



Havering

L O N D O N B O R O U G H

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE AGENDA

7.30 pm	Thursday 28 April 2016	Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
----------------	-----------------------------------	---

Members 11: Quorum 4

COUNCILLORS:

Conservative (5)

Robby Misir (Chairman)
Melvin Wallace (Vice-Chair)
Ray Best
Philippa Crowder
Steven Kelly

Residents' (2)

Stephanie Nunn
Reg Whitney

East Havering Residents' (2)

Alex Donald
Linda Hawthorn

UKIP (1)

Phil Martin

Independent Residents (1)

Graham Williamson

**For information about the meeting please contact:
Richard Cursons 01708 432430
richard.cursons@onesource.co.uk**

Protocol for members of the public wishing to report on meetings of the London Borough of Havering

Members of the public are entitled to report on meetings of Council, Committees and Cabinet, except in circumstances where the public have been excluded as permitted by law.

Reporting means:-

- filming, photographing or making an audio recording of the proceedings of the meeting;
- using any other means for enabling persons not present to see or hear proceedings at a meeting as it takes place or later; or
- reporting or providing commentary on proceedings at a meeting, orally or in writing, so that the report or commentary is available as the meeting takes place or later if the person is not present.

Anyone present at a meeting as it takes place is not permitted to carry out an oral commentary or report. This is to prevent the business of the meeting being disrupted.

Anyone attending a meeting is asked to advise Democratic Services staff on 01708 433076 that they wish to report on the meeting and how they wish to do so. This is to enable employees to guide anyone choosing to report on proceedings to an appropriate place from which to be able to report effectively.

Members of the public are asked to remain seated throughout the meeting as standing up and walking around could distract from the business in hand.

AGENDA ITEMS

1 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman will announce details of the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building's evacuation.

These are the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building's evacuation. (Double doors at the entrance to the Council Chamber and door on the right hand corner (marked as an exit).

Proceed down main staircase, out the main entrance, turn left along front of building to side car park, turn left and proceed to the "Fire Assembly Point" at the corner of the rear car park. Await further instructions.

I would like to remind members of the public that Councillors have to make decisions on planning applications strictly in accordance with planning principles.

I would also like to remind members of the public that the decisions may not always be popular, but they should respect the need for Councillors to take decisions that will stand up to external scrutiny or accountability.

Would members of the public also note that they are not allowed to communicate with or pass messages to Councillors during the meeting.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

(if any) - receive.

3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Members are invited to disclose any interest in any of the items on the agenda at this point of the meeting.

Members may still disclose any interest in an item at any time prior to the consideration of the matter.

4 MINUTES (Pages 1 - 24)

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 10 March and 31 March 2016 and to authorise the Chairman to sign them.

5 PLANNING APPLICATIONS - SEE INDEX AND REPORTS (Pages 25 - 86)

- 6 P0109.16 - 24 ROSEBANK AVENUE, HORNCHURCH** (Pages 87 - 96)
- 7 P1390.15 - 1-3 STATION ROAD, HAROLD WOOD** (Pages 97 - 116)
- 8 P1020.15 - 57 ROCKINGHAM AVENUE, HORNCHURCH** (Pages 117 - 126)
- 9 URGENT BUSINESS**

To consider any other item in respect of which the Chairman is of the opinion, by reason of special circumstances which will be specified in the minutes, that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency

**Andrew Beesley
Committee Administration
Manager**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
10 March 2016 (7.30 - 10.15 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS: 11

Conservative Group Robby Misir (in the Chair) Melvin Wallace (Vice-Chair), Philippa Crowder, Steven Kelly and +John Crowder

Residents' Group Reg Whitney and +Jody Ganly

East Havering Residents' Group Linda Hawthorn and +Ron Ower

UKIP Group Phil Martin

Independent Residents Group Graham Williamson

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Ray Best, Alex Donald and Stephanie Nunn.

+Substitute members: Councillor John Crowder (for Ray Best), Councillor Ron Ower (for Alex Donald) and Councillor Jody Ganly (for Stephanie Nunn).

Councillors Damian White, Darren Wise and David Durant were also present for parts of the meeting.

85 members of the public and a representative of the Press were present.

Unless otherwise indicated all decisions were agreed with no vote against.

Through the Chairman, announcements were made regarding emergency evacuation arrangements and the decision making process followed by the Committee.

410 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

With the Committee's agreement the following amendment was made to the minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2015.

Minute 365 was amended to read:

Councillor Chapman concluded by commenting that the proposal would not be suitable in the long term as it would impact on the residential amenity and asked that the Committee considered how this loss of amenity would be resolved for a five year period.

411 **P1407.13 - LAND ADJACENT TO WENNINGTON HALL FARM, RAINHAM**

The application before Members was for progressive mineral extraction together with the subsequent importation of inert materials to restore the land back to existing levels and agricultural use.

The application site covered approximately 26 hectares and was for the extraction of approximately 1.35 million tonnes of sand and gravel over a seven year period. Site restoration would be progressive but would continue for an additional two year period post final extraction.

The application was originally presented to the Committee on the 28 January 2016. Members had resolved to defer the application so that further information could be sought and accordingly with this information to hand the application was being re-presented for determination.

Since the last presentation two additional letters of representation had been received and a letter from John Cruddas MP had been submitted which was read to the Committee.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response by the applicant's agent.

The objector commented that he was speaking on behalf of the residents of Wennington and that the village was a peaceful and tranquil setting that would be blighted by noise nuisance if the application was approved. The objector also commented that surrounding roads were in a poor state of repair and dirty and that approving the application would only serve to exacerbate the problem.

The applicant's agent responded by commenting that the officer's report showed overwhelming approval of the proposals and that measures would be put in place to minimise the environmental impact the proposal would have on the village these would include noise screening and improved landscaping. The agent concluded that the proposal was in keeping with Green Belt policies.

With its agreement Councillor David Durant addressed the Committee.

Councillor Durant commented that the proposal site was formed of good grade agricultural land and was situated close to an eight hundred year old

church. Councillor Durant also commented that whilst Green Belt policies allowed for mineral extraction they did not allow for a processing plant and therefore the proposal fell down as it was not within the specified policies. Councillor Durant continued by commenting that other local authorities had not reached their extraction quotas and had not been penalised for failing to do so. Councillor Durant concluded by commenting that there were already a number of other extraction sites in the area but this proposal was on the doorstep of residents and would harm their amenity.

During the debate Members discussed the impact the proposal would have on the amenity of local residents and on the condition of the surrounding roads.

Members also discussed the fact that other authorities had failed to be penalised for not meeting extraction quotas and the cumulative effect the proposal would have when combined with other extraction sites in the surrounding area.

Members also discussed the possible impact the proposal would have on the proposed Beam Reach development.

The report recommended that planning permission be approved however, following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the grounds that:

- The London Borough of Havering had progressed sufficiently against land bank quota in the context of London and environmental considerations for the local community.
- The operational model depended significantly on on-site processing involving imported material and harms the Green Belt both in principle as inappropriate development and through the impact of bunds and machinery on visual amenity and rural setting of Wennington Village.
- Excessive cumulative HGV traffic with associated harm caused by environmental impact including emissions, air quality effects, dust, mud etc.
- Audible effect of plant and machinery harmful to the residential amenity.
- Excessive cumulative impact of HGV traffic on convenience of other road users.

The vote for the resolution to refuse planning permission was carried by 10 votes to 0 with 1 abstention.

Councillor Misir abstained from voting.

412 **P1373.15 - HORNCHURCH COUNTRY PARK DEPOT, SOUTH END ROAD, HORNCHURCH - ENGINEERING EARTHWORKS TO ENLARGE THE EXISTING POND AND CREATE A NEW POND WITHIN THE EXISTING DITCH NETWORK TO IMPROVE FILTRATION AND DRAINAGE AT LAND TO THE NORTH OF HORNCHURCH COUNTRY PARK**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and two additional conditions covering:

- Reed habitat creation and management plan;
- Details of weir structure.

413 **P1439.15 - 110-120 BALGORES LANE, ROMFORD**

The application before Members was for the demolition of the two existing buildings and the re-development of the site for fourteen apartments in three blocks with three floors in each.

Members were advised that 78 pro-forma letters of objection and one letter of support had been received.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response by the applicant's agent.

The objector advised that she was speaking on behalf of the Gidea Park & District Civic Society and commented that over 100 residents had objected to the proposals as they affected the conservation area and were out of keeping with surrounding properties. The objector also commented that the proposal provided insufficient parking and was out of keeping with the streetscene.

The applicant's agent commented that he consulted with the civic society who had wanted only detached homes in the area which had been incorporated into the design of the scheme. The agent stated that the design of the proposed buildings mirrored the design of three detached houses. The applicant also commented that the Council's Heritage Officer supported the proposal and that the design of the buildings sat well within the streetscene.

With its agreement Councillor Damian White addressed the Committee.

Councillor White advised that he was in receipt of a letter from the resident of the neighbouring property in Woodfield Drive who supported the proposal as it would: enhance the site; would be in keeping with the traditional streetscene; remove the prospect of the implementation of a HMO.

During the debate Members discussed the design of the proposed buildings in the streetscene. Members discussed whether the proposed development would improve the area. Members noted that the possible implementation of a HMO should not influence the determination of this application.

The report recommended that planning permission be refused however following a motion to approve the granting of planning permission which was carried by 7 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions it was **RESOLVED** that it be delegated to Head of Regulatory Services to grant planning permission contrary to recommendation and subject to prior completion of a legal agreement to secure:

- Education contribution of £78,000.
- Parking permits control.

And subject to planning conditions covering the following subjects plus any other considered necessary by the Head of Regulatory Services:

- Time limit
- Accordance with plans
- External materials
- Construction/demolition methodology
- Construction hours
- Refuse and recycling
- Cycle storage
- Secure by design for external area
- Landscaping
- Parking provision
- Access and pedestrian visibility splays
- Boundary fencing
- Vehicle cleansing
- Noise insulation
- Lighting
- Renewable energy
- Accessibility/access

The vote for the resolution to delegate the granting of planning permission was carried by 7 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions.

Councillors Misir, J.Crowder, P.Crowder, Kelly, Wallace, Martin and Williamson voted for the resolution to delegate the granting of planning permission.

Councillor Hawthorn voted against the resolution to delegate the granting of planning permission.

Councillors Ganly, Ower and Whitney abstained from voting.

414 **P1541.15 - 69 WINGLETYE LANE, HORNCHURCH - CHANGE OF USE OF GROUND FLOOR OF PROPERTY TO D1 USE (DENTAL SURGERY)**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

415 **P1801.15 - 16 HEARN ROAD, ROMFORD**

The application before Members was seeking planning permission for the erection of a detached three-storey residential block containing six one-bedroom flats.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Frederick Thompson on the grounds that he considered that the proposed development had merit and should be looked on favourably.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response from the applicant's agent.

The objector commented that the height, bulk and mass of the proposal was visually intrusive on surrounding properties and was an overdevelopment of the site. The objector also commented that there was insufficient parking for the proposed development.

In response the applicant's agent commented that the proposed building was of no greater height than adjacent properties and that the design was sympathetic to the surrounding buildings.

During the debate Members discussed the current dilapidated state of the site and the lack of parking provision proposed in the application.

The report recommended that planning permission be refused however following a motion to defer the consideration of the report which was carried by 7 votes to 4 it was **RESOLVED** that consideration of the report be deferred to allow negotiations between officers and the applicant to see if the applicant could revise the scheme to provide six on-site parking spaces.

The vote for the resolution to defer the consideration of the report was carried by 7 votes to 4.

Councillors Misir, J.Crowder, P.Crowder, Kelly, Wallace, Martin and Williamson voted for the resolution to defer the consideration of the report.

Councillors Ganly, Hawthorn, Ower and Whitney voted against the resolution to defer the consideration of the report.

416 **P1006.15 - MATTHEWS CLOSE, HAROLD WOOD**

The proposal before Members was for the erection of a 3-storey extension to an existing block of flats to provide three additional 1-bedroom apartments.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response by the applicant's agent.

The objector commented that the proposed extension would be of an overbearing nature which would lead to a loss of light and privacy for neighbouring residents.

In response the applicant's agent commented that there would be no overlooking from the proposed extension as the windows would be sited on other flanks of the extension away from existing properties.

With its agreement Councillor Darren Wise addressed the Committee.

Councillor Wise commented that he had been contacted by local residents who had concerns regarding the proposal as they felt it would lead to overlooking and a loss of amenity for existing residents. Councillor Wise also commented that the proposal was an overdevelopment of the site and would lead to an overspill of parking. Councillor Wise concluded by commenting that an independent tree survey had concluded that the affected tree was in a good condition and that he believed the proposal to be a contravention of planning policy DC2.

During a brief debate Members discussed the possible loss of amenity to existing residents, possible parking overspill and the overdevelopment of the site.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted however following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the following grounds:

- Overdevelopment of the site due to excessive density, overbearing built form and insufficient amenity space.
- Impact on outlook and amenity of neighbouring Matthew Close residents.
- Loss of tree and impact on visual amenity.
- Failure to secure a legal agreement for an education contribution.

The vote for the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission was carried by 9 votes to 2.

Councillors Kelly and Wallace voted against the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission.

417 **P1453.15 - 20 FARM ROAD, RAINHAM**

Consideration of the application was deferred at officer's request to allow officers to re-present the proposal which would include the analysis of a recent planning appeal dismissal.

418 **P1790.15 - 151 BALGORES LANE, ROMFORD - DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING DWELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BLOCK CONTAINING NINE FLATS**

The Committee considered the report noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £9,700 and without debate **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £48,000 to be used for educational purposes.
- All contribution sums should include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of receipt by the Council.
- The Developer/Owner to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs associated with the Legal Agreement prior to the completion of the agreement irrespective of whether the agreement was completed.
- Payment of the appropriate planning obligations monitoring fee prior to the completion of the agreement.

That the Head of Regulatory Services be authorised to enter into a legal agreement to secure the above and upon completion of that agreement, grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was carried by 10 votes to 0 with 1 abstention.

Councillor Ganly abstained from voting.

419 **P1468.15 - 36 HIGH STREET, ROMFORD - CHANGE OF USE FROM A DROP-IN SUPPORT FACILITY FOR THE ELDERLY TO CLASS D1 AN ADULT SUBSTANCE MISUSE CENTRE**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

420 **P1154.15 - CROWN PUBLIC HOUSE, LONDON ROAD, ROMFORD**

The proposal before Members was for the change of use and part demolition of an existing public house and new construction to provide twenty four apartments with associated amenity and car parking.

The application was originally presented to the Regulatory Services Committee meeting of 1 October 2015 with a recommendation for approval. It was deferred in order to negotiate with the applicant a revision to the scheme to meet the required PTAL parking standard provision either by providing more on-site parking or by reducing the number of units. The applicant had declined to increase the amount of parking spaces as the alternatives would raise other issues relating to insufficient amenity space provision and impact on amenity. The full statement received from the applicant was contained in the report.

During a brief debate Members again questioned the lack of parking provision contained within the proposal and the possible overdevelopment of the site and felt that a reduction in the total number of flats as opposed to loss of amenity space should have been proposed by the applicant.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted however following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission which was carried by 9 votes to 1 with 1 abstention it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the following grounds:

- Insufficient on-site parking leading to a loss of amenity for local areas through parking congestion.
- Harm to amenities of future occupiers resulting from the cramped, excessively dense development of site.
- The failure to secure a legal agreement for education contributions.

The vote for the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission was carried by 9 votes to 1 with 1 abstention.

Councillor Misir voted against the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission.

Councillor J.Crowder abstained from voting.

421 **PLANNING OBLIGATIONS/LEGAL AGREEMENTS**

The Committee considered a report that updated Members on the position of legal agreements and planning obligations. This related to approval of various types of application for planning permission decided by the Committee that could be subject to prior completion or a planning obligation.

This was obtained pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Acts.

The report also updated the position on legal agreements and planning obligations agreed by this Committee during the period 2000-2016.

The Committee **NOTED** the report and the information contained therein.

422 PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT APPEALS RECEIVED, PUBLIC INQUIRIES/HEARINGS AND SUMMARY OF APPEAL DECISIONS

The report accompanied a schedule of appeals and a schedule of appeal decisions, received between 13 November 2015 and 19 February 2016.

The report detailed that 42 new appeals had been received since the last meeting of the Monitoring Committee in December 2015.

The Committee **NOTED** the report and the results of the appeal decisions received.

423 SCHEDULE OF ENFORCEMENT NOTICES

The Committee considered and noted the schedules detailing information regarding enforcement notices updated since the meeting held in December 2015.

Schedule A showed notices currently with the Secretary of State for the Environment (the Planning Inspectorate being the executive agency) awaiting appeal determination.

Schedule B showed current notices outstanding, awaiting service, compliance, etc. with up-dated information from staff on particular notices.

The Committee **NOTED** the information in the report.

424 PROSECUTIONS UPDATE

The report updated the Committee on the progress and/or outcome of recent prosecutions undertaken on behalf of the Planning Service.

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

425 SCHEDULE OF COMPLAINTS

Members had previously been emailed a schedule which listed the complaints received by the Planning Control Service regarding alleged

planning contraventions for the period 13 November 2015 to 19 February 2016.

The Committee **NOTED** the report and **AGREED** the actions of the Service.

426 **SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**

During the discussion of the reports the Committee **RESOLVED** to suspend Committee Procedure Rule 8 in order to complete the consideration of the remaining business of the agenda.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
31 March 2016 (7.30 - 11.30 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS: 11

Conservative Group Robby Misir (in the Chair) Melvin Wallace (Vice-Chair), Ray Best, Steven Kelly and +Damian White

Residents' Group Stephanie Nunn and Reg Whitney

East Havering Residents' Group Alex Donald and Linda Hawthorn

UKIP Group Phil Martin

Independent Residents Group Graham Williamson

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Philippa Crowder.

+Substitute member: Councillor Damian White (for Philippa Crowder).

Councillors Robert Benham, Dilip Patel, Viddy Persaud, Linda Trew, Linda Van den Hende and Jeffrey Tucker were also present for parts of the meeting.

65 members of the public and a representative of the Press were present.

Unless otherwise indicated all decisions were agreed with no vote against.

Through the Chairman, announcements were made regarding emergency evacuation arrangements and the decision making process followed by the Committee.

427 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 February 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

428 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Damian White declared a prejudicial interest in application P1210.15. Councillor White advised that he was the Cabinet Member for Housing and the applicant was the Council.

Councillor White left the chamber prior to the consideration of the report and took no part in the voting.

429 P1210.15 - 1 KILMARTIN WAY, HORNCHURCH

The proposal before Members was for the erection of eighteen dwellings comprising of ten two-bedroom houses and eight three-bedroom houses.

The application site was Council owned land.

A late letter of representation was received from Councillor Barry Mugglestone. A copy of the letter was given to each Member of the Committee.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response from the applicant's agent.

The objector commented that the access road to the proposed development was situated adjacent to his property and was not wide enough to incorporate two way traffic and a pavement on either side. The objector also commented that there had been drainage problems on the site and that existing residents would be losing the use of their garages.

The applicant's agent responded by commenting that he had worked closely with planning officers to present a suitable scheme which had been the subject of two public consultations. The agent also commented that the proposal increased the level of parking in the area and that the dwellings fitted within the existing streetscene. The agent concluded by commenting that the Council's highways team had not raised any objections, the existing amenity space was being retained and the proposal would enhance a run-down site.

During the debate Members sought and received clarification regarding the amount of parking currently on the site and what would be provided within the proposal.

Members also discussed the access and egress arrangements of the site and whether the roads were adoptable or not.

Members commented that the proposal was a good development that would bring a run-down site back into use but felt there were further points that needed clarifying before they could make a considered decision on the proposal.

