF/PA12/09RevA, HSF/PA12/10RevB, HSF/PA12/12RevA, HSF/PA12/13RevB, HSF/PS13/10RevB, 12.17-001A(Nov14), TCP/APA/AP/2012/134, T950-003, T950-004.

3. No works above ground level shall take place until details and samples of all facing materials to buildings within the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The samples and details shall include: brickwork including string courses; cladding materials (where relevant); window treatment (including sections and reveals); balustrading treatment (including sections where relevant); privacy screens (where relevant); and extract flues and other external features. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

4. No works above ground level shall take place until details of a scheme of site-wide hard and soft landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The detailed landscaping scheme shall include the following: soft planting, including any grass and turf areas, trees, planters, shrub and herbaceous areas with details of species, sizes and numbers/densities; topographical survey, including earthworks, ground finishes, top soiling with both conserved and imported topsoil, levels, drainage and fall in drain types; hard landscaping, including ground surfaces, kerbs, edges, ridge and flexible pavings, unit paving, furniture, steps, 'visual thread' and if applicable synthetic surfaces for both ground level and roof terrace level; fences and walls and any other boundary treatments; any signage and information boards; brown (biodiversity) roofs/green walls (where relevant); cycle parking stands/enclosures; any external lighting; and any other landscaping feature forming part of the scheme. The submission shall include a 5 year management programme. Any trees or shrubs planted which die within 5 years of completion of the development shall be replaced with the same species, and of comparable maturity, or an approved alternative. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved landscaping scheme which shall be maintained in place thereafter. All landscaping in accordance with the approved scheme shall be completed/planted during the first planting season following completion of construction works.

5. No part of the development shall be occupied or the use commenced until the cycle storage provision shown on the approved plans has been completed; thereafter, the



cycle storage spaces shall be kept free of obstruction and available for the parking of cycles only.

6. No development shall take place until a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) covering the construction stages has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CLP shall cover: (i) any external illumination of the site; (ii) measures to ensure that all mud and other loose materials are not carried on the wheels and chassis of any vehicles leaving the site; (iii) measures to minimise dust nuisance caused by the operations and to ensure that no dust or other debris is carried on to the adjoining properties; (iv) the routing of vehicles to the site, access and egress arrangements and waiting areas; and (v) boundary treatment and measures to ensure it is maintained in a secure and tidy condition. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CLP.

7. No part of the development shall be occupied until evidence (e.g. photographs and copies of installation contracts) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to demonstrate that the development has been carried out in accordance with the submitted Energy Statement by Bluesky Unlimited dated 17<sup>th</sup> June 2013, or such other scheme that meets the CO2 emissions reductions requirement contained in London Plan (2015) policy 5.2.

8. No development shall take place until:

(a) A contaminated land Phase 1 desk study report has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Should the Phase 1 report recommend that a Phase 2 site investigation is required, then this shall be carried out and submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The site shall be investigated by a competent person to identify the extent and nature of contamination. The report should include a tiered risk assessment of the contamination based on the proposed end use of the site. Additional investigation may be required where it is deemed necessary.

(b) If required, a scheme for decontamination of the site shall be submitted to the local planning authority, for written approval. The scheme shall account for any comments made by the local planning authority before the development hereby permitted is first occupied.

(c) The local planning authority shall be notified immediately if additional contamination is discovered during the course of the development. A competent person shall assess the additional contamination, and shall submit appropriate amendments to the scheme for decontamination in writing to the Local Planning Authority for approval before any work on that aspect of development continues.

(d) Before the development is first brought into use the agreed scheme for decontamination referred to in clauses b) and c) above, including amendments, shall be fully implemented and a written validation (closure) report submitted to the local planning authority for approval.

9. No demolition or construction work shall take place on the site except between the hours of 0800 and 1800 on Mondays to Friday and 0800 and 1300 on Saturdays and no work shall take place on Sundays and Public Holidays.

10. No part of the building shall be occupied until the means of pedestrian and vehicular access has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

11. No part of the building shall be occupied until the parking, loading and turning spaces shown on the approved drawings have been constructed and are available for

use. The parking, loading and turning spaces shall not be used for any other purposes.

12. No apartment shall be occupied until a Car Park Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan shall include the following: details and location of 10% electric vehicle charging points and details of a further 10% passive provision; details of measures proposed to restrict parking to designated bays only and prohibit parking on the access road. The car parking areas shall thereafter be managed in accordance with the approved Car Park Management Plan.

13. The development hereby permitted shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Lifetime Home standards as set out in the London Plan and Accessible London Supplementary Planning Guidance.