The report recommending that planning permission be granted, however following a motion to defer the consideration of the report it was **RESOLVED** that consideration of the report be deferred for staff to clarify:

- Whether both roadways could be adopted (and brought up to necessary adoptable standard) and if not why not.
- Access road width dimensions including footways and adequacy against standards.
- "Nett" parking impact taking account of surrounding houses (how many and where) which had the right to use existing car park areas on the site.
- How UKPN substation, unimpeded access, would affect construction traffic.
- Whether the new houses fronting Kilmartin Way would be responsible for contributing to the upkeep if non-adopted roadway.
- Adequacy of visibility spaces for vehicle egress into South End Road.
- UKPN consultation response also to be reported to the Committee.

As advised earlier in the minutes Councillor Damian White declared a prejudicial interest in application P1210.15. Councillor White advised that he was the Cabinet Member for Housing and the applicant was the Council.

Councillor White left the chamber prior to the consideration of the report and took no part in the voting.

430 P0118.16 - 67 CORBETS TEY ROAD, (LAND ADJ) UPMINSTER

The application before Members was for the erection of four one bedroom flats on land adjacent to 67 Corbets Tey Road. The application site had an extensive planning history with planning applications previously submitted, and refused, for five and six units respectively.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Linda Van Den Hende on the grounds that that whilst the proposal was a smaller application to that previously refused, there were still significant difficulties with the site. It was considered that the proposals represented an over-development of the plot and the design was unacceptable in terms of scale and bulk. In addition to this was the issue of parking. As part of the plans for the development, two spaces assigned to the existing development on-site would be re-assigned thereby reducing the visitor parking bay provision. Concerns were furthermore raised in respect of construction traffic and how vehicles would access the site in view that the access into the site was single lane.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response by the applicant.

The objector commented that residents of Bellmakers Mews had concerns regarding access and egress as the site was quite compact and had a very

narrow entrance. The objector also commented that existing residents were concerned how the build of the proposal would impact on their amenity.

The applicant responded by commenting that he had worked closely with planning officers, following the previous refusals of planning permission, to design a scheme that reduced the mass and bulk of the proposed development. The applicant also commented that the parking provision for the development would be the current visitor spaces on the adjacent development.

With its agreement Councillor Linda Van den Hende addressed the Committee.

Councillor Van den Hende commented that the application was for an infill site that should have been developed at the same time as the adjacent building. Councillor Van den Hende also commented that the parking for the site was below the Council's policy level and was also reducing the visitor parking provision that had been afforded to the adjacent development. Councillor Van den Hende concluded by commenting that the access road was too narrow for increased traffic, during the first build commercial vehicles had accessed the site from an entrance adjacent to the nearby school which had subsequently been closed following completion of the initial development and therefore all traffic would now be entering/exiting the site through the narrow entrance.

During the debate Members sought and received clarification of the distance between the existing development and the proposed development.

Members also questioned the legitimacy of taking parking provision from the existing development and including it in the proposed development.

Discussions around the possible overdevelopment of the site and effect on existing resident's amenity were also had.

Members also discussed possible safety measures that could be introduced along the narrow access road.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted however following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission which was carried by 6 votes to 5 it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the grounds:

- Cramped overdevelopment by reason of footprint, proximity to boundaries, lack of amenity, effect on existing residents living conditions harmful to amenity.
- Failure to secure a legal agreement for parking permits.
- Failure to secure a legal agreement for a contribution to school places.

The vote for the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission was carried by 6 votes to 5.

Councillors Donald, Hawthorn, Nunn, Whitney, Martin and Williamson voted for the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission.

Councillors Misir, Kelly, Best, Wallace and White voted against the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission.

431 **P1787.15 - ST PETERS RC PRIMARY SCHOOL, DORSET AVENUE, ROMFORD**

The application before Members detailed proposals to enlarge the school to two form entry capacity and to provide the following: six new 30 pupil place classrooms, group teaching rooms, stores and toilets, and a studio learning space.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response from the applicant's agent.

The objector commented that he was representing the neighbours of the school who were experiencing high levels of inappropriate parking in the area. Parents dropping off and collecting children were parking across resident's driveways and generally blocking access and egress on neighbouring roads. The objector concluded by commenting that deliveries to the school were also taking place at inappropriate hours and these were affecting resident's amenity.

The applicant's agent commented that the proposed extensions were only single storey developments and discussions had taken place between school representatives and officers regarding the possible submission of an updated School Travel Plan.

During a brief debate Members discussed the recent introduction of increased traffic enforcement that was due to be implemented around school sites across the borough.

It was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

432 **P1652.15 - 2 BROOKLANDS ROAD, ROMFORD**

The proposal before Members was for the erection of an apartment building to provide ten 2 bedroom flats and associated vehicular access, drainage works and landscaping, following the demolition of all existing buildings on the site.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response by the applicant's agent.

The objector commented that the proposal would have a negative impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties. The objector also commented that the site was accessed and egressed through a very narrow road that was flanked by high walls which made visibility onto the main road quite difficult. The objector also commented that the proposed building would be taller than surrounding properties which would lead to a loss of sunlight on existing homes. The objector concluded by commenting that the noise and dust during the construction period would harm neighbours amenity.

In response the applicant's agent commented that applicant had liaised with officers throughout the planning process and that the all planning policies, including parking provision, had been adhered to. The agent concluded by commenting that the distances between the proposed development and existing properties had been maximised at every opportunity available.

With its agreement Councillor Robert Benham addressed the Committee.

Councillor Benham advised that he spoke on behalf of his fellow ward Councillor Viddy Persaud as well in opposing the proposed development. Councillor Benham commented that the proposal was of a cramped design and was an overdevelopment of the site. Councillor Benham also commented that the existing building and hard-standing had been built without planning permission and did not have permission to trade as a car showroom. Councillor Benham also commented that the existing premises had been the subject of planning enforcement which had not been adhered to. Councillor Benham concluded by commenting that the proposal would lead to a loss of privacy to neighbouring properties, a loss of amenity and was an overdevelopment of the site.

During the debate Members sought and received clarification on the provision of affordable housing.

Members also discussed the possible previous planning breaches and enforcement action that had been taken.

Members concluded by discussing the possible improvement that the proposal would bring to the site and the narrow access road.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted however following a motion to defer the consideration of the report which was carried by 9 votes to 2 it was **RESOLVED** that consideration of the report be deferred for officers to clarify:

- Enforcement history and relevance to the material considerations including comparisons drawn between existing and new impacts, eg traffic.

- Whether vehicle access safety arrangements (narrow width and visibility) can be improved, eg lights.
- Whether applicant can revisit viability which led to 0% affordable housing and possibility of contribution by commuted sum.

The vote for the resolution to defer consideration of the report was carried by 9 votes to 2.

Councillors Kelly and Wallace voted against the resolution to defer consideration of the report.

433 **P1734.15 - 30 UPMINSTER ROAD SOUTH, RAINHAM**

The application before Members sought permission for the demolition of a existing single storey social club and the construction of 1 new three-storey building to house retail accommodation at the ground floor and 1 flat at first and second floors respectively. The proposal was also for 4 two-storey buildings to house 4 1-bedroom townhouses.

With its agreement Councillor Jeffrey Tucker addressed the Committee.

Councillor Tucker commented that he had been contacted by residents and shopkeepers in the area who had advised him that there had been no consultation carried out regarding the proposals. Councillor Tucker also commented that the Council's Economic Development Team and Housing had made no comments regarding the proposal. Councillor Tucker concluded by commenting that the proposal would be detrimental to the conservation area and that further consultation should take place.

During a brief debate Members sought and received clarification that the proposal site was outside the Rainham Conservation Area and that the correct consultation had been carried out.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted however following a motion to defer consideration of the report which was carried by 6 votes to 5 it was **RESOLVED** that consideration of the report be deferred to allow staff to clarify:

- The extent of notification and verification that it had been undertaken correctly.
- The extent of statutory consultation in relation to requirements.
- To seek the views of Economic Development & Housing and in the case of the latter whether they may have been currently reviewing local parking conditions behind the application site.
- To ascertain further details on why the loss of the community asset was judged not to contravene parking conditions.

The vote for the resolution to defer consideration of the report was carried by 6 votes to 5.

Councillors Donald, Hawthorn, Nunn, Whitney, Martin and Williamson voted for the resolution to defer consideration of the report.

Councillors Misir, Best, Kelly, Wallace and White voted against the resolution to defer the consideration of the report.

434 **P1744.15 - 2 HAMLET ROAD, ROMFORD**

The application before Members sought planning permission for the erection of a new house.

Members noted that the application had been called-in by Councillor Dilip Patel on the following grounds:

- That a six-bedroom house was considered to be unsuitable for Hamlet Road as the rest of the dwellings were three/four bedrooms and bungalows.
- That the potential parking for roughly four to five cars was considered to be a big issue for the road as it was very narrow and residents had complained about parking on that corner of the Hamlet Road.
- There were already two cottages that were being built at the rear of this property.
- A number of residents had complained to Councillor Patel and also Councillor Jason Frost about the size of the building.

With its agreement Councillor Dilip Patel addressed the Committee.

Councillor Patel commented that Hamlet Road was a very narrow road and there had been numerous complaints relating to parking in the road. Councillor Patel also commented that the road was used by visitors to a nearby boot sale on Sundays for parking and this was exacerbating the parking problems. Councillor Patel concluded by commenting that a six bedroom house was far too large for the size of the road.

During a brief debate Members discussed the parking provision in the area, how the property would sit in the streetscene and the possibility of the property becoming an HMO.

Members noted that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £330.00 and **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and subject to an additional condition that notwithstanding provisions of the General Permitted Development Order the building should be used solely as a single family dwelling and not for any other purpose including as a house of multiple occupation.

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was carried by 10 votes to 0 with 1 abstention.

Councillor Donald abstained from voting.

435 P1656.15 - 4 HAMLET ROAD, ROMFORD

The application before Members sought planning permission for the conversion of a bungalow to a two-storey house including a loft conversion and the demolition of an existing conservatory.

Members noted that the application had been called-in by Councillors Dilip Patel and Jason Frost on the following grounds:

- That a six-bedroom house was considered to be unsuitable for Hamlet Road as the rest of the dwellings were three/four bedrooms and bungalows.
- That the potential parking demand for roughly four to five cars was considered to be a big issue for the road as it was very narrow and residents had complained about parking on that corner of the Hamlet Road.
- There were already two cottages that were being built at the rear of the property.
- A number of residents had already complained to Councillor Patel and Councillor Frost regarding the size of the building.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response by the applicant's agent.

The objector commented that both Hamlet Road and Hamlet Close were only wide enough for parking on one side of the road and that the proposed development could potentially increase vehicle numbers using and parking in the roads. The objector concluded by commenting that the roads were not built for properties of this size.

In response the applicant's agent commented that officers had approved the plans and there was a possibility that not all the bedrooms in the property would be used. The agent concluded by commenting that the proposal would not result in a loss of amenity for any neighbouring properties.

With its agreement Councillors Dilip Patel and Linda Trew addressed the Committee.

Councillor Patel commented that the two applications for Hamlet Road had perhaps been heard in the wrong order as by granting planning permission for P1744.15 this had set a precedent making it difficult for the Committee to refuse the granting of planning permission.

Councillor Trew commented that she agreed with Councillor Patel's comments regarding the order the applications were considered. Councillor Trew also commented that the proposal was an overdevelopment of the site and that she had concerns that the property would become an HMO.

During the debate Members discussed the effect the proposal would have on neighbouring properties and the planning history of the application site.

It was **RESOLVED** to delegate to the Head of Regulatory Services to clarify whether the applicant was willing to provide 4 parking spaces within the site curtilage and if so to grant planning permission subject to confirmation of this via a planning condition and also a condition that notwithstanding the provisions of the General Permitted Development Order the building should be used solely as a single family dwelling and not for any other purpose including as a house in multiple occupation.

The vote for the resolution to delegate the granting of planning permission to the Head of Regulatory Services was carried by 4 to 2 with 5 abstentions

Councillors Misir, Best, Kelly and Nunn voted for the resolution to delegate the granting of planning permission.

Councillors Wallace and White voted against the resolution to delegate the granting of planning permission.

Councillors Donald, Hawthorn, Whitney, Martin and Williamson abstained from voting.

- 436 **P1848.15 - SOUTH HORNCHURCH MODULAR BUILDING, RAINHAM ROAD, RAINHAM - RETENTION OF AND WORKS TO THE EXISTING MODULAR BUILDING AND USE FOR CLASS D1 PURPOSES (DAY NURSERY, PLAYGROUP, PRE-SCHOOL OR EDUCATIONAL DAY CENTRE)**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

- 437 **P1670.15 - 67 BUTTS GREEN ROAD, HORNCHURCH - PROPOSED REAR EXTENSION AT 4M TO BOTH GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR, WITH CONVERSION OF THE EXISTING BUILDING INTO THREE SEPARATE SELF-CONTAINED APARTMENTS WITH ASSOCIATED AMENITY AND PARKING**

The Committee considered the report noting that the proposal qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £1,320 and without debate **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to

the applicant entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £18,000 to be paid prior to commencement of development and to be used towards infrastructure costs.
- All contribution sums should include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of receipt by the Council.
- To pay the Council's reasonable legal costs in association with the preparation of a legal agreement, prior to completion of the agreement, irrespective of whether the legal agreement was completed.
- Payment of the appropriate planning obligation/s monitoring fee prior to completion of the agreement.

That the Head of Regulatory Services be authorised to enter into a legal agreement to secure the above and upon completion of that agreement, grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

438 **P1453.15 - 20 FARM ROAD, RAINHAM - DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING BUNGALOW AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF FOUR DWELLINGS**

The Committee considered the report noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £6,580 and without debate **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £18,000 to be used for educational purposes.
- All contribution sums should include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of receipt by the Council.
- The Developer/Owner to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs associated with the Legal Agreement prior to the completion of the agreement irrespective of whether the agreement was completed.
- Payment of the appropriate planning obligations monitoring fee prior to the completion of the agreement.

That the Head of Regulatory Services be authorised to enter into a legal agreement to secure the above and upon completion of that agreement, grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

439 **P0011.16 - UNIT 7 BEAM REACH BUSINESS PARK 5, CONSUL AVENUE, RAINHAM - CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING BUILDING FROM B1 AND B2 WITH ANCILLARY B8 TO B1, B2 AND B8**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to a variation to the existing Deed made pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to:

- Ensure that the existing schedules and covenants carry forward and apply to any occupation of the building within the B8 use class.
- The Developer/Owner to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs associated with the legal agreement, prior to the completion of the agreement, irrespective of whether the agreement was completed; and

That the Head of Regulatory Services be authorised to make the aforementioned variation to the existing Deed and, upon completion of that obligation, grant planning permission for the change of use as per the conditions set out in the report.

440 **SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**

During the discussion of the reports the Committee **RESOLVED** to suspend Committee Procedure Rule 8 in order to complete the consideration of the remaining business of the agenda.

Chairman

Regulatory Services Committee

28 April 2016

Application No.	Ward	Address
P0159.16	Havering Park	Havendale, 58 Orange Tree Hill, Havering-atte-Bower, Romford
P0208.16	Havering Park	Citrus Grove, Orange Tree Hill, Havering-atte-Bower, Romford
P0213.16	Rainham & Wennington	CEME, Marsh Way Rainham
P0242.16	Romford Town	Romford Brewery Shopping Centre, Romford
P1286.15 & L0008.15	Havering Park	Bower House, Orange Tree Hill, Havering-atte-Bower, Romford
P1910.15	Havering Park	Fairlawns, Havering-atte-Bower, Romford

OFFICER REPORT FOR REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE - 28th April 2016

APPLICATION NO.	P0159.16	
WARD:	Havering Park	Date Received: 1st February 2016 Expiry Date: 28th March 2016
ADDRESS:	Havendale 58 Orange Tree Hill Havering-atte-Bower Romford	
PROPOSAL:	Loft conversion, single storey rear extension and conversion of front bay window.	
DRAWING NO(S):	099 PL1 100 PL1 101 PL1 102 PL1 202 PL1 111 PL1 112 PL1 200 PL1 201 PL1 110 PL1	
RECOMMENDATION	It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report	

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a one and a half storey detached chalet bungalow situated on the western side of Orange Tree Hill. The application premises is set back from the highway by some 17.0 metres.

The site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt.

Ground level fluctuates within the locality. Generally it is observed that the rear gardens of premises situated on the western side of Orange Tree Hill have a downward gradient to the west.

The dominant building form within the locality is varied and there is no uniform architectural typology. Premises are mostly detached, but are comprised of single and two storey form, some of which have been extensively developed.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The proposal is for the extension of the ridge of the main roof rearwards in the form of a two storey rear extension to accommodate two flat roofed side dormers. Consent is also sought for alterations to an existing flat roofed front dormer, a single storey front extension to straighten the existing curved bay and a raised decking area to the rear.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P0508.99 - Detached garage
Refuse 13-08-1999

CONSULTATIONS / REPRESENTATIONS

The proposal has been advertised by site notice and in the local press as development which is contrary to the Metropolitan Green Belt Policies of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

27 neighbouring occupiers were consulted directly and no letters of representation were received.

Highway Authority - No objection.

Env Health - No Objection.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

- DC32 - The Road Network
- DC33 - Car Parking
- DC45 - Appropriate Development in the Green Belt
- DC61 - Urban Design
- SPD04 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

OTHER

LONDON PLAN - 6.13 Parking

-

LONDON PLAN - 7.16 Green Belt

-

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The application is not liable for Mayoral CIL.

STAFF COMMENTS

The main issues in this case are the impact on the character and openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt, effect on the streetscene, the impact on residential amenity and any highway and parking issues.

This application is to be determined at Regulatory Services Committee owing to the recommendation made for approval by staff, representing a departure from Green Belt Policy.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The application site falls within the Metropolitan Green Belt however, this does not preclude extensions to residential properties in principle. National and local policies refer to a presumption against inappropriate development in Green Belt areas.

Chapter 9 of the NPPF states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. An exception to this is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

In addition, Policy DC45 of the LDF Core Strategy states that extensions to existing dwellings will only be permitted when the cubic capacity of the resultant building is not more than 50% greater than the cubic capacity of the original dwelling. The proposal will exceed this but is judged to be acceptable for reasons set out below. Staff do not consider the resultant extensions to be disproportionate to the original dwelling and therefore to comply in principle with the NPPF.

GREEN BELT IMPLICATIONS

The applicant states that Havendale originally had a cubic capacity of 496m³ and from review of the planning history staff are able to corroborate this figure. The volume of the additions proposed to the dwelling within this application cumulatively amount to an increase in volume of 54%.

Whilst this increase in volume exceeds the 50% threshold stipulated by Policy DC45 of the LDF Core Strategy, Staff are of the opinion that there are special circumstances which exist so as to justify a departure from adopted Policy in this case.

The NPPF places greater weight on whether or not additions to properties within the Green Belt are disproportionate, both in the context of the host building and also of the wider locality. In addition consideration is also given as to whether or not development would detract from the open nature of the Green Belt. The building form within the immediate vicinity of the host premises is varied and the building line of premises on the western side of Orange Tree Hill is varied to the rear, such that properties are staggered and set back substantially from the highway. Examples of flat roofed dormers and extensions of depth to the rear, which are deeper than that generally permitted, are prevalent and there is no established uniform architectural typology.

The application premises itself is within a ribbon of existing development and is flanked by existing premises of comparable size. The position of the proposed extensions relative to surrounding development is such that the development proposed is not considered to harm the open nature of the Green Belt. Furthermore, staff consider that the alterations proposed would not appear disproportionate when seen within the context of surrounding development.

DESIGN / IMPACT ON STREET / GARDEN SCENE

There is no established pattern of development within the locality. The front and rear building line of dwellings meanders, such that the properties on the western side of Orange Tree Hill appear to be staggered with little unity. The main unifying feature identified by staff is that the dwellings located on the western side of Orange Tree Hill are set back substantially from the highway with spacious and open frontages.

Staff observed whilst attending site and review of recent applications within the area, that the surrounding locality is populated by premises which have been developed extensively. Flat roofed dormers are a prevalent feature, easily visible from the street-scene and staff also note the presence of extensions of depth in excess of that generally permitted - owing to the special

circumstances brought about by the varied building line and form within the locality.

The alterations to the front of the property are judged to be in keeping with the character of the locality.

The extensions to the rear of the dwelling are compatible with the scale of neighbouring development and it is noted that the design of nearby properties vary. The raised area to the rear is modest in depth and would be set in from both common boundaries. Raised areas to the rear are not uncommon within the locality due to the change in ground level to the rear of premises on the western side of Orange Tree Hill. Staff have no objections to this element of the proposal visually, it is considered to relate well proportionally to the host premises.

To this end, the additions proposed cumulatively, when seen within the context of the locality and the varied building form present would not appear uncharacteristic, nor incongruous. Staff are of the opinion that the cumulative impact of the development proposed would not be harmful to the character of the area nor the host premises.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

It is considered that the proposal would not result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring properties, primarily due to the siting and detached nature of the host dwelling.

The unattached neighbour to the south sits deeper into the plot than the host premises, such that the result of the development proposed would be a similar rear building line. The raised area to the rear is modest in terms of depth, having been reduced to 2.50m from 4.0m and the viewing angle/inter-visibility would not be unusual given the staggered rear building lines on the western side of Orange Tree Hill. Staff consider that the viewing angle would be oblique and therefore this element of the proposal is not judged to result in a material loss of privacy. Staff observed flank windows at ground, first and second floors - however all are obscure glazed and do not appear to serve primary habitable rooms, therefore no material loss of light or privacy would occur. The proposed new windows to the side facing dormer would not cause loss of privacy owing to the location of the windows relative to the flank wall of the neighbouring house.

The unattached neighbour to the north benefits from existing development at single storey level, therefore the impact of the two storey projection is primarily limited to first floor level. Staff are of the view that there would be an adequate separation distance between the two premises to negate any substantial loss of light or overshadowing. The proposed new dormer window introduces windows that would face towards the flank/roof of the neighbouring house, therefore no material loss of privacy is considered to result. It would be reasonable however to impose a condition requiring obscure glazing to the flank ensuite window. In addition, staff note mature vegetation which lines the boundary of the site. This affords this neighbour a degree of screening from potential overlooking/inter-visibility resulting from the raised patio area.

HIGHWAY / PARKING

It is considered that the proposal would not create any parking or highway issues.

KEY ISSUES / CONCLUSIONS

The development proposed at Havendale is considered to be acceptable and to not adversely affect the open nature and character of the Green Belt.

Whilst exceeding the 50% threshold stipulated by Policy DC45 in respect of the resultant volume of the dwelling it is the view of staff that the proposed development would not represent disproportionate additions to the existing building and therefore would be in accordance with the aims of the NPPF.

In addition, the proposal would not result in a loss of amenity to any neighbouring occupiers, nor any adverse highway or parking issues.

Accordingly it is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:-

To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. SC32 (Accordance with plans)

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason:-

The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

3. Materials (details no samples)

Before any of the development hereby permitted is commenced, written specification of external walls and roof materials to be used in the construction of the building(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the development shall be constructed with the approved materials.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the materials to be used. Submission of a written specification prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding area and comply with Policy DC61 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

4. SC46 (Standard flank window condition)

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, no window or other opening (other than those shown on the submitted and approved plan,) shall be formed in the flank wall(s) of the building(s)

hereby permitted, unless specific permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has first been sought and obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In order to ensure a satisfactory development that will not result in any loss of privacy or damage to the environment of neighbouring properties which exist or may be proposed in the future, and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

5. SC34B (Obscure with fanlight openings only) ENTER DETAILS

The proposed window within the north facing dormer serving the proposed first floor en-suite shall be permanently glazed with obscure glass and with the exception of top hung fanlight(s) shall remain permanently fixed shut and thereafter be maintained.

Reason:-

In the interests of privacy, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

INFORMATIVES

1. Approval following revision ENTER DETAILS

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: In accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, improvements required to make the proposal acceptable were negotiated with the agent by email 24-04-2016. The revisions involved clarification of the raised patio proposed. The amendments were subsequently submitted on 05-04-2016.

OFFICER REPORT FOR REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE - 28th April 2016

APPLICATION NO. P0208.16
WARD: Havering Park **Date Received:** 12th February 2016
Expiry Date: 8th April 2016
ADDRESS: Citrus Grove
Orange Tree Hill
Havering-atte-Bower
Romford
PROPOSAL: Proposed double storey rear extension and alterations to rear elevation, reconfiguration of roof to include a front dormer and rear flat roof with lantern and reconfiguration of internal layout.
DRAWING NO(S): PL-5263_01
PL-5263_02
PL-5263_03
PL-5263_08
PL-5263_05
PL-5263_06
PL-5263_07
PL-5263_04
RECOMMENDATION It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two storey detached dwelling situated on the western side of Orange Tree Hill, set back from the highway by some 37 metres.

The site is located in Metropolitan Green Belt.

Ground level fluctuates but the general pattern is that the rear gardens of premises on the western side of Orange Tree Hill within the immediate vicinity of Citrus Grove slope down to the west.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for a two storey rear extension and a front dormer. Shown on submitted plans are alterations to the form of the existing dwelling to facilitate the development proposed - including a revised flat roofed section to the rear of the premises and alterations to the roof form over the historic part two storey/part single storey side extension.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P0448.98 - Single storey side/rear extension and pitch roof to existing flat roofed rear extension
Apprv with cons 03-07-1998

CONSULTATIONS / REPRESENTATIONS

The proposal was advertised by way of a site notice and in the local press as development which is contrary to the Metropolitan Green Belt Policies of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. 10 neighbouring occupiers were consulted and no letters of representation were received.

Highway Authority - No objection.

Environmental Health - No comment.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

- DC32 - The Road Network
- DC33 - Car Parking
- DC45 - Appropriate Development in the Green Belt
- DC61 - Urban Design
- SPD04 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

OTHER

LONDON PLAN - 6.13 Parking

-

LONDON PLAN - 7.16 Green Belt

-

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The application is not liable for Mayoral CIL.

STAFF COMMENTS

The main issues in this case are the impact on the character and openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt, the streetscene, the impact on residential amenity and any highway and parking issues.

For the purposes of this application, the Planning Officer's calculations have been used to determine this application.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The application site falls within the Metropolitan Green Belt however, this does not preclude extensions to residential properties in principle. National and local policies refer to a presumption against inappropriate development in Green Belt areas.

Chapter 9 of the NPPF states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. An exception to this is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

In addition, Policy DC45 of the LDF Core Strategy states that extensions to existing dwellings will only be permitted when the cubic capacity of the resultant building is not more than 50% greater

than the cubic capacity of the original dwelling.

GREEN BELT IMPLICATIONS

Policy DC45 states that extensions, alterations and replacement of existing dwellings will be allowed provided that the cubic capacity of the resultant building is not more than 50% greater than that of the original dwelling.

Staff calculate the original volume of the host premises to be 363m³. Having reviewed historic detail the application premises has already been extensively developed - such that the footprint of the property has more than doubled since construction due to historic additions to the side and rear. Currently, the existing extensions to the premises equate to an increase of some 101% (369m³) of the original cubic capacity of the application building (363m³).

Whilst alterations to the pitched roof over the single storey projection to the rear are proposed, this does not offset the additional volume proposed in any substantial way and the resultant cubic capacity of Citrus Grove resulting from the development proposed is a total volume increase of 139% - (508m³) of the properties original cubic capacity. The development proposed is therefore contrary to the aims of Policy DC45 as it exceeds the 50% threshold stipulated.

The siting and scale of the additions proposed are such that the bulk of development is contained to the envelope of the existing building however. To put this into context, staff have calculated the original footprint of the dwelling to be 66.70m². Currently the premises has a footprint of 149.4m² which is the result of the existing additions. The increase in the footprint of the dwelling resulting from this application is an additional 25m². Staff are of the view that this increase is marginal and mitigated by the resultant visual appearance of the dwelling.

On balance staff accept that the additions proposed are substantial, however are of the opinion that they would not result in any further harm to the Green Belt setting. Citrus Grove has been extended in stages and consequently the application premises has a disorganised and visually jarring appearance, with conflicting roof angles and pitches. The additions do not relate well to one another and lack cohesion visually which detracts from the overall visual appearance of the property. The development proposed would rectify this existing anomalous development and would not result in any further encroachment into the Green Belt.

Staff are of the opinion that the development proposed would not harm the open nature and character of the Green Belt.

DESIGN / IMPACT ON STREET / GARDEN SCENE

Properties on the western side of Orange Tree Hill have few unifying traits besides a characteristic set back from the highway and long open frontages.

The application premises has been developed extensively and consequently the visual appearance of Citrus Grove is visually jarring with conflicting roof angles which are at odds with one another.

The alterations proposed would substantially alter the appearance of the host dwelling when viewed from the street and rear garden environment and rectify the historic anomalous additions

which have been added. No objections are raised as to the resultant visual appearance of the proposed development.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

The front and rear building line varies in the locality. Citrus Grove sits considerably deeper into its plot than neighbouring premises to the South and an access road separates the application premises and the closest unattached neighbour to the North, the boundary of which staff observed is framed by mature vegetation.

It is considered that the proposal would not result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring properties, primarily due to the siting and detached nature of the host building.

The application premises is situated due north of the closest unattached neighbour, Rosemount. Any loss of light or potential overshadowing is negated as a result of this favourable siting. In addition, the application premises sits deeper in its plot than the unattached neighbour to the South. This reduces the visual impact of the two storey rear extension proposed, as the angle at which it would be visible from rear facing windows in Rosemount at ground and first floors is oblique, with the majority of its bulk subsumed by the form of the existing building.

The Juliet balcony proposed to the first floor would have limited views into the rear garden of this neighbour and would not give rise to any sense of overlooking or loss of privacy. To the rear, the site is framed by mature vegetation which affords a level of screening to the unattached neighbour to the west.

On balance it is not considered that the proposed development would present any undue issues in relation to privacy, overlooking or loss of daylight and overshadowing in accordance with policy DC61, the Residential Design SPD and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

HIGHWAY / PARKING

It is considered that the proposal would not create any parking or highway issues.

KEY ISSUES / CONCLUSIONS

In light of the above, Members are invited to make a balanced judgement in terms of the impact of the proposed development upon the Green Belt.

Staff are of the opinion that the development proposed is not disproportionate when seen within the context of existing development, however recognise that the cumulative volume increase is far in excess of the 50% stipulated by relevant planning policy. Given that there would be no considerable harm to the open nature of the Green Belt, as the development is contained to the existing envelope of the host premises staff recommend approval subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:-

To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. SC10 (Matching materials)

All new external finishes shall be carried out in materials to match those of the existing building(s) to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

3. SC32 (Accordance with plans)

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason:-

The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

INFORMATIVES

1. Approval - No negotiation required

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

OFFICER REPORT FOR REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE - 28th April 2016

APPLICATION NO. P0213.16
WARD: Rainham & Wennington **Date Received:** 12th February 2016
Expiry Date: 13th May 2016
ADDRESS: CEME
Marsh Way
Rainham
PROPOSAL: Change of use of 1,454 sq.m. of floor space in the West Wing of the main CEME training and conference centre from a D1 use to a mixed D1 and B1 use
DRAWING NO(S): Location Plan - Drawing Number 1
Site Plan - Drawing Number 2
Ground Floor Plan - Drawing Number 3
First Floor Plan - Drawing Number 4
RECOMMENDATION It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report

BACKGROUND

This application is being reported to Members as the change of use relates to more than 1,000m² of floorspace. The scheme of delegation does not allow decisions for such applications to be made under delegated powers, irrespective of policy compliance and/or the level of public interest. In this instance, the modest nature of the change of use (D1 to a mixed D1/B1 use) is reflected in the length of the report before Members, with an assessment in terms of policy compliance solely undertaken within the 'Staff Comments' section of this report.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site forms part of the CEME complex and comprises the west wing of the main building on-site. CEME is a gold accredited purpose-built, modern events and conference venue located on an 18 acre business, education and research campus. The CEME building runs parallel with the A13 with access to the site provided off Marsh Way. The site is supported by a large car parking, located to the front and side of the building, and a servicing and delivery road/area to the north.

In terms of designations, the site forms part of a strategic industrial designation, as per the LDF Proposals Maps; and forms part of the London Riverside Business Improvement District.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

As existing the building, inclusive of the western wing to which this application relates, is permitted to be used within the D1 use class (non-residential institutions). This application seeks a change of use of this to allow a mixed D1 and B1 (office) use. The change of use, as alluded above, relates solely to the west wing of the building - approximately 12% of the total floorspace (1,545m²).

The change of use is proposed to allow this part of the CEME building to be occupied by the North

East London NHS Foundation Trust (NEFLT). The floorspace would be used for non-clinical staff training but the NEFLT would also like to deploy some general administrative and office functions to the site, which would extend beyond a D1 use. The flexibility sought through a mixed D1 and B1 use would therefore allow the NEFLT to operate from the building as required. It has been suggested that up to 80 staff would be accommodated within the floorspace.

RELEVANT HISTORY

This site (the CEME complex) has a long planning history with many planning applications relating to built development, the installation of solar panels and technology and advertisements. Below are the most relevant applications to this proposal, which have been granted planning permission:

- P1729.14 - Change of use of (Class D1) to business use (Class B1) and erection of connecting link to the Business Innovation Centre building.
Apprv with cons 10-02-2015
- P0936.13 - Creation of new three storey education facility and remodelling of existing CEME building with associated landscaping works.
Apprv with cons 16-10-2013
- U0001.08 - Extension to existing car parking to provide an additional 107 vehicle spaces
Apprv with cons 28-10-2008
- P1022.02 - Phase 2 detailed design for Dagenham Centre of Excellence for Manufacturing and Engineering (CEME) including academic floorspace and landscaping details, plus amendments to the building design of creche and canopies for Phase 1
Apprv with cons 09-08-2002
- P1384.01 - Revised detailed design pursuant to condition 1 of planning permission P0096.01, including revised design and location of Centre of Excellence for Manufacturing and Engineering (including Business Centre), Centre of Excellence for manufacturing and Engineering Core building and Business Innovation Centre, position of access road, detail of car parking layout and partial landscaping scheme.
Apprv with cons 02-11-2001
- P0377.01 - Phase 1 detailed design for Dagenham Centre of Excellence for Manufacturing & Engineering (CEME) including 12000sq.m (gross) floorspace, Academic, Business Innovation Centre, Conference Centre, parking for 500 cars & associated landscaping
Apprv with cons 22-05-2001
- P0098.01 - Dagenham Centre of Excellence for Manufacturing and Engineering scheme, site remediation engineering works (Stage 2)
Apprv with cons 25-04-2001
- P0096.01 - Development for Dagenham Centre of Excellence for Manufacturing & Engineering including 25000 sqm (gross) floorspace, Academic, Business Innovation Centre, hostel/hotel, parking for 500 cars and associated landscaping - Outline
Apprv with cons 16-05-2001
- P0097.01 - Dagenham Centre of Excellence for Manufacturing and Engineering scheme, site remediation engineering works (advanced Stage 1)
Apprv with cons 25-04-2001

CONSULTATIONS / REPRESENTATIONS

Highway Authority - No objection.

London Borough of Havering Environmental Health - No objection.

London Riverside BID - No comments received.

Rainham Conservation & Improvement Society - No comments received.

Thames Chase - No comments received.

Transport for London - No objection.

Public Consultation:

15 properties were directly notified of this application. No letters of public representation have been received.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (LDF): CP3 (Employment), CP9 (Reducing The Need To Travel), CP10 (Sustainable Transport), CP15 (Environmental Management), CP17 (Design), DC9 (Strategic Industrial Locations), DC12 (Offices), DC13 (Access To Employment Opportunities), DC32 (The Road Network), DC33 (Car Parking), DC34 (Walking), DC35 (Cycling), DC36 (Servicing), DC52 (Air Quality), DC53 (Contaminated Land), DC55 (Noise), DC56 (Light), DC61 (Urban Design) and DC62 (Access).

London Plan: 1.1 (Delivering The Strategic Vision And Objectives For London), 2.1 (London In Its Global, European and United Kingdom Context), 2.2 (London And The Wider Metropolitan Area), 2.3 (Growth Areas And Co-Ordination Corridors), 2.8 (Outer London: Transport), 2.13 (Opportunity Areas And Intensification Areas), 2.14 (Areas For Regeneration), 2.17 (Strategic Industrial Locations), 4.1 (Developing London's Economy), 4.2 (Offices), 4.3 (Mixed Use Development and Offices), 4.4 (Managing Industrial Land And Premises), 5.21 (Contaminated Land), 6.1 (Strategic Approach), 6.3 (Assessing Effects Of Development On Transport Capacity), 6.9 (Cycling), 6.10 (Walking), 6.11 (Smoothing Traffic Flow And Tackling Congestion), 6.12 (Road Network Capacity), 6.13 (Parking), 7.4 (Local Character), 7.6 (Architecture), 7.14 (Improving Air Quality), 7.15 (Reducing And Managing Noise, Improving And Enhancing The Acoustic Environment And Promoting Appropriate Soundscapes) and 8.3 (Community Infrastructure Levy)

Draft London Riverside Opportunity Area Planning Framework (2015)

Government Guidance: National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

Given the proposed type of development, this application is exempt from CIL contributions.

STAFF COMMENTS

Policy DC9 of the LDF details that planning permission will only be granted for B1 (b+c), B2 and B8

uses in the Rainham Employment Area, Harold Hill Industrial Estate and King George Close Estate Strategic Industrial Locations. Advanced manufacturing uses (B1 (b) (c) and B2) will be prioritised within the Beam Reach Business Park together with other (B1 (b) (c) and B2) uses which provide a similar quality and intensity of employment and a high standard of design.

CEME as an educational/training centre (D1 use) does not strictly accord with the above and the land use designation for the area within the LDF. That being said, the use is considered complimentary and the reasoned justification for policy DC9 actually states that the presence of CEME alludes to high quality business park environment.

It is not considered that the proposed change of use of part of the building from D1 to a mix of B1 and D1 would adversely impact on the perceived quality of this area and/or detract from the future aspirations of this area. A B1 use is, in policy terms, compliant with a strategic industrial location and accordingly it is not considered that there is a principle policy objection to the proposed change of use.

With regard to the site and the use, there would be no change to the external appearance of the building and it is considered that the use proposed by the NELFT would largely be akin to the intensity of use currently experienced. For reference, the floorspace has most recently been leased to the Council and used for learning and development.

The car parking area to the front of the CEME complex would remain un-changed by this development and this, for reference, is sufficient for some 600 vehicles inclusive of a number of disabled bays. There is also cycle racks for 46 bicycles and parking for 11 motorcycles. NELFT, as part of this application, have submitted an employee travel plan which seeks to encourage sustainable travel methods and initiatives such as car-sharing. No objection to the proposed change of use, on grounds of inadequate parking provision, has been received from the Highway Authority and/or Transport for London and accordingly it is not considered that the development (change of use) would adversely impact on highway efficiency or safety. The efforts of the applicant in respect of the production of the travel plan is furthermore considered to be representative of compliance with policy DC32 of the LDF and policies 6.11 and 6.12 of the London Plan.

This development has been assessed in context of all other material planning considerations and it is not considered that the proposed broadening of use would result in any significant environmental or amenity impacts to warrant refusal. There would be no physical changes to the site and/or the building and it is not considered that a mix D1/B1 use would be materially out of character and/or result in impacts of a different nature to the D1 use as existing.