14. No development shall take place until details of the easily adaptable wheelchair accommodation (minimum 4 units), including location and internal layouts, have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Any works that form part of such a scheme shall be completed before any part of the development is first occupied.

15. No development shall take place until details of a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme, including measures as appropriate for (i) the harvesting of rainwater, (ii) the minimisation of water run-off from the site, aiming for greenfield levels, and (iii) the conservation and reuse as appropriate of other water supplies in the buildings, have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. No part of the building shall be occupied until evidence (e.g. photographs and copies of installation contracts) has been submitted to the local planning authority to demonstrate that the development has been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

16. No development shall take place until a statement on the sourcing of materials to be used in the building, involving reuse, recycling and other sustainable sourcing of materials to be used in the construction and fitting out of the building wherever possible, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The building shall not be occupied until evidence (e.g. photographs and copies of installation contracts) has been submitted to the local planning authority to demonstrate that the development has been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

17. No part of the development shall be occupied until details of any external plant to be installed on the buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include any necessary sound reduction mitigation measures. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. No fans, louvres, ducts or other external plant shall be installed other than in accordance with the approved details.

18. No part of the development shall be occupied until the waste and recycling facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved plans. The facilities shall be maintained as such thereafter in accordance with the London Borough of Hounslow's Guidance for Planning applications: Recycling & Non-Recycling provision for new developments. The developer shall notify the Council's refuse and recycling services when the development is first occupied.

19. No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

20. No part of the development shall be occupied until details of a Travel Plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Travel Plan shall include measures to reduce dependency on the private car, which shall include clear and unambiguous objectives and modal split targets, together with a time-bound programme of implementation, monitoring and regular review and improvement; and be based on the particulars contained within the approved framework produced in support of the original application, The Travel Plan shall thereafter be operated in accordance with the approved details.

## **Schedule B**

Conservation area consent is granted for the demolition of all the existing buildings on the site at the former People's Centre, High Street, Feltham, London TW13 4AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00609/AB/CA4 dated 7 July 2013, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

1. The works hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
2. No demolition works shall take place until a contract for the redevelopment of the site in accordance with either planning permission 00609/AB/P11 or 00609/AB/P12 has been signed and a copy of the contract has been lodged with, and receipt acknowledged in writing by, the local planning authority.

## **Schedule C**

Planning permission is granted for the demolition of the former Peoples Centre and the erection of a building ranging in height from one to six storeys for D1 use providing an education skills training and community space, with roof top plant room, roof top recreation space, vehicle access, parking and landscaping at the former People's Centre, High Street, Feltham, London TW13 4AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00609/AB/P11 dated 20 April 2012, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and as approved under conditions of this permission: 955/001, 955/002, 955/010, 955/020, 955/021, 955/100 Rev M, 955/101 Rev K, 955/102 Rev G, 955/104 Rev C, 955/105 Rev C, 955/106 Rev C, 955/108, 4481.01.03b and 4481.01.04b.
3. No works above ground level shall take place until details and samples of all facing materials to buildings within the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The samples and details shall include: brickwork (including brick sample panels with string courses and mortar courses on-site); cladding materials (where relevant); window treatment (including sections and reveals); obscure glazing details (where relevant); balustrading treatment (including sections where relevant); privacy screens (where relevant); and extract flues and other external features. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
4. No demolition or construction work shall take place on the site except between the hours of 0800 and 1800 on Mondays to Friday and 0800 and 1300 on Saturdays and no work shall take place on Sundays and Public Holidays.
5. No part of the development shall be occupied until details of a scheme for the storage and collection of waste and materials to be recycled , including a timetable for implementation, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be operated in accordance with the approved details.
6. No works above ground level shall take place until details of the siting and design of secure, covered cycle storage to accommodate a minimum of 43 spaces has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No part of the development to which the facilities relate shall be occupied until the cycle spaces are available for use and they shall be kept available thereafter.
7. No development shall take place until a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) covering the construction stages has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CLP shall cover: (i) any external illumination of the site; (ii) measures to ensure that all mud and other loose materials are not carried on the wheels and chassis of any vehicles leaving the site; (iii) measures to minimise dust nuisance caused by the operations and to ensure that no dust or other debris is carried on to the adjoining properties; (iv) the routeing of vehicles to the site, access

and egress arrangements and waiting areas; and (v) boundary treatment and measures to ensure it is maintained in a secure and tidy condition. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CLP.

8. No part of the development shall be occupied until evidence (e.g. photographs and copies of installation contracts) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to demonstrate that the development has been carried out in accordance with the submitted Energy Statement by Bluesky Unlimited dated 17<sup>th</sup> June 2013, or such other scheme that meets the CO2 emissions reductions requirement contained in London Plan (2015) policy 5.2.