KEY ISSUES / CONCLUSIONS

This site forms part of a strategic industrial designation within the LDF Proposals Map. In such locations B1, B2 and B8 uses are accepted. The CEME complex (as a D1 use) is a slight anomaly to this however, the complex performs an important function in the Borough and is considered complimentary to the designation overall. From a land-use perspective, no principle policy objection exists to a proposed B1 use within a strategic industrial location and it is not considered that such a use would be detrimental to the CEME complex, overall; the locality and designation, in general; and/or the future aspirations for this area. It is not considered that the development would

give rise to any significant amenity and/or highway impacts and accordingly it is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit (3yrs)

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:-

To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. Accordance with plans

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason:-

The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

INFORMATIVES

1. Approval - No negotiation required

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

OFFICER REPORT FOR REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE - 28th April 2016

APPLICATION NO. P0242.16
WARD: Romford Town **Date Received:** 18th February 2016
Expiry Date: 14th April 2016
ADDRESS: Romford Brewery Shopping Centre
Romford
PROPOSAL: Installation of a climbing play frame on the approved patio and installation of 2No.Customer Order Display(COD) and associated Canopies
DRAWING NO(S): 6563-AL-001 Rev B Location
6563-PL-004 Rev F Proposed site layout
6563-SA-8120-P002A Block Plan
COD DT Canopy
EQ001 Outdoor Climb 3x2 Renders
EQ001 Outdoor Climb 3x2 Activities
EQ001 Outdoor Climb 3x2 Views
RECOMMENDATION It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report

CALL-IN

The application has been called-in by Councillor Frederick Thompson for the following reason:-

He considers the site to be unsuitable for the children's play equipment as it would be subject to much airborne pollution from vehicular traffic. The site is next to Waterloo Road which is heavily trafficked and which frequently has extended lines of traffic with idling engines as a result of queuing traffic around the Brewery entrance. Cars picking up food from the drive through facility would add to this. There are no objections to the two information boards.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site lies on the western edge of the Brewery development adjacent to Waterloo Road. The site is currently occupied by a single storey building that accommodates an A1 unit, formerly occupied by Carphone Warehouse, and a bus drivers welfare facility that serves the bus interchange for the Brewery. Planning permission has been granted for a restaurant with drive-thru on the site. The proposed development concerns an open area to the south of the proposed restaurant building adjacent to the main exit road for the Brewery onto Waterloo Road and two locations on the proposed internal road for the drive-thru.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission has been granted for a restaurant/takeaway, including drive-thru facility, a retail unit and a new bus facility on the site. This application provides details of a children's play area on the patio area approved as part of the original application and two customer ordering points for the drive-thru.

The proposed play area would be located to the south of the proposed restaurant building adjacent

to the exit slip road from the Brewery Centre onto Waterloo Road. The two customer ordering points would be located on the north side of the proposed restaurant on the internal access road.

The play area would be an enclosed structure 3.5 metres high containing a number of pieces of play equipment. The area involved is 19.2 square metres and is designed to cater for up to 25 children in the 3-10 age range.

The two food ordering points would be located on the north side of the proposed restaurant. Display information and ordering equipment would be located on a display panel supported by a 3 metre high frame with an ellipse shaped canopy over the top. The display board would have dimensions of 0.6 metres by 1.5 metres.

A 1.1 metre high barrier with lighting columns between each 1.5 metre section is proposed along the edge of the internal road on the south side of the restaurant building. The barrier would comprise a galvanised mesh with wooden supporting columns. The lighting columns would be 1.8 metres to lamp head.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P1120.14 - Demolition of existing retail pavilion, Erection of two-storey drive-through restaurant (688sqm) in use classes A3 and A5, Erection of a stand-alone, single storey commercial building to provide 107sqm in Use Class A1 and/or A2 and/or A3, Erection of welfare building for use by bus drivers (33sqm), Erection of a stand-alone refuse and recycling storage building (15sqm) and rearrangement and reprovision of bus interchange -approved

CONSULTATIONS / REPRESENTATIONS

One letter of objection has been received raising the following concerns:

* Children should not be playing in an area where the air quality is bad as a result of dangerous emissions from traffic, including numerous idling engines queuing to access the restaurant building and exiting the Brewery site. Council policy seeks to reduce the risks associated with poor air quality which is more harmful to children. Children living near to busy roads have a much greater risk of health concerns, especially asthma.

* The four trees proposed in the original application should be replaced with other planting.

Public Protection has commented that in terms of air quality while the location of the play area is not ideal, due to the short exposure times (30 mins-60 mins) this would not result in any detrimental effects on children's health. A suggested mitigation would be to provide a 'green' screen/wall of vegetation known for their air cleaning properties. Such a screen would provide some protection and also help reduce noise.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

CP04 -	Town Centres
DC15 -	Retail and Service Development
DC52 -	Air Quality

DC61 - Urban Design
DC65 - Advertisements
ROM12 - The Brewery

OTHER

LONDON PLAN - 7.14 Improving air quality

-

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

There would be no liability for Mayoral CIL.

STAFF COMMENTS

Planning permission has been granted for the restaurant, including drive-thru takeaway facility. The approved plans show the general location of the play area and the customer ordering points. The current application seeks approval for the details of these facilities. Therefore, the development has already been considered acceptable in principle in the locations proposed.

The facilities would be ancillary to development already permitted and are considered to be appropriate for a shopping centre. They would not result in any material harm to the character and appearance of the area. There would be no impact on the amenities of residents living on the fringes of the shopping centre.

There has been one objection to the proposal on the grounds of the impact on children using the play area from the poor air quality associated with this part of the town centre. The call-in is also based upon this concern.

There are no specific policies in the LDF with regard to the impact of poor air quality on occupiers/users of proposed new development. London Plan Policy 7.14 seeks to minimise the exposure to existing poor air quality (particularly in Air Quality Management Areas), especially where likely to be used by those particularly vulnerable, such as children. This should be addressed through design solutions and use of buffer zones. All of Havering is an AQMA (Air Quality Management Area).

The guidance in the National Planning Practice Guidance is that where development would expose people to existing poor air quality this is a material planning consideration. In order to mitigate impacts the use of green infrastructure is recommended where appropriate. Under the guidance local authorities also need to be mindful of children's best interests and whether they outweigh other considerations, and the scope to mitigate potential harm. In doing so, they will want to ensure their approach is proportionate.

In this case the advice from Public Protection is that in light of the limited exposure to polluted air children would have, there would be no detrimental effect on their health. The play area would be enclosed and the provision of a 'green' screen wall of plants noted for their air cleaning properties as recommended would provide some further protection. In the light of this advice staff consider that there would be no detrimental impact on health, but that in view of the poor air quality in the area the provision of a 'green' fence/barrier should be required and would be a proportionate

approach to the issue. The fence would also help to reduce noise. It is recommended that the 'green' barrier replaces the originally proposed mesh barrier along its whole length and should be 1.5 metres high. The lighting columns could be retained between each section. Further details of this boundary treatment have been requested from the applicant and could be approved as part of a planning permission if details are received in advance of the committee meeting. Otherwise the details of the barrier could be required by condition to be submitted and implemented prior to the use of the playspace.

KEY ISSUES / CONCLUSIONS

The provision of a play area and customer ordering points have already been approved in principle through the planning permission for the restaurant and takeaway. The submitted details are considered acceptable in terms of their visual impact on the area. They would be modest in scale and appropriate to the location within the Brewery development. The enclosed play area is also judged to be acceptable in a town centre location. The impact on children using the play area is also judged to be acceptable given the limited exposure times and the enclosure of the facilities. The provision of a 'green' fence/barrier would further help to reduce the impact. The grant of planning permission is recommended accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:-

To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. SC32 (Accordance with plans)

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason:-

The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

3. Non Standard Condition 1 (Pre Commencement Condition)

Notwithstanding the barrier details shown on drawing 6563-PL-004 Rev F, the play area hereby permitted shall not be opened for use until a 'green' fence/barrier has been erected along the southern boundary of the site in the position shown for a barrier in accordance with details to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The barrier shall be a minimum of 1.5 metres high. The 'green' fence/barrier shall be retained and maintained in accordance with the approved details throughout the lifetime of the development. All planting comprised within the scheme which within a period of 5 years from completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:

To protect the users of the play area from noise and pollution in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.14 and the guidance in the National Planning Practice Guidance.

INFORMATIVES

1. **Approval following revision ENTER DETAILS**

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: In accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, improvements required to make the proposal acceptable were negotiated with Donna Smith of Planware Ltd by telephone and e-mail on 7th April 2016. The revisions concerned the installation of a 'green' barrier/fence along the southern boundary of the site.

OFFICER REPORT FOR REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE - 28th April 2016

APPLICATION NO.	P1286.15	
WARD:	Havering Park	Date Received: 30th September 2015 Expiry Date: 30th December 2015
ADDRESS:	Bower House Orange Tree Hill Havering-atte-Bower Romford	
PROPOSAL:	Demolition of existing twentieth century buildings and erection of replacement training centre facility with associated landscaping to the walled garden area along with refurbishment works to the stable block.	
DRAWING NO(S):	PL.171, PL.172, PL.173, PL.174, PL.175 PL.176, PL.182, PL.183, PL.186, PL.191 PL.192 PL.100, PL.101, PL.102, PL.105, PL.106, PL132 REV A PL.118, PL.119, PL.120, PL.121, PL.130 PL.131, PL150, PL.151, PL152, PL.153 PL.154, PL.155, PL.160, PL.161, PL.104 REV A, PL.110, PL.111, PL.112, PL.116, PL.117,	
RECOMMENDATION	It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report	

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to the grounds of Bower House, Orange Tree Hill, Havering-atte-Bower. The site comprises a Grade I listed mansion house which is located to the south of the site as well as a Grade I listed stable complex located to the rear of the main house set within spacious landscaped grounds. In addition to the listed buildings a series of mid-twentieth century buildings lie towards the north of the site set within a historic walled garden area. The grounds are accessed from the west via a driveway leading from Orange Tree Hill.

The site is currently owned by The Amana Trust, a registered UK charity whose aims are to advance the Christian faith and to educate people in relation to that faith. The Trust has occupied the buildings and grounds for educational purposes since 2005 and currently occupies the two Grade I listed buildings on the site and has also made use of the facilities added to the site during the post-war period. Prior to the occupation of the site by the Amana Trust the site was owned by the Ford Motor Company who also used the buildings for conferences and training purposes.

In terms of the Local Development Framework (LDF) land designation, the Bower House grounds are located within the Havering-atte-Bower Conservation Area and the Havering Ridge Area of Special Character. The site is also located within the Metropolitan Green Belt and a Archaeological Priority Area.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The application is seeking planning permission for the demolition of the existing twentieth century buildings and the erection of a replacement training centre facility with associated landscaping to the walled garden area along with refurbishment works to the Grade I listed stable block.

A separate listed building consent application (L0008.15) has also been submitted in relation to the works to the stable block and chapel.

The proposed development would involve the demolition of the former Ford training centre and dormitory buildings that were originally constructed in the 1960's and are located to the rear of the main Bower House. Under the proposals these buildings would be replaced with a new purpose built training centre, including classrooms, a kitchen and a dining room.

The proposed training centre would be built into the sloping land gradient within the historic walled garden area, creating a partially subterranean building comprising two main levels. The two storey element of the building would be approximately 8 metres in width and 40 metres in depth, with a height of 8.6 metres, when viewed from the newly laid out courtyard area to the rear of the stable block.

The width of the lower level of the building would be wider than the upper level at 23 metres. The eastern flank elevation would be positioned in line with the rear elevation of the listed stable building. The lower level would be accessed from the new courtyard and would include four classrooms, a kitchen and storage areas as well as a refuse store.

The upper floor of the proposed training centre would comprise an open communal dining area and servery. To the west the elements of the side elevation located above ground would be formed of a reinstated section of the original walled garden. The sections of the new wall adjacent to the dinning area would be punctured with a lightweight glazed building leading out to an open patio area which overlooks a pond. To the east the dining room elevation would be formed of full length glazing panels which would lead out onto a landscaped roof garden, set out on the area above the lower level classrooms. The roof garden would then merge into the higher ground level of the rear walled garden area, which would also be comprehensively re-landscaped.

As part of the removal of the post-war twentieth buildings, the Grade I listed stable block and chapel would be refurbished internally and the fenestration restored and repaired. A blocked up window opening in the southern elevation of the stable block would be reinstated and modern fire escapee ladder and air conditioning units would be removed from the north elevation. A new glazed lobby link would be constructed between the stable block and chapel.

According to the supporting statement the proposed training centre would provide more fitting facilities for the Trust in order to enable them to expand their current teaching activities and accommodate a wider range of short and long term training programmes. Currently there are up to 90 students on site at any one time (comprising 45 temporary one week students and 45 full time students), but the Trust has set out its intentions to eventually achieve around 300 students on site, with a mix of part time and full time students, with the focus on residential training.

It is intended that the majority of students would arrive at the facility by either public transport or

dedicated shuttle bus and then remain at the centre during their stay. The proposed development would retain the existing on site car parking arrangements which provide a capacity of 62no. parking spaces, plus 2no. accessible spaces. An additional 10no. cycle storage spaces would also be provided.

RELEVANT HISTORY

230/48 Conversion of stables - Approved

188/50 Conversion of garage - Approved

405/57 Extension to test room - Approved

486/59 Building for trainees (sales and servicing centre) - Approved

1037/66 20 Bedroom annexe, showroom & external work in garden - Approved

342/67 Bedroom annexe - Approved

1948/70 External toilet extension - Approved

1382/83 Car park extension - Approved 7/3/84

L0008.15 - Refurbishment works to the stable block, including; removal of external fire escape stair, removal of externally mounted air conditioning units, reinstatement of original window openings, replacement of non-original windows with new timber sash windows and internal modifications.

Awaiting Decision

P1591.14 - Widen the access (drive entrance) to Bower House from 4 metres to 6 metres with associated landscaping.

Apprv with cons 10-04-2015

L0018.14 - Listed Building Consent to widen the access (drive entrance) to Bower House from 4 metres to 6 metres with associated landscaping.

Apprv with cons 10-04-2015

L0013.08 - Listed building consent for repairs to and redecoration of existing windows and doors. Repointing to window and door reveals where defective only

Apprv with cons 16-12-2008

P0950.02 - Alterations to car parking setting out and landscape works

Apprv with cons 23-08-2002

L0006.02 - Alterations to car parking and landscaping works

Apprv with cons 23-08-2002

L0003.02 - Alterations to car parking and landscaping works

Refuse 25-04-2002

P0395.02 - Alterations to car parking setting out and landscape works

Refuse 25-04-2002

P0075.02 - Part demolition, alteration and extension of training and graduate assessment centre

Apprv with cons 01-05-2003

- L0001.02 - Part demolition, alteration and extension of training and graduate assessment centre
Apprv with cons 01-05-2003
- L0009.01 - Change of layout for the existing WC accommodation within the stable building
Apprv with cons 15-11-2001
- L0004.99 - Reinstatement of entrance door, construction of partitions, formation of internal opening at existing hatch, enlargement of existing door opening and introduction of new ceiling to conceal services
Apprv with cons 19-10-1999
- L0005.98 - Internal alterations
Apprv with cons 05-02-1999
- L0009.94 - Listed Building application for strengthening of east wing replacement of dormer windows upgrading fire resistance internally
Apprv with cons 01-03-1995
- L0005.90 - Listed building consent for de molition of external bund wall to oil storage tank and sundry minor works of making good. (Retrospective application). Additional information received 11/12/90.
Apprv with cons 10-12-1991

CONSULTATIONS / REPRESENTATIONS

the application has been advertised by way of site notice and press advert. Notification letters were sent to 19 neighbouring occupiers and no representations have been received.

The following internal and external consultation responses have been received:

Historic England - no objection, subject to a condition in relation to the submission of sample panels for all new facing brickwork and repairs.

Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) - the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of an archaeological interest.

Greater London Authority (GLA) - no objection, the proposal does not raise any strategic planning issues.

Place Services Conservation Consultants - no objection, subject to a series of conditions in relation to external materials, landscaping and the specifications for repair work to the windows of the listed stable block.

Local Highway Authority - no objection, recommended a condition in relation to vehicle cleaning during construction.

Environmental Health - no objection in terms of both land contamination and air quality and have recommended a condition in relation to noise levels.

Lead Local Flood Authority - no objection, the drainage proposals are very good and acceptable with the decrease in runoff rate and an increased storage utilising natural retention.

Secured by Design Officer - no objection.

Energy and Sustainability Officer - the information provided with the application meets both Havering and London Plan standards.

London Fire Brigade Water Team - no objection.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

CP14 -	Green Belt
CP17 -	Design
CP18 -	Heritage
DC29 -	Educational Premises
DC32 -	The Road Network
DC33 -	Car Parking
DC34 -	Walking
DC35 -	Cycling
DC36 -	Servicing
DC45 -	Appropriate Development in the Green Belt
DC55 -	Noise
DC61 -	Urban Design
DC67 -	Buildings of Heritage Interest
DC68 -	Conservation Areas
DC69 -	Other Areas of Special Townscape or Landscape Character
SPD02 -	Heritage SPD

OTHER

LONDON PLAN - 3.18	Education facilities
-	
LONDON PLAN - 5.13	Sustainable drainage
-	
LONDON PLAN - 6.10	Walking
-	
LONDON PLAN - 6.13	Parking
-	
LONDON PLAN - 6.5 -	Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport
LONDON PLAN - 6.9 -	Cycling
LONDON PLAN - 7.16	Green Belt
-	
LONDON PLAN - 7.4 -	Local character
LONDON PLAN - 7.8 -	Heritage assets and archaeology
NPPF -	National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed development would create 468.2 square metres of new gross internal non-residential floorspace. Therefore the proposal is liable for Mayoral CIL and will incur a charge of £9364.00 (subject to indexation) based on the calculation of £20.00 per square metre.

STAFF COMMENTS

The main considerations in this case relate to the following key issues:

- The principle of the development, including the impact on the Green Belt; the visual impact of the development on the character and openness of the Green Belt and the general landscape.
- The impact on the Grade I listed heritage assets; including the historic fabric of the stable block, as well as the setting of Bower House and stable block.
- The impact on the special character and appearance of the Havering-atte-Bower Conservation Area.
- The impact on the amenity of adjoining residential occupiers and the highways/parking implications.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The applicant, the Amana Trust, have occupied the buildings and grounds for educational purposes since 2005 and currently utilise the two Grade I listed buildings on the site and has also made use of the facilities added to the site during the post-war period. Prior to the occupation of the site by the Amana Trust the site was owned by the Ford Motor Company who also used the buildings for conferences and training purposes and therefore no planning permission is required for a change of use.

The application site is designated as being within the Metropolitan Green Belt where Government guidance and local planning policy encourages specified uses which have a positive role in fulfilling Green Belt objectives. New buildings in the Green Belt are regarded as inappropriate unless, amongst other things, the following exemptions apply:

- the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

In coming to a conclusion on the acceptability of the principle of the development, Members are advised that the above criteria is considered in more detail in the following 'Green Belt Implications' section.

GREEN BELT IMPLICATIONS

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) attaches great weight to Green Belts in preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. In addition the NPPF sets out five purposes of the Green Belt, which includes to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. As with previous Green Belt policy, the NPPF advises that inappropriate development is by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

The NPPF sets out forms of development that are deemed to be appropriate within the Green Belt and states that construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate development. A given exception to this is that in the instance of a replacement building, the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.

The proposed new training centre would have a volume of 6,014 square metres which represents over an 80% increase in comparison to the volume of the existing complex of mid-twentieth century buildings that would be demolished. However, in order to mitigate the additional scale and amount of the new building a significant proportion would be built into the sloping ground level. This would effectively create a partially subterranean building. Taking into account the volume of the sections of the building that would be below ground, the volume of the exposed elements of the new training centre would be 2691 cubic metres, which would represent over a 20% reduction of the amount of visible building in comparison to the existing buildings within the walled garden.

The NPPF also provides that the partial or complete redevelopment of a previously developed site is acceptable in principle where it would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it. This is judged to be a previously developed site and this exception is therefore judged relevant.

Staff are of the view that whilst the new building would be larger in terms of gross volume, the innovative partially subterranean design would on balance result in a reduction in the visible built development within the walled garden area. The overall footprint of the new training centre would also be smaller than that of the existing buildings, consolidating the built development to the north west corner of the walled garden.

In order for the development to be considered appropriate development, the openness of the Green Belt must be preserved. In terms of the impact on the openness, the western sections of the walled garden area are currently dominated by the mid-twentieth century buildings and hard surfacing that sprawls out from the rear of the listed stable block building. When viewed from the southern sections of the site the buildings create a significant sense of enclosure, appearing obtrusive and over-intensive and fail to integrate satisfactorily within the countryside setting.

Whilst the proposed training centre would be taller than the existing buildings, the first floor level would be integrated into a section of reinstated historic walled garden, with western sections of the wall sympathetically rebuilt in the original position and height. The upper floor elements of the new building would comprise a lightweight modern glazed design which would serve to condense the overall scale and bulk of the new structure, allowing the building to sit unobtrusively within this setting, particularly from key views to the west including the main driveway entrance into the site.

The new training centre would be set back from the rear of the listed stable block and chapel buildings creating a new open courtyard area which would introduce a clear separation between the new and existing historic buildings. It is considered that this measure would deliver a new sense of openness and spaciousness within this section of the walled garden by opening up new unobstructed views from east to west across the walled garden enclosure. Therefore Staff are of the view that the proposal would serve to improve the degree of openness within the walled garden setting in accordance with the intentions of the NPPF.

Whilst the impact of the development on openness is essentially a matter of judgement, Members may therefore wish to consider that the development would provide a well designed, proportionate replacement building that is not materially larger in terms of its appearance and setting, and that crucially it would create an improved sense of openness within the walled garden area of the site. As such, Staff consider the proposal to be in accordance with the Green Belt objectives of the NPPF.

CONSERVATION AREA

The Bower House grounds are located in the Havering-atte-Bower Conservation Area and as such, the general consideration is whether new development would preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the area.

According to the Conservation Area Character Appraisal the Havering-atte-Bower Conservation Area's spatial qualities are determined by its ridge-top location and the visual dominance of the green. The Conservation Area includes extensive areas of open land south of Broxhill Road and to the east of Bower House, bounded by Bower Wood.

The Heritage SPD states that demolition should only be considered where the building fails to make a positive contribution to the character and historic significance of the Conservation Area. Replacement buildings will be expected to be high quality buildings which make a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. New buildings should respect the important characteristics of the Conservation Area. It is important that high quality materials are used in order to provide a building that complements the quality of the existing architecture.

The NPPF states that local authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal. In determining proposals, local planning authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities, and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

The existing mid-twentieth century buildings located within the walled garden are unsympathetic to the adjacent listed buildings in terms of design, scale, appearance and setting and as such are considered to contribute negatively to the conservation area. As such the removal of these buildings would not detract from the character of the conservation area.

The proposed new training centre building would comprise a high quality light-weight modern design and elements of the building would be subterranean, reducing the overall scale of the structure. In contrast to the existing buildings it is considered that the replacement training centre would sit comfortably within the walled garden setting and would be sympathetic in terms of its

height, massing and setting. In addition the proposed green roof above the lower section of the building would complement the setting, and would flow elegantly from the original level of the garden as opposed to a hard landscaped roof terrace.

As part of the redevelopment scheme the walled garden would be comprehensively re-landscaped. This aspect of the development would remove an unsympathetic 1960's service road and expanse of hard standing which runs through the centre of the walled garden enclosure. The proposed re-landscaping scheme would return a significant proportion of the walled enclosure back to an attractive garden. As such Staff are of the view that the proposal in this regard would enhance the special character and appearance of the conservation area.

Therefore, it is considered that the demolition of the post-war buildings would enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The design of the proposed development would result in a significant improvement on the in situ buildings it would replace. Staff are satisfied that no harm to the heritage asset would result. Rather the proposals have the potential to enhance the significance of the heritage asset, by removing existing unsympathetic development, the construction of well-designed buildings and the opportunity to better secure the continued use of the listed buildings within the site. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with the NPPF in this regard.

In addition to the Conservation Area designation the site and surrounding area forms part of the Havering Ridge Area of Special Character. Havering Ridge was recognised by the former London Planning Advisory Committee as an Area of Special Character because of its skyline character and the panoramic views it affords of Central London. It has also been identified by Historic England as an Area of Heritage Land for its combined intrinsic value for landscape, historic and nature conservation interest. Any proposals which come forward for new buildings on the site should have regard to the special character of the area and demonstrate that they would not have adverse impact on either the skyline or views.

Staff are of the view that the high quality light-weight modern design and subterranean sections of the building would ensure that the new building would not form an unduly tall, obtrusive or disproportionate addition to the skyline or unduly harm the special landscape character in this area.

LISTED BUILDING

Bower House is a Palladian mansion, which was built in 1729 for John Baynes, with grounds laid out by Charles Bridgeman, incorporating some fabric from the former royal palace. It was the architect Henry Flitcroft's first commission. There is a surviving ice house and pond in the grounds, built as a later addition to Bower House. In context, the stable block, chapel and walled garden form part of the development of the grade I listed Bower House and are contemporary with Bower House.

While the application does not directly affect the historic fabric or character of Bower House, the proposed development affects its setting. The main impact of the proposed redevelopment would be on the walled garden and the Grade I listed stable block and chapel.

In 1946 the Bower House site was purchased by the Ilford Film Company for low impact

commercial activities. It was during their ownership that the stable block was reconfigured, resulting in the widespread loss of historic fabric, including the removal and replacement of the staircase. The Ilford Film Company also linked the stable block and Chapel together with an external addition, and constructed an addition to the Chapel's west elevation, which now forms the bookshop. Although the date of the work is not known, the stable block was listed Grade I in 1952, as was Bower House.

The historical context and use of the Chapel is unknown, it seems the name was given due to the building's Gothic fenestration.

In 1960 the site was purchased by the Ford Motor Company for the provision of a training centre. In the early 1960s, Ford obtained planning permission to construct a group of buildings in the walled garden to accommodate their training facilities for automotive engineering and sales. The complex included classrooms and a purpose built car showroom. It is probable that Ford carried out internal works to the stable block to facilitate their use requirements. The facility links to the stable block via a wide corridor which leads to the classrooms and former car showroom.

The 2010 Conservation Statement identifies that the Ford additions were to be constructed so that they did not impact on the view and with the use of materials sympathetic to the listed buildings. In order to mitigate the impact on the view the ground level was reduced and the buildings were constructed with steel frames, a low pitch roof clad with metal sheeting, and the external envelope was cased in red brick, with metal profiled sheets similar to the roof, to the eaves of the building. The roof material and metal cladding to the eaves are probably post construction as they are similar in style to late 20th century Ford dealerships. The buildings are surrounded by extensive tarmac to accommodate the access of motor vehicles serving the Ford training facility. Also, the south and west walls of the walled garden were removed, for reasons unknown, but possibly due to the close proximity to the new buildings and associated excavation works.

The removal of the post-war buildings and tarmac surface to the walled garden is welcomed as these features do not preserve the character or setting of the stable block or the conservation area. The proposed development would also remove the permanent large marquee situated in the walled garden. The current cumulative impact from the post-war buildings, marquee and landscape on the character and setting of the listed stable block and walled garden is regarded as harmful.

The proposed repair works to the stable block's windows, some of which are historic, and the reinsertion of fenestration to openings which were probably infilled in the 20th century would significantly contribute to enhancing the character and appearance of the stable block, and therefore are welcome improvements. Likewise, the removal of the fire escape and external air conditioning units would also contribute to enhancing the character and appearance of the listed building. However, it is considered that the proposed works to the building's fenestration need more detail in terms of repair methods and details of new windows, and as such would be managed through relevant conditions.

The proposed scheme also demolishes the link between the stable block and the Chapel and includes the insertion of a new glazed link, which would improve the relationship between new and historic fabric. It is intended that sample details of this section of the new development would be

conditioned so that its appearance, materials and structural fixing to the listed building are acceptable, and appropriate for the listed building.

The scheme also seeks to carry out investigative work to the Chapel in order to guide future works. Details of this work would be provided via condition requiring full details of any proposed work following the investigation and would be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of work.

Replacing the western section of garden wall would reinstate the historic boundary and the context of the walled garden. The full details of the bricks and mortar would also be reserved by condition.

The proposed new training building would be located to the northwest corner of the walled garden.

The location for the proposed new building is considered to be acceptable as it is located in an area which has been significantly impacted on from by the post-war development. The scheme uses the reconstructed west wall of the garden as a part of the developments external wall which allows the new training facility to be as close as possible to the boundary of the walled garden, therefore freeing open space within the garden enclosure.

Staff have obtained specialist heritage advice to assess the application. Whilst the proposals are generally supported, some concerns have been raised in relation to the palette of materials proposed, which would include flint, red brick, timber, Cotswold Stone and glazing. The variety of materials, so diverse in texture, are considered potentially to have an adverse effect, making the development prominent and dominant in the landscape rather than subservient to the listed buildings. Specialist advice received is that the use of red brick to the south elevation would be more acceptable as opposed to the brick, timber and flint. The applicant is aware of these observations and it is considered that it would be appropriate to deal with the matter of external materials through condition.

Staff are of the view that the proposed green roof would complement the setting of the listed buildings and would flow elegantly from the original level of the garden as opposed to a hard landscaped roof terrace.

To the west elevation of the rebuilt garden wall it is proposed to construct a glazed building which punctures the rebuilt wall. Access from this element would lead to an open patio area which overlooks the adjacent pond. The glazed structure would add natural daylight into the first floor dining area. Given that this element of the building would comprise a lightweight frame and the extensive use of glazing it is not considered that this aspect of the development would unduly harm the setting of the designated heritage assets.

Historic England have been consulted on the proposals and have requested further details during the consultation process. Historic England have advised that they have no objection to the proposals subject to conditions and no contrary direction from the Secretary of State.

Overall, it is not considered that the proposal would adversely affect the Grade I listed buildings in accordance with policy DC67 and the Heritage SPD.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

The proposed development would be set well within the mature grounds of Bower House and more than 175 metres from the nearest residential properties located on the west of the site on the opposite side of Orange Tree Hill. Given the distance and that the proposal would not be visible from outside of the site, it is not considered that the proposed scheme would result in any undue impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents in accordance with policy DC61.

HIGHWAY / PARKING

The proposed development would retain the existing on site car parking arrangements and would provide a capacity of 62no. parking spaces, plus 2no. accessible spaces. An additional 10no. cycle storage spaces would also be provided.

According to the supporting statement the proposed training centre would provide more fitting facilities for the Trust in order to enable them to expand their current teaching activities and accommodate a wider range of short and long term training programmes.

Currently there are up to 90 students on site at any one time (comprising 45 temporary one week students and 45 full time students), but the Trust has set out its intentions to eventually achieve around 300 students on site, with a mix of part time and full time students. With the focus on residential training, the Trust contend that this would not result in a significant increase in traffic or parking as most students would arrive at the facility by either public transport or shuttle bus and then remain at the centre during their stay.

The Local Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposal and it is considered that the current car parking and access arrangements are satisfactory for the proposed use.

ARCHAEOLOGY

The site is located within an Archaeological Priority Area. The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) have provided a consultation response stating that the proposed development is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest. As such Staff are advised that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of the impact on any potential archaeological remains.

KEY ISSUES / CONCLUSIONS

Having regard to all relevant factors and material planning considerations Staff are of the view that this proposal would be acceptable.

Staff consider that the proposed development raises considerations in relation to the principle of the development, including the impact on the Green Belt; the visual impact of the development on the character and openness of the Green Belt and the general landscape. It also raises considerations with regard to the impact on the Grade I listed heritage assets; including the historic fabric of the stable block, as well as the setting of Bower House and stable block as well as the impact on the special character and appearance of the Havering-atte-Bower Conservation Area.

Staff are of the view that elements of the development would not be disproportionate, visually intrusive or have a harmful impact on the open character of the Green Belt. Staff are also of the

view that the proposal would not adversely affect the Grade I listed buildings or Havering-atte-Bower Conservation Area.

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in all other respects and it is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:-

To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. SC32 (Accordance with plans)

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason:-

The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

3. Joint Implementation

The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in association with the works permitted by Listed Building Consent reference L0008.15.

Reason:-

To ensure that the full range of benefits to this Grade I Listed Building are secured, in the interests of its integrity and setting.

4. SC71 (Listed Building - making good)

All new work and works of making good to the retained fabric whether internal or external shall be finished to match the existing original work with regard to the methods used and to material, colour, texture and profile and in the case of brickwork facebond and pointing.

Reason:-

To preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting, and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC67.

5. SC09 (Materials) (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until samples of all materials to be used in the external construction of the building are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the development shall be constructed with the approved materials.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the materials to be used. Submission of samples prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding Conservation Area and preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting and comply with Policies DC61, DC67 & 69 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document..

6. New Window Details (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until details of the proposed new windows to be used in the stable block, by section and elevation, at scales of between 1:20 and 1:1 as appropriate, are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the materials to be used. Submission of samples prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting and comply with Policy DC67 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

7. Plans for Link Building (Pre Commencement Condition)

Notwithstanding the approved drawings, the development shall not be carried out until additional drawings of the proposed new link structure between the stable block and Chapel, in section and elevation, at scales between 1:2 and 1:20 as appropriate, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the link structure and the materials to be used. Submission of the additional plans and details prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting and comply with Policy DC67 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

8. Chapel Investigation Works (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until details of the investigation works to the chapel, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the scope and extent of the method to be used. Submission of details prior to commencement will ensure that the investigation works help to preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting and comply with Policy DC67 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

9. Surfacing Materials (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until samples of all materials to be used in the external surfacing as part of the landscaping works, are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the development shall be constructed with the approved materials.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the materials to be used. Submission of samples prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the

surrounding Conservation Area and preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting and comply with Policies DC61, DC67 & 69 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

10. Specification for Stable Block (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until details of specification detailing the repair work to the existing windows and door to the stable block, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the scope and extent of the method to be used. Submission of details prior to commencement will ensure that the investigation works help to preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting and comply with Policy DC67 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

11. Brickwork Sample Board (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to the proposed teaching facility, until a sample panel of brickwork showing the brick bond, mortar and pointing profile has been built on site for approval by the Local Planning Authority prior to the construction of the teaching facility, which shall be constructed in accordance with this panel. The panel shall be retained for the duration of the construction to allow comparison.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the materials to be used. Submission of samples prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding Conservation Area and preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Buildings and its setting and comply with Policies DC61, DC67 & 69 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

12. Brickwork Sample Board - Wall (Pre Commencement Condition)

Prior to commencement of construction of the west garden wall, a sample panel of brickwork minimum size 900 x 900mm to show brick bond, mortar and pointing profile shall be built on site, approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and retained on site until the end of the contract, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved panel.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the materials to be used. Submission of samples prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding Conservation Area and preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Buildings and its setting and comply with Policies DC61, DC67 & 69 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

13. Details of Glazed Structure (Pre Commencement Condition)

The proposed new glazed structure adjacent to the proposed dining hall, shall be constructed in accordance with the details in Drawing No: PL.193.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the glazed structure and the materials to be used. Submission of the additional plans and details prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Buildings and its setting and comply with Policy DC67 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

14. SC11 (Landscaping) (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and shrubs on the site, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for the protection in the course of development. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised within the scheme shall be carried out in the first planting season following completion of the development and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the hard and soft landscaping proposed. Submission of a scheme prior to commencement will ensure that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61. It will also ensure accordance with Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

15. SC57 Wheel washing (Pre Commencement)

Before the development hereby permitted is first commenced, vehicle cleansing facilities to prevent mud being deposited onto the public highway during construction works shall be provided on site in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved facilities shall be retained thereafter and used at relevant entrances to the site throughout the duration of construction works. If mud or other debris originating from the site is deposited in the public highway, all on-site operations shall cease until it has been removed.

The submission will provide;

- a) A plan showing where vehicles will be parked within the site to be inspected for mud and debris and cleaned if required. The plan should show where construction traffic will access and exit the site from the public highway.
- b) A description of how the parking area will be surfaced, drained and cleaned to prevent mud, debris and muddy water being tracked onto the public highway;
- c) A description of how vehicles will be checked before leaving the site - this applies to the vehicle wheels, the underside of vehicles, mud flaps and wheel arches.
- d) A description of how vehicles will be cleaned.
- e) A description of how dirty/ muddy water be dealt with after being washing off the vehicles.
- f) A description of any contingency plan to be used in the event of a break-down of the wheel washing arrangements.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application in relation to wheel washing facilities. Submission of details prior to commencement will ensure that the facilities provided prevent materials from the site being deposited on the adjoining public highway, in the interests of highway safety and the amenity of the surrounding area. It will also ensure that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policies DC32 and DC61.

16. SC63 (Construction Methodology) (Pre Commencement)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until a Construction Method Statement to control the adverse impact of the development on the amenity of the public and nearby occupiers is submitted to and approved in writing by the

Local Planning Authority. The Construction Method statement shall include details of:

- a) parking of vehicles of site personnel and visitors;
- b) storage of plant and materials;
- c) dust management controls;
- d) measures for minimising the impact of noise and ,if appropriate, vibration arising from construction activities;
- e) predicted noise and, if appropriate, vibration levels for construction using methodologies and at points agreed with the Local Planning Authority;
- f) scheme for monitoring noise and if appropriate, vibration levels using methodologies and at points agreed with the Local Planning Authorities;
- g) siting and design of temporary buildings;
- h) scheme for security fencing/hoardings, depicting a readily visible 24-hour contact number for queries or emergencies;
- i) details of disposal of waste arising from the construction programme, including final disposal points. The burning of waste on the site at any time is specifically precluded.

And the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and statement.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application in relation to the proposed construction methodology. Submission of details prior to commencement will ensure that the method of construction protects residential amenity. It will also ensure that the development accords the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

17. SC58 (Refuse and recycling)

No building shall be occupied or use commenced until refuse and recycling facilities are provided in accordance with details which shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The refuse and recycling facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge how refuse and recycling will be managed on site. Submission of this detail prior to occupation in the case of new building works or prior to the use commencing in the case of changes of use will protect the amenity of occupiers of the development and also the locality generally and ensure that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

18. SC59 (Cycle Storage)

No building shall be occupied or use commenced until cycle storage is provided in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle storage shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to demonstrate what facilities will be available for cycle parking. Submission of this detail prior to occupation in the case of new building works or prior to the use commencing in the case of changes of use is in the interests of providing a wide range of facilities for non-motor car residents and sustainability.

19. SC62 (Hours of construction)

All building operations in connection with the construction of external walls, roof, and foundations; site excavation or other external site works; works involving the use of plant or machinery; the erection of scaffolding; the delivery of materials; the removal of materials and spoil from the site, and the playing of amplified music shall only take place between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00am and 1.00pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays/Public Holidays.

Reason:-

To protect residential amenity, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

INFORMATIVES

1. **Approval and CIL (enter amount)**

The proposal is liable for the Mayor of London Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Based upon the information supplied with the application, the CIL payable would be £9,364.00 (this figure may go up or down, subject to indexation). CIL is payable within 60 days of commencement of development. A Liability Notice will be sent to the applicant (or anyone else who has assumed liability) shortly and you are required to notify the Council of the commencement of the development before works begin. Further details with regard to CIL are available from the Council's website.