9. No fans, louvres, ducts or other external plant shall be installed other than in accordance with the approved plans.

10. No part of the development shall be occupied until details of a scheme for the control of fumes and odours including details of sound attenuation for any necessary plant has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

11. No part of the development shall be occupied until details of a scheme for the ventilation of the motor workshop, including details of sound attenuation, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

12. The premises shall be used for Further Education uses and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class D2 of the Schedule of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

13. No works above ground level shall take place until details of a scheme of site-wide hard and soft landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The detailed landscaping scheme shall include the following: soft planting, including any grass and turf areas, trees, planters, shrub and herbaceous areas with details of species, sizes and numbers/densities; topographical survey, including earthworks, ground finishes, top soiling with both conserved and imported topsoil, levels, drainage and fall in drain types; hard landscaping, including ground surfaces, kerbs, edges, ridge and flexible pavings, unit paving, furniture, steps, 'visual thread' and if applicable synthetic surfaces for both ground level and roof terrace level; fences and walls and any other boundary treatments; any signage and information boards; brown (biodiversity) roofs/green walls (where relevant); cycle parking stands/enclosures; any external lighting; and any other landscaping feature forming part of the scheme. The submission shall include a 5 year management programme. Any trees or shrubs planted which die within 5 years of completion of the development shall be replaced with the same species, and of comparable maturity, or an approved alternative. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved landscaping scheme which shall be maintained in place thereafter. All landscaping in accordance with the approved scheme shall be completed/planted during the first planting season following completion of construction works.

14. No development shall take place until:

(a) A contaminated land Phase 1 desk study report has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Should the Phase 1 report recommend that a Phase 2 site investigation is required, then this shall be carried out and submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The site shall be investigated by a competent person to identify the extent and nature of contamination. The report should include a tiered risk assessment of the contamination based on the proposed end use of the site. Additional investigation may be required where it is deemed necessary.

(b) If required, a scheme for decontamination of the site shall be submitted to the local planning authority, for written approval. The scheme shall account for any comments made by the local planning authority before the development hereby permitted is first occupied.

(c) The local planning authority shall be notified immediately if additional contamination is discovered during the course of the development. A competent person shall assess the additional contamination, and shall submit appropriate amendments to the scheme for decontamination in writing to the Local Planning Authority for approval before any work on that aspect of development continues.

(d) Before the development is first brought into use the agreed scheme for decontamination referred to in clauses b) and c) above, including amendments, shall be fully implemented and a written validation (closure) report submitted to the local planning authority for approval.

15. No part of the building shall be occupied until the means of pedestrian and vehicular access has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

16. No part of the building shall be occupied until the parking, loading and turning spaces shown on the approved drawings have been constructed and are available for use. The parking, loading and turning spaces shall not be used for any other purposes.

17. No apartment shall be occupied until a Car Park Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan shall include the following: details and location of 10% electric vehicle charging points and details of a further 10% passive provision; details of measures proposed to restrict parking to designated bays only and prohibit parking on the access road. The car parking areas shall thereafter be managed in accordance with the approved Car Park Management Plan.

18. No development shall take place until details of a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme, including measures as appropriate for (i) the harvesting of rainwater, (ii) the minimisation of water run-off from the site, aiming for greenfield levels, and (iii) the conservation and reuse as appropriate of other water supplies in the buildings, have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

No part of the building shall be occupied until evidence (e.g. photographs and copies of installation contracts) has been submitted to the local planning authority to demonstrate that the development has been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

19. No development shall take place until a statement on the sourcing of materials to be used in the building, involving reuse, recycling and other sustainable sourcing of materials to be used in the construction and fitting out of the building wherever possible, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning

authority. The building shall not be occupied until evidence (e.g. photographs and copies of installation contracts) has been submitted to the local planning authority to demonstrate that the development has been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

20. No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

21. No part of the development shall be occupied until details of a Travel Plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Travel Plan shall include measures to reduce dependency on the private car, which shall include clear and unambiguous objectives and modal split targets, together with a time-bound programme of implementation, monitoring and regular review and improvement; and be based on the particulars contained within the approved framework produced in support of the original application, The Travel Plan shall thereafter be operated in accordance with the approved details.



If you require an alternative accessible version of this document (for instance in audio, Braille or large print) please contact our Customer Services Department:

Telephone: 0370 333 0607

Fax: 01793 414926

Textphone: 0800 015 0516

E-mail: [customers@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:customers@HistoricEngland.org.uk)