2. **Approval - No negotiation required**

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

OFFICER REPORT FOR REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE - 28th April 2016

APPLICATION NO. L0008.15
WARD: Havering Park **Date Received:** 30th September 2015
Expiry Date: 25th November 2015
ADDRESS: Bower House
Orange Tree Hill
Havering-atte-Bower
Romford
PROPOSAL: Refurbishment works to the stable block, including; removal of external fire escape stair, removal of externally mounted air conditioning units, reinstatement of original window openings, replacement of non-original windows with new timber sash windows and internal modifications.
DRAWING NO(S): PL100
PL101
PL102
PL104 Rev. A
PL105
PL106
PL110
PL111
PL112
PL116
PL117
PL118
PL119
PL120
PL121
PL130
PL131
PL132 Rev. A
PL150
PL151
PL152
PL153
PL154
PL155
PL160
PL161

RECOMMENDATION Approval subject to no contrary direction from the Secretary of State

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to the grounds of Bower House, Orange Tree Hill, Havering-atte-Bower. The site comprises a Grade I listed mansion house which is located to the south of the site as well as a Grade I listed stable complex located to the rear of the main house set within spacious

landscaped grounds. In addition to the listed buildings a series of mid-twentieth century buildings lie towards the north of the site set within a historic walled garden area. The grounds are accessed from the west via a driveway leading from Orange Tree Hill.

The site is currently owned by The Amana Trust, a registered UK charity whose aims are to advance the Christian faith and to educate people in relation to that faith. The Trust has occupied the buildings and grounds for educational purposes since 2005 and currently occupies the two Grade I listed buildings on the site and has also made use of the facilities added to the site during the post-war period. Prior to the occupation of the site by the Amana Trust the site was owned by the Ford Motor Company who also used the buildings for conferences and training purposes.

In terms of the Local Development Framework (LDF) land designation, the Bower House grounds are located within the Havering-atte-Bower Conservation Area and the Havering Ridge Area of Special Character. The site is also located within the Metropolitan Green Belt and a Archaeological Priority Area.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The application is seeking listed building consent for the refurbishment works to the stable block, including; removal of external fire escape stair, removal of externally mounted air conditioning units, reinstatement of original window openings, replacement of non-original windows with new timber sash windows and internal modifications.

The wider development would involve the demolition of the former Ford training centre and dormitory buildings that were originally constructed in the 1960's and are located to the rear of the main Bower House. Under the proposals these buildings would be replaced with a new purpose built training centre, including classrooms, a kitchen and a dining room, which is being considered under planning application P1286.15.

As part of the removal of the post-war twentieth buildings, the Grade I listed stable block and chapel would be refurbished internally and the fenestration restored and repaired. A blocked up window opening in the southern elevation of the stable block would be reinstated and modern fire escapee ladder and air conditioning units would be removed from the north elevation. A new glazed lobby link would be constructed between the stable block and chapel.

RELEVANT HISTORY

230/48 Conversion of stables - Approved

188/50 Conversion of garage - Approved

405/57 Extension to test room - Approved

486/59 Building for trainees (sales and servicing centre) - Approved

1037/66 20 Bedroom annexe, showroom & external work in garden - Approved

342/67 Bedroom annexe - Approved

1948/70 External toilet extension - Approved

1382/83 Car park extension - Approved 7/3/84

P1286.15 - Demolition of existing twentieth century buildings and erection of replacement training centre facility with associated landscaping to the walled garden area along with refurbishment works to the stable block.

Awaiting Decision

P1591.14 - Widen the access (drive entrance) to Bower House from 4 metres to 6 metres with associated landscaping.

Apprv with cons 10-04-2015

L0018.14 - Listed Building Consent to widen the access (drive entrance) to Bower House from 4 metres to 6 metres with associated landscaping.

Apprv with cons 10-04-2015

L0013.08 - Listed building consent for repairs to and redecoration of existing windows and doors. Repointing to window and door reveals where defective only

Apprv with cons 16-12-2008

P0950.02 - Alterations to car parking setting out and landscape works

Apprv with cons 23-08-2002

L0006.02 - Alterations to car parking and landscaping works

Apprv with cons 23-08-2002

L0003.02 - Alterations to car parking and landscaping works

Refuse 25-04-2002

P0395.02 - Alterations to car parking setting out and landscape works

Refuse 25-04-2002

P0075.02 - Part demolition, alteration and extension of training and graduate assessment centre

Apprv with cons 01-05-2003

L0001.02 - Part demolition, alteration and extension of training and graduate assessment centre

Apprv with cons 01-05-2003

L0009.01 - Change of layout for the existing WC accommodation within the stable building

Apprv with cons 15-11-2001

L0004.99 - Reinstatement of entrance door, construction of partitions, formation of internal opening at existing hatch, enlargement of existing door opening and introduction of new ceiling to conceal services

Apprv with cons 19-10-1999

L0005.98 - Internal alterations

Apprv with cons 05-02-1999

L0009.94 - Listed Building application for strengthening of east wing replacement of dormer windows upgrading fire resistance internally

Apprv with cons 01-03-1995

L0005.90 - Listed building consent for de molition of external bund wall to oil storage tank and sundry minor works of making good. (Retrospective application). Additional information received 11/12/90.

Apprv with cons 10-12-1991

CONSULTATIONS / REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been advertised on site and in the local press. Notification letters were sent to 19 neighbouring occupiers and no representations have been received.

The following internal and external consultation responses have been received:

Historic England - no objection to the proposed scheme subject to no contrary direction from the Secretary of State, and subject to a condition in relation to the submission of sample panels for all new facing brickwork and repairs and no direction of referral to the Secretary of State.

Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) - the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of an archaeological interest.

Greater London Authority (GLA) - no objection, the proposal does not raise any strategic planning issues.

Place Services Conservation Consultants - no objection, subject to a series of conditions in relation to external materials, landscaping and the specifications for repair work to the windows of the listed stable block.

Local Highway Authority - no objection, recommended a condition in relation to vehicle cleaning during construction.

Environmental Health - no objection in terms of both land contamination and air quality.

Secured by Design Officer - no objection.

London Fire Brigade Water Team - no objection.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

CP14 -	Green Belt
CP17 -	Design
CP18 -	Heritage
DC29 -	Educational Premises
DC32 -	The Road Network
DC33 -	Car Parking
DC34 -	Walking
DC35 -	Cycling
DC36 -	Servicing
DC45 -	Appropriate Development in the Green Belt
DC55 -	Noise
DC61 -	Urban Design
DC67 -	Buildings of Heritage Interest
DC68 -	Conservation Areas
DC69 -	Other Areas of Special Townscape or Landscape Character
SPD02 -	Heritage SPD

OTHER

LONDON PLAN - 3.18 Education facilities

-

LONDON PLAN - 5.13 Sustainable drainage

-

LONDON PLAN - 6.10 Walking

-

LONDON PLAN - 6.13 Parking

-

LONDON PLAN - 6.9 - Cycling

LONDON PLAN - 7.16 Green Belt

-

LONDON PLAN - 7.4 - Local character

LONDON PLAN - 7.8 - Heritage assets and archaeology

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

There are no Mayoral CIL implications relating to this listed building consent application.

STAFF COMMENTS

The main considerations in this case relate to the following key issues:

- The impact on the Grade I listed heritage assets; including the historic fabric of the stable block, as well as the setting of Bower House and stable block.

LISTED BUILDING

Bower House is a Palladian mansion, which was built in 1729 for John Baynes, with grounds laid out by Charles Bridgeman, incorporating some fabric from the former royal palace. It was the architect Henry Flitcroft's first commission. There is a surviving ice house and pond in the grounds, built as a later addition to Bower House. In context, the stable block, chapel and walled garden form part of the development of the grade I listed Bower House and are contemporary with Bower House.

While the application does not directly affect the historic fabric or character of Bower House, the proposed development affects its setting. The main impact of the proposed redevelopment would be on the walled garden and the Grade I listed stable block and chapel.

In 1946 the Bower House site was purchased by the Ilford Film Company for low impact commercial activities. It was during their ownership that the stable block was reconfigured, resulting in the widespread loss of historic fabric, including the removal and replacement of the staircase. The Ilford Film Company also linked the stable block and Chapel together with an external addition, and constructed an addition to the Chapel's west elevation, which now forms the bookshop. Although the date of the work is not known, the stable block was listed Grade I in 1952, as was Bower House.

The historical context and use of the Chapel is unknown, it seems the name was given due to the building's Gothic fenestration.

In 1960 the site was purchased by the Ford Motor Company for the provision of a training centre. In the early 1960s, Ford obtained planning permission to construct a group of buildings in the walled garden to accommodate their training facilities for automotive engineering and sales. The complex included classrooms and a purpose built car showroom. It is probable that Ford carried out internal works to the stable block to facilitate their use requirements. The facility links to the stable block via a wide corridor which leads to the classrooms and former car showroom.

The 2010 Conservation Statement identifies that the Ford additions were to be constructed so that they did not impact on the view and with the use of materials sympathetic to the listed buildings. In order to mitigate the impact on the view the ground level was reduced and the buildings were constructed with steel frames, a low pitch roof clad with metal sheeting, and the external envelope was cased in red brick, with metal profiled sheets similar to the roof, to the eaves of the building. The roof material and metal cladding to the eaves are probably post construction as they are similar in style to late 20th century Ford dealerships. The buildings are surrounded by extensive tarmac to accommodate the access of motor vehicles serving the Ford training facility. Also, the south and west walls of the walled garden were removed, for reasons unknown, but possibly due to the close proximity to the new buildings and associated excavation works.

The removal of the post-war buildings and tarmac surface to the walled garden is welcomed as these features do not preserve the character or setting of the stable block or the conservation area. The proposed development would also remove the permanent large marquee situated in the walled garden. The current cumulative impact from the post-war buildings, marquee and landscape on the character and setting of the listed stable block and walled garden is regarded as harmful.

The proposed repair works to the stable block's windows, some of which are historic, and the reinsertion of fenestration to openings which were probably infilled in the 20th century would significantly contribute to enhancing the character and appearance of the stable block, and therefore are welcome improvements. Likewise, the removal of the fire escape and external air conditioning units would also contribute to enhancing the character and appearance of the listed building. However, it is considered that the proposed works to the building's fenestration need more detail in terms of repair methods and details of new windows, and as such would be managed through relevant conditions.

The proposed scheme also demolishes the link between the stable block and the Chapel and includes the insertion of a new glazed link, which would improve the relationship between new and historic fabric. It is intended that sample details of this section of the new development would be conditioned so that its appearance, materials and structural fixing to the listed building are acceptable, and appropriate for the listed building.

The scheme also seeks to carry out investigative work to the Chapel in order to guide future works. Details of this work would be provided via condition requiring full details of any proposed work following the investigation and would be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of work.

Replacing the western section of garden wall would reinstate the historic boundary and the context of the walled garden. The full details of the bricks and mortar would also be reserved by condition.

The proposed new training building would be located to the northwest corner of the walled garden. The location for the proposed new building is considered to be acceptable as it is located in an area which has been significantly impacted on from by the post-war development. The scheme uses the reconstructed west wall of the garden as a part of the developments external wall which allows the new training facility to be as close as possible to the boundary of the walled garden, therefore freeing open space within the garden enclosure.

Specialist heritage advice has been obtained in relation to the application. Whilst the advice is generally supportive, some concerns have been raised in relation to the palette of materials proposed, which would include flint, red brick, timber, Cotswold Stone and glazing. There is concern that the variety of materials, so diverse in texture, could have an adverse effect, making the development prominent and dominant in the landscape rather than subservient to the listed buildings. The use of red brick to the south elevation would be more acceptable as opposed to the brick, timber and flint. The applicant is aware of these considerations and it is judged reasonable this this matter could be addressed through the inclusion of a pre-commencement condition.

Staff are of the view that the proposed green roof would complement the setting of the listed buildings and would flow elegantly from the original level of the garden as opposed to a hard landscaped roof terrace.

To the west elevation of the rebuilt garden wall it is proposed to construct a glazed building which punctures the rebuilt wall. Access from this element would lead to an open patio area which overlooks the adjacent pond. The glazed structure would add natural daylight into the first floor dining area. Given that this element of the building would comprise a lightweight frame and the extensive use of glazing it is not considered that this aspect of the development would unduly harm the setting of the designated heritage assets.

Historic England have raised no objection to the proposals, subject to statutory referral to the Secretary of State. Historic England have provided detailed guidance and advice throughout the pre-application and application process which has been followed closely by the applicant and used constructively within the design process.

Overall, it is not considered that the proposal would adversely affect the Grade I listed buildings in accordance with policy DC67 and the Heritage SPD. The proposal is also judged to accord with the requirements of the NPPF.

ARCHAEOLOGY

The proposed development would be set well within the mature grounds of Bower House and more than 175 metres from the nearest residential properties located on the west of the site on the opposite side of Orange Tree Hill. Given the distance and that the proposal would not be visible from outside of the site, it is not considered that the proposed scheme would result in any undue impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents in accordance with policy DC61.

KEY ISSUES / CONCLUSIONS

Having regard to all relevant factors and material planning considerations Staff are of the view that this proposal would be acceptable.

Staff consider that the proposed development raises considerations in relation to the impact on the Grade I listed heritage assets; including the historic fabric of the stable block, as well as the setting of Bower House and stable block.

Staff are also of the view that the proposal would not adversely affect the Grade I listed buildings.

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in all other respects and it is therefore recommended, subject to no direction requiring referral of the application to the Secretary of State, that listed building consent be granted subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that

1. SC69 (Listed buildings) 3yrs

The development to which this consent relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this consent.

Reason:-

To comply with the requirements of Section 18(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. SC70 (Standard EH condition for start of works 3yrs)

Written notification of the intended start of works on site shall be sent to Historic England, London Region (23 Saville Row, London W1X 1AB), with a copy sent to the Local Planning Authority, at least seven days before the works hereby approved are commenced.

Reason:-

In order that Historic England and the Local Planning Authority may be given the opportunity of monitoring the progress of works on site to ensure the preservation of the special interest of the building affected by the works hereby approved.

3. SC32 (Accordance with plans)

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason:-

The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

4. SC71 (Listed Building - making good)

All new work and works of making good to the retained fabric whether internal or external shall be finished to match the existing original work with regard to the methods used and to

material, colour, texture and profile and in the case of brickwork facebond and pointing.

Reason:-

To preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting, and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC67.

5. SC09 (Materials) (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until samples of all materials to be used in the external construction of the building are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the development shall be constructed with the approved materials.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the materials to be used. Submission of samples prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding Conservation Area and preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting and comply with Policies DC61, DC67 & 69 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document..

6. New Window Details (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until details of the proposed new windows to be used in the stable block, by section and elevation, at scales of between 1:20 and 1:1 as appropriate, are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the materials to be used. Submission of samples prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting and comply with Policy DC67 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

7. Plans for Link Building (Pre Commencement Condition)

Notwithstanding the approved drawings, the development shall not be carried out until additional drawings of the proposed new link structure between the stable block and Chapel, in section and elevation, at scales between 1:2 and 1:20 as appropriate, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the link structure and the materials to be used. Submission of the additional plans and details prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting and comply with Policy DC67 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

8. Chapel Investigation Works (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until details of the investigation works to the chapel, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the scope and extent of the method to be used. Submission of details prior to

commencement will ensure that the investigation works help to preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting and comply with Policy DC67 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

9. Surfacing Materials (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until samples of all materials to be used in the external surfacing as part of the landscaping works, are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the development shall be constructed with the approved materials.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the materials to be used. Submission of samples prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding Conservation Area and preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting and comply with Policies DC61, DC67 & 69 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

10. Specification for Stable Block (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until details of specification detailing the repair work to the existing windows and door to the stable block, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the scope and extent of the method to be used. Submission of details prior to commencement will ensure that the investigation works help to preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and its setting and comply with Policy DC67 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

11. Brickwork Sample Board (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to the proposed teaching facility, until a sample panel of brickwork showing the brick bond, mortar and pointing profile shall be built on site for approval by the Local Planning Authority prior to the construction of the teaching facility, which shall be constructed in accordance with this panel. The panel shall be retained for the duration of the construction to allow comparison.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the materials to be used. Submission of samples prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding Conservation Area and preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Buildings and its setting and comply with Policies DC61, DC67 & 69 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

12. Brickwork Sample Board - Wall (Pre Commencement Condition)

Prior to commencement of construction of the west garden wall, a sample panel of brickwork minimum size 900 x 900mm to show brick bond, mortar and pointing profile shall be built on site, approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and retained on site until the end of the contract, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved panel.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the materials to be used. Submission of samples prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding Conservation Area and preserve the character and appearance of the Listed

13. SC11 (Landscaping) (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and shrubs on the site, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for the protection in the course of development. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised within the scheme shall be carried out in the first planting season following completion of the development and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the hard and soft landscaping proposed. Submission of a scheme prior to commencement will ensure that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61. It will also ensure accordance with Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

14. SC57 Wheel washing (Pre Commencement)

Before the development hereby permitted is first commenced, vehicle cleansing facilities to prevent mud being deposited onto the public highway during construction works shall be provided on site in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved facilities shall be retained thereafter and used at relevant entrances to the site throughout the duration of construction works. If mud or other debris originating from the site is deposited in the public highway, all on-site operations shall cease until it has been removed.

The submission will provide;

- a) A plan showing where vehicles will be parked within the site to be inspected for mud and debris and cleaned if required. The plan should show where construction traffic will access and exit the site from the public highway.
- b) A description of how the parking area will be surfaced, drained and cleaned to prevent mud, debris and muddy water being tracked onto the public highway;
- c) A description of how vehicles will be checked before leaving the site - this applies to the vehicle wheels, the underside of vehicles, mud flaps and wheel arches.
- d) A description of how vehicles will be cleaned.
- e) A description of how dirty/ muddy water be dealt with after being washing off the vehicles.
- f) A description of any contingency plan to be used in the event of a break-down of the wheel washing arrangements.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application in relation to wheel washing facilities. Submission of details prior to commencement will ensure that the facilities provided prevent materials from the site being deposited on the adjoining public highway, in the interests of highway safety and the amenity of the surrounding area. It will also ensure that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policies DC32 and DC61.

15. SC63 (Construction Methodology) (Pre Commencement)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until a

Construction Method Statement to control the adverse impact of the development on the amenity of the public and nearby occupiers is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Method statement shall include details of:

- a) parking of vehicles of site personnel and visitors;
- b) storage of plant and materials;
- c) dust management controls;
- d) measures for minimising the impact of noise and ,if appropriate, vibration arising from construction activities;
- e) predicted noise and, if appropriate, vibration levels for construction using methodologies and at points agreed with the Local Planning Authority;
- f) scheme for monitoring noise and if appropriate, vibration levels using methodologies and at points agreed with the Local Planning Authorities;
- g) siting and design of temporary buildings;
- h) scheme for security fencing/hoardings, depicting a readily visible 24-hour contact number for queries or emergencies;
- i) details of disposal of waste arising from the construction programme, including final disposal points. The burning of waste on the site at any time is specifically precluded.

And the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and statement.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application in relation to the proposed construction methodology. Submission of details prior to commencement will ensure that the method of construction protects residential amenity. It will also ensure that the development accords the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

16. SC62 (Hours of construction)

All building operations in connection with the construction of external walls, roof, and foundations; site excavation or other external site works; works involving the use of plant or machinery; the erection of scaffolding; the delivery of materials; the removal of materials and spoil from the site, and the playing of amplified music shall only take place between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00am and 1.00pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays/Public Holidays.

Reason:-

To protect residential amenity, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

INFORMATIVES

1. Approval - No negotiation required

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

OFFICER REPORT FOR REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE - 28th April 2016

APPLICATION NO.	P1910.15	
WARD:	Havering Park	Date Received: 20th January 2016 Expiry Date: 5th May 2016
ADDRESS:	Fairlawns Broxhill Road Havering-atte-Bower Romford	
PROPOSAL:	The erection of a new dwelling house and detached cart shed to replace existing residential unit including removal of barn, outbuildings and caravan	
DRAWING NO(S):	FBR/PP/101 FBR/PP/102 FBR/PP/103 SK01 SK02 Rev. A SK03 Rev. A	
RECOMMENDATION	It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report	

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is located to the northeastern side of Broxhill Road, Havering-atte-Bower. The site measures approximately 0.3ha and currently has two mobile homes to the front of the property and various structures and dismantled cars to the rear of the site. One of the mobile homes to the front of the site has been granted an Established Use Certificate. There is no proof of planning permission being granted for the remainder of the structures on the site or the car dismantling use, however aerial photos suggest that the structures and a significant amount of hardstanding have been present to the rear of the site for a number of years.

The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt and also forms part of the Havering Ridge Area of Special Character. Ground levels are relatively level to the front of the site and drop down towards the rear. The site is characterised by mature trees and dense vegetation which screen views of the site from Broxhill Road.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The Council is in receipt of a planning application seeking permission for the demolition of the existing structures, the removal of existing hardstanding and cessation of the car dismantling use on site and to construct a replacement dwelling and detached garage.

The proposed chalet bungalow would be situated in line with the neighbouring dwelling to the northwest of the subject site and would have a volume of approximately 1014m³. The detached garage would be situated further back in the site on the southeastern boundary and would have a volume of 137m³.

The proposed dwelling would have a T-shape with an overall width of 18.5m and a depth of 14.5m. The building would be finished with a dual pitched roof with two front, one rear and two side dormers and would have a height of 7.65m to the top of the ridge of the main roof and 8.3m to the top of the chimneys. The dormers would measure 1.4m in width (width of the roof is 2m) and 2m in depth. The dormers would be finished with dual pitched roofs measuring 2.4m in height.

The detached garage would measure 6.5m in width, 6.4m in depth and 4.5m in height to the top of the dual pitched roof.

The proposal also indicates new hardstanding for parking, access and turning points to the front, side and rear of the proposed dwelling.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P1018.15 - Outline application in respect of access to a new dwelling to replace existing residential unit authorised by Certificate of Lawful Use or Development reference E0011.14

Withdrawn 27-08-2015

E0017.14 - Certificate of Lawfulness for construction of brick building prior to 2000, and occupation of same as a residential dwelling since 2005

PP not required 23-04-2015

P1512.04 - Replacement dwelling, bungalow - Outline

Refuse 12-11-2004

CONSULTATIONS / REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been advertised on site and in the local press as development contrary to Green Belt policies. Neighbour notification letters have also been sent to 19 local addresses. No letters of representations have been received

Highways has raised no objection subject to a vehicle cleansing condition.

The London Fire Brigade has not raised an objection to the proposal.

Thames Water has not raised an objection to the proposal

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

CP14 - Green Belt

CP17 - Design

DC3 - Housing Design and Layout

DC33 - Car Parking

DC45 - Appropriate Development in the Green Belt

DC61 - Urban Design

DC69 - Other Areas of Special Townscape or Landscape Character

SPD4 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

SPD9 - Residential Design SPD

OTHER

LONDON PLAN - 3.8 - Housing choice

LONDON PLAN - 7.16 Green Belt

-

LONDON PLAN - 7.4 - Local character

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The development proposed is liable for the Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in accordance with London Plan Policy 8.3 and the applicable fee is based on an internal gross floor area of 19m² (393m² minus existing floor area of 374m²) and amounts to £380.

STAFF COMMENTS

The issues arising from this application are whether the development is acceptable in principle and, if not, whether there are very special circumstances sufficient to justify the development; the impact on the character and openness of the Green Belt, the impact on the street scene, the Havering Ridge Area of Special Character and adjoining Conservation Area, impact on local amenity, parking and highway issues.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The application site falls within the Metropolitan Green Belt where National and local policies refer to a presumption against inappropriate development in Green Belt areas.

Policy DC45 of the LDF states that extensions, alterations and replacement of existing dwellings will be allowed provided that the cubic capacity of the resultant building is not more than 50% greater than that of the original dwelling. The proposal does not comply with Policy DC45 in that the dwelling proposed is substantially larger than the existing dwelling on the site.

Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development, would be deemed appropriate development in the Green Belt.

Although the proposal is not compliant with Policy Dc45, the proposal is deemed to be acceptable in principle as it would comply with Paragraph 89 of the NPPF, which is considered to be more up to date than Policy DC45 of the LDF.

GREEN BELT IMPLICATIONS

The subject site has the benefit of an established residential use and various single storey buildings scattered throughout the site. There is also a large hardstanding area to the rear of the site which has been constructed sometime between 2002 and 2007. At the time of the site visit it was also established that the site is being used for vehicle dismantling with a large number of partially dismantled vehicles present on site. This use does not have the benefit of planning

permission and has not been in use on site for more than 6 years, so is not judged to be lawful.

The proposed dwelling and outbuilding with a combined volume of 1151m³ will replace the number of single storey detached buildings on site which have a combined external volume of 1367m³. The proposal would also reduce the amount of hardstanding on site.

The proposal is contrary to Policy DC45 in that it would provide a dwelling that is approximately 300% larger than the existing mobile home on site. However, in accordance with the NPPF, it is considered to be appropriate development, in principle, in the Green Belt as it involves the partial development of brownfield land, providing the proposal is judged not to have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Although the new dwelling and detached garage may be judged to have a greater impact when viewed from Broxhill Road compared to the existing buildings, Staff have considered the overall benefits to the openness of the site arising from the removal of the existing structures, which extend much deeper into the site, as well as the benefit from the removal of the extensive hard surfacing to the rear of the site. The existing built form would be removed from the rear of the site and relocated to the front of the site in line with the current building line of properties along Broxhill Road and in close proximity to the neighbouring dwelling to the northwest, further mitigating the impact on the Green Belt. The buildings and hard standing would be removed from the rear portion of the site and returned to a landscaped amenity area.

The proposal would further benefit from the removal of an unauthorised use and a large amount of partly dismantled cars which is currently present on site and significantly detracts from its openness.

Staff also do not consider the proposed hardstanding would result in an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt as it would represent an improvement on the existing situation. A condition will be imposed to ensure that suitable materials are used to minimise any visual impact.

Having regard to the existing site conditions, staff are of the opinion that the proposal would not have a greater impact on openness compared to the present character of the site, and would therefore be acceptable and acceptable in principle under the provisions of the NPPF.

DESIGN / IMPACT ON STREET / GARDEN SCENE

Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Plan Document seeks to ensure that new developments are satisfactorily located and are of a high standard of design and layout. Furthermore, the appearance of new developments should be compatible with the character of the surrounding area, and should not prejudice the environment of the occupiers and adjacent properties. Policy DC61 of the DPD states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area.

The proposal would be set back from the edge of Broxhill Road by approximately 13m and would follow the existing building line of the residential properties to the northeast of the subject site. The proposal will have a similar chalet bungalow design to that of existing properties elsewhere in Broxhill Road. It is therefore not considered that the development would have any harmful impact in terms of its visual appearance from the street scene.

The site is situated within the Havering Ridge Area of Special Character. Policy DC69 of the LDF states that planning permission will only be granted in areas of special townscape or landscape character if it maintains or enhances the special character area. Havering Ridge was recognised by the former London Planning Advisory Committee as an Area of Special Character because of its skyline character and the panoramic views it affords of Central London. It has also been identified by English Heritage (now Historic England) as an Area of Heritage Land for its combined intrinsic value for landscape, historic and nature conservation interest. Even if a development is generally acceptable in terms of Green Belt policy, the Council will ensure that any development has regard to the special character of the area.

It is considered that the existing mobile home and various outbuildings on site makes no contribution to the special character area. In light of the visual impact of the existing buildings scattered over the site and extensive hard surfacing, the alignment of the proposed dwelling with the prevailing building line along Broxhill Road and the design of the proposed development in keeping with surrounding dwellings, Staff are of the opinion that the proposed new dwelling and detached garage would not adversely affect the special character of the Havering Ridge. An appropriate condition can be imposed to require the submission of material samples which will ensure that the character of the ridge is maintained.

For the reasons mentioned above, it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of its overall scale, bulk and design and would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the street scene and in particular on the Havering Ridge Area of Special Character. It is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the Special Character Area. The development is therefore considered to be consistent with the aims and objectives of Policies DC61 and DC69 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Policy DC61 considers that new developments should not materially reduce the degree of privacy enjoyed by the occupants of adjoining properties and should not have an unreasonably adverse effect on sunlight and daylight to adjoining properties.

The proposed dwelling and detached garage would be approximately 18m and 13m from the neighbouring dwelling to the southwest respectively and is therefore not considered to have an unacceptable impact in terms of outlook or loss of light. Two flank dormer windows are proposed at first floor with views towards this neighbour. Given that these windows would serve a bathroom and secondary window to a bedroom a condition will be imposed to have them windows obscure glazed and fixed shut with the exception of the top fanlight.

The proposed dwelling will be in close proximity (1.4m) to the northeastern boundary with a separation distance of approximately 2.1m between the proposed dwelling and this mobile home. A window is situated in the southwestern elevation of the mobile home. Staff acknowledge that there will be some loss of light and outlook to this window, however it is not considered to justify a refusal given the open nature plan nature of the mobile home and primary windows situated to the front and rear elevations. The proposed dwelling would not project forward of the neighbouring dwellings front and rear building lines. Any potential impact to this neighbouring occupier is therefore considered acceptable. It should be noted that this neighbour has not objected to the

proposal.

HIGHWAY / PARKING

Policy DC33 in respect of car parking refers to the density matrix in Policy DC2. The site has a PTAL rating of 1-2 and therefore requires 2 - 1.5 parking spaces per unit for a development of this type in Romford. The off-street parking provision of approximately 6 vehicles would be sufficient to comply with the requirements of Policies DC2 and DC33. Access to the site will remain as per the existing arrangement.

KEY ISSUES / CONCLUSIONS

The application is considered appropriate development in the Green Belt under the provisions of the NPPF. The proposed development is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on the openness of the Green Belt as explained above. The proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on the streetscene, surrounding area or neighbouring amenity. No highways or parking concerns are raised. The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable having had regard to NPPF, and all other material considerations.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:-

To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. SC09 (Materials) (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until samples of all materials to be used in the external construction of the building(s) are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the development shall be constructed with the approved materials.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the materials to be used. Submission of samples prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding area and comply with Policy DC61 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

3. SC32 (Accordance with plans)

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason:-

The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

4. SC11 (Landscaping) (Pre Commencement Condition)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and shrubs on the site, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for the protection in the course of development. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised within the scheme shall be carried out in the first planting season following completion of the development and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the hard and soft landscaping proposed. Submission of a scheme prior to commencement will ensure that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61. It will also ensure accordance with Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

5. SC13B (Boundary treatment) (Pre Commencement)

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of all proposed walls, fences and boundary treatment shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The boundary development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained permanently thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of any boundary treatment. Submission of this detail prior to commencement will protect the visual amenities of the development, prevent undue overlooking of adjoining property and ensure that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

6. SC19 (Restricted use) ENTER DETAILS

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 the use hereby permitted shall be single residential dwelling (class C3(A)) only and shall be used for no other purpose(s) whatsoever including any other use in Class C3 of the Order, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

To restrict the use of the premises to one compatible with the surrounding area and to enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control over any future use not forming part of this application, and that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61

7. SC46 (Standard flank window condition)

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, no window or other opening (other than those shown on the submitted and approved plan,) shall be formed in the flank wall(s) of the building(s) hereby permitted, unless specific permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has first been sought and obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In order to ensure a satisfactory development that will not result in any loss of privacy or damage to the environment of neighbouring properties which exist or may be proposed in the future, and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies

8. SC34B (Obscure with fanlight openings only) ENTER DETAILS

The proposed dormers in the southeastern elevation serving a bathroom and bedroom shall be permanently glazed with obscure glass and with the exception of top hung fanlight(s) shall remain permanently fixed shut and thereafter be maintained.

Reason:-

In the interests of privacy, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

9. SC57 (Wheel washing) (Pre Commencement)

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until wheel scrubbing/wash down facilities to prevent mud being deposited onto the public highway during construction works is provided on site in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved facilities shall be retained thereafter and used at relevant entrances to the site throughout the duration of construction works.

The submitted scheme will provide the following details:

- a) A plan showing where vehicles will be parked within the site, to be inspected for mud and debris and cleaned if required. The plan should show where construction traffic will access and exit the site from the public highway.
- b) A description of how the parking area will be surfaced, drained and cleaned to prevent mud, debris and muddy water being tracked onto the public highway.
- c) A description of how vehicles will be checked before leaving the site, including their wheels, the underside of vehicles, mud flaps and wheel arches.
- d) A description of how vehicles will be cleaned.
- e) A description of how dirty/muddy water be dealt with after being washed off the vehicles.
- f) A description of any contingency plan to be used in the event of a break-down of the wheel washing arrangements.
- g) A description of how any material tracked into the public highway will be removed.

Should material be deposited in the public highway, then all operations at the site shall cease until such time as the material has been removed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application in relation to wheel washing facilities. Submission of details prior to commencement will ensure that the facilities provided prevent materials from the site being deposited on the adjoining public highway, in the interests of highway safety and the amenity of the surrounding area. It will also ensure that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policies DC32 and DC61.

10. SC58 (Refuse and recycling)

No building shall be occupied or use commenced until refuse and recycling facilities are provided in accordance with details which shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The refuse and recycling facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge how refuse and

recycling will be managed on site. Submission of this detail prior to occupation in the case of new building works or prior to the use commencing in the case of changes of use will protect the amenity of occupiers of the development and also the locality generally and ensure that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

11. SC59 (Cycle Storage)

No building shall be occupied or use commenced until cycle storage is provided in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle storage shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason:-

Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to demonstrate what facilities will be available for cycle parking. Submission of this detail prior to occupation in the case of new building works or prior to the use commencing in the case of changes of use is in the interests of providing a wide range of facilities for non-motor car residents and sustainability.

12. SC62 (Hours of construction)

All building operations in connection with the construction of external walls, roof, and foundations; site excavation or other external site works; works involving the use of plant or machinery; the erection of scaffolding; the delivery of materials; the removal of materials and spoil from the site, and the playing of amplified music shall only take place between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00am and 1.00pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays/Public Holidays.

Reason:-

To protect residential amenity, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

13. SC45A (Removal of permitted development rights) EDIT DETAIL

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order), other than porches erected in accordance with the Order, no extension or enlargement (including additions to roofs) shall be made to the dwellinghouse(s) hereby permitted, or any detached building erected, without the express permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In the interests of amenity and to enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over future development, and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

14. Removal of existing structures

The existing single storey buildings, as depicted on Drawing No.FBR/PP/102 hereby approved, shall be substantially demolished and removed from the application site prior to the first residential occupation of the proposed dwelling as shown on the same drawing. Thereafter the site shall be landscaped in accordance with condition 4 of this application

Reason:-

In order to ensure that the density and characteristics of the area is maintained, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policies DC2 and DC61.

15. Removal of existing harstanding and dismantled vehicles

The existing single hardstanding towards the rear of the site and dismantled vehicles, shall be removed from the application site prior to the first residential occupation of the proposed dwelling. Thereafter the site shall be landscaped in accordance with drawing No.

Reason:-

In order to ensure that the density and characteristics of the area is maintained, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policies DC2 and DC61.

16. Hardstanding

Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, the hardstanding area as indicated on drawing No. FBR/PP/103 shall be laid out and surfaced with materials previously submitted and agreed with in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the area shall be permanently retained and maintained for parking of vehicles related to the residential dwelling only and shall be used for no other purposes whatsoever, including any form of open storage or business activities, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:

In order to prevent any additional harm to the openness of the Green Belt and in order for the development to comply with Policies DC45 and DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

INFORMATIVES

1. Fee Informative

A fee is required when submitting details pursuant to the discharge of conditions. In order to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications, Deemed Applications, Requests and Site Visits) (England) Regulations 2012, which came into force from 22.11.2012, a fee of £97 per request or £28 where the related permission was for extending or altering a dwelling house, is needed.

2. Approval - No negotiation required

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

3. Approval and CIL (enter amount)

The proposal is liable for the Mayor of London Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Based upon the information supplied with the application, the CIL payable would be £380 (this figure may go up or down, subject to indexation). CIL is payable within 60 days of commencement of development. A Liability Notice will be sent to the applicant (or anyone else who has assumed liability) shortly and you are required to notify the Council of the commencement of the development before works begin. Further details with regard to CIL are available from the Council's website.

4. Highways Informative

The developer is advised that if construction materials are proposed to be kept on the highway during construction works then they will need to apply for a license from the Council. If the developer requires scaffolding, hoarding or mobile cranes to be used on the highway, a licence is required and Streetcare should be contacted on 01708 434343 to make the necessary arrangements. Please note that unauthorised use of the highway for construction works is an offence.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE

20 April 2016

REPORT

Subject Heading:

P0109.16 – 24 Rosebank Avenue,
Hornchurch

Erection of granny annexe in the rear
garden (Application received 27th January
2016)

Ward

Hacton

Report Author and contact details:

Helen Oakerbee
Planning Manager
helen.oakerbee@havering.gov.uk
01708 432800

Policy context:

Local Development Framework
The London Plan
National Planning Policy Framework

Financial summary:

None

The subject matter of this report deals with the following Council Objectives

Havering will be clean and its environment will be cared for	[X]
People will be safe, in their homes and in the community	[]
Residents will be proud to live in Havering	[X]

SUMMARY

The Council are in receipt of an application seeking planning permission for the construction of a single storey annexe building in the rear garden environment of 24 Rosebank Avenue.

Due to the potential for the annexe to be accessed independently of the main dwelling, a legal agreement is required to ensure that the annexe shall be used only for living accommodation ancillary to that of the main dwelling and to ensure that the annexe and main dwelling operate as a single planning unit.

The development proposed is considered to be acceptable in all material aspects and it is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to conditions and also the completion of a legal agreement to ensure that the unit remains as an annexe to the main dwelling and not a separate residential unit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the application is unacceptable as it stands but would be acceptable subject to applicant entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the following:

- That the residential annexe hereby approved shall be permanently retained as an annexe to the existing dwelling at 24 Rosebank Avenue and shall not be sub-divided or sold off separately from the main dwelling.
- The Developer/Owner pay the Council's reasonable legal costs in association with the preparation of a legal agreement, prior to completion of the agreement, irrespective of whether the legal agreement is completed.
- The Developer/Owner to pay the appropriate planning obligation/s monitoring fee prior to completion of the agreement.

That the Head of Regulatory Services be authorised to enter into a legal agreement to secure the above and upon completion of that agreement, grant subject to the conditions set out below:

1. Time Limit

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

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

2. Materials (Detail no samples)

Before any of the development hereby permitted is commenced, written specification of external walls and roof materials to be used in the construction of the building(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the development shall be constructed with the approved materials.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding area and comply with Policy DC61 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

3. Accordance with Plans

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans, particulars and specifications (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason: The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

4. Use as part of the main dwelling

The outbuilding hereby permitted shall be used only for living accommodation as an integral part of the existing dwelling known as 24 Rosebank Avenue, Hornchurch, RM12 4QX and shall not be used as a separate unit of residential accommodation at any time.

Reason: The site is within an area where the Local Planning Authority consider that the sub-division of existing properties should not be permitted in the interests of amenity, and that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

5. Removal of Permitted Development Rights

Removal of permitted development rights - Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), no extension or enlargement (including additions to roofs) shall be made to the annexe hereby permitted, without the express permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and to enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over future development, and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

6. Adapted flank and rear window condition

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), no window or other opening (other than those shown on the submitted and approved plan,) shall be formed in the flank or rear wall(s) of the building(s) hereby permitted, unless specific permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has first been sought and obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory development that will not result in any loss of privacy or damage to the environment of neighbouring properties which exist or may be proposed in the future, and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

7. Balcony Condition

The roof area of detached annexe hereby permitted shall never be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwelling, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

8. Sub-division

The garden area shall not be subdivided at any time and nor shall there be any additional pedestrian or vehicular accesses into the site.

Reason: In order that the annex approved remains ancillary to the main dwelling and that the development accords with Policy DC61 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

9. Incidental Use

The outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be arranged or disposed of as a separate unit of residential accommodation from the use of the main dwelling.

Reason: In order that the annex approved remains ancillary to the main dwelling and that the development accords with Policy DC61 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

INFORMATIVES

17. Approval – no negotiation required

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

19. Planning Obligation

The planning obligations recommended in this report have been subject to the statutory tests set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and the obligations are considered to have satisfied the following criteria:-

- (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

REPORT DETAIL

1. Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a residential two storey semi-detached dwelling finished in rough render. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of different residential building forms.

2. Description of Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for a detached single storey granny annexe to the rear of 24 Rosebank Avenue.
- 2.2 The annexe would be set against the rear boundary of the site, 1.0m from the southern boundary and 0.60m from the northern boundary.
- 2.3 The annexe would have a width of 10.0m, a depth of 5.0m, with a flat roof measuring 2.50m in height.

3. History

- 3.1 No relevant planning history

4. Consultation/Representations

- 4.1 In accordance with recognised procedure, notification letters were sent to 20 neighbouring properties. No letters of representation were received.
- 4.2 Highway Authority – No objections to the proposal.
- 4.3 Environmental Health – No objections to the proposal.

5. Relevant Policy

- 5.1 Policies DC33 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document are relevant.
- 5.2 Also relevant is policy 7.4 of the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- 5.3 The Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD is also relevant in this instance.

6. Staff Comments

- 6.1 The application is being reported to Committee because the proposed development requires a legal agreement to ensure that the use of the annexe is solely ancillary to the main dwelling 24 Rosebank Avenue.
- 6.2 The main issues to be considered in this case are the principle of development, the impact on local character and the street scene, the impact on amenity of neighbouring properties and parking and highway issues.

7. Principle of Development

- 7.1 The Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD defines a residential annexe as accommodation that is ancillary to the main dwelling within the residential curtilage and must only be used for this purpose. The guidance states that the annexe must form part of the same planning unit, sharing facilities, including access, parking and garden areas.
- 7.2 The layout, design and physical relationship between the house and the proposed annexe are therefore important considerations and the proposed annexe must demonstrate clear connections with the main dwelling. The size and scale of the accommodation to be provided should be proportionate to the main dwelling. As a guide, the scale should be such that the annexe can be used as a part of the main dwelling once any dependency has ceased.

7.3 Although it is capable of independent occupation by virtue of its facilities and siting it would be unlikely to be occupied by anyone other than people closely associated with the occupants of the main house who would be content to share the remaining curtilage area to no.24 and live closely overlooked by the occupants of the main house.

7.4 The applicant has expressed that the annexe would be occupied solely by family members and would not be let separately. Nevertheless staff consider it necessary to seek a Section 106 legal agreement that would ensure that the annexe remains ancillary to the main dwelling as there is a concern that it would be relatively easy to subdivide the plot in the future, given the location of the annexe building within this corner plot and the ability to access it from the side.

8. Design/Impact on Street/Garden Scene

8.1 Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Plan Document seeks to ensure that new developments are satisfactorily located and are of a high standard of design and layout. Furthermore, the appearance of new developments should be compatible with the character of the surrounding area, and should not prejudice the environment of the occupiers and adjacent properties. Policy DC61 states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area.

8.2 Within the locality, other outbuildings of similar scale are present in the rear gardens of neighbouring premises. Staff consider that the annexe would integrate satisfactorily into the rear garden environment, as it is single storey and of moderate height, therefore would not appear disproportionate in relation to the main residence.

8.3 The annexe would not be easily visible from the street scene therefore no issues arise in this respect..

9. Impact on Amenity

9.1 The Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD states that outbuildings should not cause undue loss of light to neighbouring properties or adversely affect the living conditions of neighbouring properties. Policy DC61 reinforces these requirements by stating that planning permission will not be granted where the proposal results in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of sunlight/ daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy to existing properties.

9.2 Staff have given consideration to the scale and bulk of the proposed detached annexe in relation to the garden size of the application site and surrounding properties. The site is bounded by a close boarded

fence, which would serve to screen a considerable amount of the proposal's height and depth. Staff conclude that despite the proposed annexe occupying a prominent position, visible from a number of aspects, that it would not unacceptably detract from neighbouring amenity by reason of its modest height, which is comparable to that which could be achieved under permitted development which allows outbuildings of 2.5m in height within 2.0m of the common boundary.

9.3 Staff accept that there would be comings and goings to the annexe and increased use of the garden area in a general sense but no more so than an outbuilding in use as a hobby, games and garden room, particularly in the summer months. As such, staff are of the view that the use of the outbuilding proposed as a residential annexe would not give rise to an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance and would be unlikely to give rise to significant adverse impacts

9.4 It is still considered reasonable to impose a condition to prevent further extensions or enlargements to the proposed annexe (including additions to the roof) which could result in further intensification of use of the curtilage to the possible detriment of neighbouring residents' living conditions and a reduction in the amount of amenity space provision. In this instance it would also be necessary to include a condition restricting the occupancy of the annexe to purposes connected to the residential use of the main dwelling 24 Rosebank Avenue.

9.5 Finally, although staff view the application as acceptable on its own merits, it is acknowledged that no letters of objection have been received.

9.6 On balance, subject to safeguarding conditions and the provision of a Section-106 agreement to prevent the outbuilding being used for purposes other than those ancillary to the main dwelling staff are of the view that the proposed annexe would be in accordance with provisions of Policy DC61 and the Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD.

10. **Highway/Parking**

10.1 The proposal would have no bearing on existing provision of parking and the Highways Authority raised no objections.

11. **Conclusion**

11.1 The scale, height and massing of the proposed outbuilding would be sympathetic to the rear garden setting and officers are of the opinion that the proposal would not result in an undue impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents nor present any issues visually.

- 11.2 Therefore having had regard to all relevant planning policy and material considerations, subject to conditions and the provision of a Section 106 agreement to prevent the annexe being used for any other purpose other than those ancillary to the main dwelling approval is recommended accordingly.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications and risks:

Financial contributions will be sought through the legal agreement, should the application be approved.

Legal Implications and risks:

Legal resources will be required for the drafting of a legal agreement.

Human Resource Implications:

None.

Equalities and Social Inclusion Implications:

The Council's planning policies are implemented with regard to equality and diversity. The proposal will provide a form of accommodation that meets the particular needs of an individual.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application form and drawings received 27-01-2016

This page is intentionally left blank



REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE

28 April 2016

REPORT

Subject Heading:

**P1390.15: 1-3 Station Road, Harold
Wood, Romford**

**Demolition of existing building and
erection of new block comprising 3no.
retail units and 6no. two-bedroom flats.
(Application received 9 October 2016)**

Ward:

Harold Wood

Report Author and contact details:

**Helen Oakerbee
Planning Manager
helen.oakerbee@havering.gov.uk
01708 432800**

Policy context:

**Local Development Framework
The London Plan
National Planning Policy Framework**

Financial summary:

None

The subject matter of this report deals with the following Council Objectives

Havering will be clean and its environment will be cared for [X]

People will be safe, in their homes and in the community [X]

Residents will be proud to live in Havering [X]

SUMMARY

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a new block comprising 3no. retail units at ground floor and 6no. two-bedroom flats above.

It raises considerations in relation to the impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene, the impact on the residential amenity of the future occupants and of neighbouring residents, and parking and access.

On balance the proposal is considered to be acceptable in all material respects and it is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to conditions and the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That it be noted that proposed development is liable for the Mayors Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in accordance with London Plan Policy 8.3. The applicable fee is based on 469 square metres of new gross internal floor space. The proposal would therefore give rise to the requirement of £9,380 Mayoral CIL payment (subject to indexation).

That the proposal is unacceptable as it stands but would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £36,000 to be used for educational purposes.
- All contribution sums shall include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of receipt by the Council.
- The Developer/Owner to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs associated with the Legal Agreement prior to the completion of the agreement irrespective of whether the agreement is completed.

- Save for the holder of blue badges that the future occupiers of the proposal will be prevented from purchasing residents or business parking permits for their own vehicles for any existing, revised or new permit controlled parking scheme
- Payment of the appropriate planning obligations monitoring fee prior to the completion of the agreement.

That the Head of Regulatory Services be authorised to enter into a legal agreement to secure the above and upon completion of that agreement, grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out below:

1. Time Limit

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

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

2. In Accordance with Plans

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason: The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

3. External Materials

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until samples of all materials to be used in the external construction of the building(s) are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the development shall be constructed with the approved materials.

Reason: Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the materials to be used. Submission of samples prior to commencement will ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding area and comply with Policy DC61 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

4. Construction Methodology

Before development is commenced, a scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority making provision for a Construction Method Statement to control the adverse impact of the development on the amenity of the public and nearby occupiers. The Construction Method statement shall include details of:

- a) parking of vehicles of site personnel and visitors;
- b) storage of plant and materials;
- c) dust management controls;
- d) measures for minimising the impact of noise and ,if appropriate, vibration arising from construction activities;
- e) predicted noise and, if appropriate, vibration levels for construction using methodologies and at points agreed with the Local Planning Authority;
- f) scheme for monitoring noise and if appropriate, vibration levels using methodologies and at points agreed with the Local Planning Authorities;
- g) siting and design of temporary buildings;
- h) scheme for security fencing/hoardings, depicting a readily visible 24-hour contact number for queries or emergencies;
- i) details of disposal of waste arising from the construction programme, including final disposal points. The burning of waste on the site at any time is specifically precluded.

And the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and statement.

Reason: Insufficient information has been supplied with the application in relation to the proposed construction methodology. Submission of details prior to commencement will ensure that the method of construction protects residential amenity. It will also ensure that the development accords the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

5. Hours of Construction

All building operations in connection with the construction of external walls, roof, and foundations; site excavation or other external site works; works involving the use of plant or machinery; the erection of scaffolding; the delivery of materials; the removal of materials and spoil from the site, and the playing of amplified music shall only take place between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00am and 1.00pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays/Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect residential amenity, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

6. Refuse and Recycling

Prior to occupation of the building the refuse and recycling facilities as detailed on drawing 'BA/2281.01 P004 Rev B' shall be provided to the full satisfaction the Local Planning Authority. The refuse and recycling facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of amenity of occupiers of the development and also the visual amenity of the development and the locality generally, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

7. Cycle Storage

Prior to occupation of the building the secure cycle storage facilities as detailed on drawing 'BA/2281.01 P004 Rev B' shall be provided to the full satisfaction the Local Planning Authority. The cycle storage shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of providing a wide range of facilities for non-motor car residents, in the interests of sustainability.

8. Landscaping

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and shrubs on the site, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for the protection in the course of development. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised within the scheme shall be carried out in the first planting season following completion of the development and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local Planning Authority.

Reason: Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of the hard and soft landscaping proposed. Submission of a scheme prior to commencement will ensure that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61. It will also ensure accordance with Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

9. Servicing

Before any part of the commercial units hereby permitted are first occupied the servicing arrangements as indicated in drawing 'BA/2281.01 P004 Rev B' shall be laid out and implemented to the full satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and thereafter this car parking provision shall remain unobstructed and permanently

available for use, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that car parking accommodation is made permanently available to the standards adopted by the Local Planning Authority in the interest of highway safety, and that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC33.

10. Boundary Fencing

The proposed building shall not be occupied until details of all proposed walls, fences and boundary treatment have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The boundary development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained permanently thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the appropriateness of any boundary treatment. Submission of this detail prior to commencement will protect the visual amenities of the development, prevent undue overlooking of adjoining property and ensure that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC6.

11. Pedestrian Visibility Splay

The proposals should provide a 2.1 by 2.1 metre pedestrian visibility splay on either side of the proposed access gates to the service road, set back to the boundary of the public footway. There should be no obstruction or object higher than 0.6 metres within the visibility splay.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC32.

12. Vehicle Cleansing

Before the development hereby permitted is first commenced, vehicle cleansing facilities to prevent mud being deposited onto the public highway during construction works shall be provided on site in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved facilities shall be retained thereafter and used at relevant entrances to the site throughout the duration of construction works. If mud or other debris originating from the site is deposited in the public highway, all on-site operations shall cease until it has been removed.

The submission will provide;

- a) A plan showing where vehicles will be parked within the site to be inspected for mud and debris and cleaned if required. The plan should show where construction traffic will access and exit the site from the public highway.
- b) A description of how the parking area will be surfaced, drained and cleaned to prevent mud, debris and muddy water being tracked onto the public highway;
- c) A description of how vehicles will be checked before leaving the site - this applies to the vehicle wheels, the underside of vehicles, mud flaps and wheel arches.
- d) A description of how vehicles will be cleaned.
- e) A description of how dirty/ muddy water be dealt with after being washing off the vehicles.
- f) A description of any contingency plan to be used in the event of a break-down of the wheel washing arrangements.

Reason: Insufficient information has been supplied with the application in relation to wheel washing facilities. Submission of details prior to commencement will ensure that the facilities provided prevent materials from the site being deposited on the adjoining public highway, in the interests of highway safety and the amenity of the surrounding area. It will also ensure that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policies DC32 and DC61.

13. Noise Insulation

The buildings shall be constructed so as to provide sound insulation of 45 DnT, w + Ctr dB (minimum value) against airborne noise and 62 L'nT,w dB (maximum values) against impact noise.

Reason: To prevent noise nuisance to adjoining properties in accordance with Policy DC55 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

14. Lighting

No building shall be occupied or use commenced until external lighting is provided in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall be provided and operated in strict accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the impact arising from any external lighting required in connection with the building or use. Submission of this detail prior to occupation in the case of new building works or prior to the use commencing in the case of changes of use will protect

residential amenity and ensure that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

15. Railway Noise Assessment

No works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until an assessment of the impact of: a) railway noise (in accordance with Technical memorandum, "Calculation of Railway Noise", 1995) and; b) vibration from the use of the railway lines upon the site; is undertaken and a scheme detailing the measures to protect future residents from railway noise and vibration is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to occupancy taking place.

Reason: Insufficient information has been supplied with the application to judge the impact of transportation noise and vibration upon the proposed development. Submission of an assessment prior to commencement will protect future residents against the impact of transportation noise and vibration, in accordance with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policies DC55 and DC61.

16. Contaminated Land

Prior to the commencement of any works pursuant to this permission the developer shall submit for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority;

a) A Phase I (Desktop Study) Report documenting the history of the site, its surrounding area and the likelihood of contaminant/s, their type and extent incorporating a Site Conceptual Model.

b) A Phase II (Site Investigation) Report if the Phase I Report confirms the possibility of a significant risk to any sensitive receptors. This is an intrusive site investigation including factors such as chemical testing, quantitative risk assessment and a description of the sites ground conditions. An updated Site Conceptual Model should be included showing all the potential pollutant linkages and an assessment of risk to identified receptors.

c) A Phase III (Remediation Strategy) Report if the Phase II Report confirms the presence of a significant pollutant linkage requiring remediation. A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to all receptors must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works, site management procedures and procedure for dealing with previously unidentified any contamination. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

d) Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme mentioned in 1(c) above, a “Verification Report” that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out, any requirement for longer-term monitoring of contaminant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect those engaged in construction and occupation of the development from potential contamination and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC53.

17. Contaminated Land (2)

- a) If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.
- b) Following completion of the remediation works as mentioned in (a) above, a ‘Verification Report’ must be submitted demonstrating that the works have been carried out satisfactorily and remediation targets have been achieved.

Reason: To ensure that any previously unidentified contamination found at the site is investigated and satisfactorily addressed in order to protect those engaged in construction and occupation of the development from potential contamination.

18. Water Efficiency

All dwellings hereby approved shall comply with Regulation 36 (2)(b) and Part G2 of the Building Regulations - Water Efficiency.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy 5.15 of the London Plan.

INFORMATIVES

- 1. Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 2. The proposal is liable for the Mayor of London Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Based upon the information supplied with the application, the

CIL payable would be £9,380 (subject to indexation). CIL is payable within 60 days of commencement of development. A Liability Notice will be sent to the applicant (or anyone else who has assumed liability) shortly and you are required to notify the Council of the commencement of the development before works begin. Further details with regard to CIL are available from the Council's website.

3. Changes to the public highway (including permanent or temporary access)

Planning approval does not constitute approval for changes to the public highway. Highway Authority approval will only be given after suitable details have been submitted considered and agreed. If new or amended access as required (whether temporary or permanent), there may be a requirement for the diversion or protection of third party utility plant and it is recommended that early involvement with the relevant statutory undertaker takes place. The applicant must contact Engineering Services on 01708 433751 to discuss the scheme and commence the relevant highway approvals process. Please note that unauthorised work on the highway is an offence.

4. Highway legislation

The developer (including their representatives and contractors) is advised that planning consent does not discharge the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 and the Traffic Management Act 2004. Formal notifications and approval will be needed for any highway works (including temporary works of any nature) required during the construction of the development. Please note that unauthorised work on the highway is an offence.

5. Temporary use of the public highway

The developer is advised that if construction materials are proposed to be kept on the highway during construction works then they will need to apply for a license from the Council. If the developer requires scaffolding, hoarding or mobile cranes to be used on the highway, a licence is required and Streetcare should be contacted on 01708 434343 to make the necessary arrangements. Please note that unauthorised use of the highway for construction works is an offence.

6. With regards to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777.

7. A fee is required when submitting details pursuant to the discharge of conditions. In order to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications, Deemed Applications, Requests and Site Visits) (England) Regulations 2012, which came into force from 22.11.2012, a fee of £97 per request or £28 where the related permission was for extending or altering a dwellinghouse, is needed

REPORT DETAIL

1. Site Description

- 1.1 The application relates to the property at 1-3 Station Road, Harold Wood, Romford. The site occupies a prominent corner plot on the junction of Station Road and Gubbins Lane and comprises two retail units with residential accommodation above as well as an area of hardstanding located at the northern end of the site.
- 1.2 The western and southern boundaries adjoin Gubbins Lane and Station Road respectively; the northern boundary lies adjacent to a shared access road adjacent to No.64 Gubbins Lane; whilst the eastern boundary adjoins other retail premises located along Station Road. Harold Wood station is located on the opposite side of Station Road.
- 1.3 The building is not listed and is not located within a conservation area. The land is located within the Harold Wood Major Local Centre but is not subject to any other land use designation within the LDF.

2. Description of Proposal

- 2.1 The application is seeking planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a new block comprising 3no. retail units at ground floor and 6no. two-bedroom flats above.
- 2.2 The proposed new building would wrap around the junction frontage with Station Road and Gubbins Lane and would project forward of the existing building line up to the pavement edge. The building would incorporate a part pitched roof and crown roof design with a ridge height of 11.3 metres. To the north of the development a single storey section of the building with a height of 3.5 metres would project a further 7.5 metres along the Gubbins Lane frontage.
- 2.3 The proposed 6no. flats would occupy the first and second floor areas of the building, with the second floor set out partially within the roof space. As such the development would include a series of second floor windows set within the roof slope as well as an enclosed balcony facing on to Station Road. A

projecting balcony would be positioned on the northern flank elevation. At first floor level each flat would be served by an enclosed balcony.

- 2.4 The existing service road from Gubbins Lane would be retained allowing the commercial units to be serviced from the rear of the site. The proposal would not include any off street car parking provision for the flats or the commercial units. Commercial and residential refuse stores and a secure cycle storage facility would be provided in the single storey section of the building adjacent to the entrance to the servicing road.
- 2.5 The existing row of young deciduous trees along the frontage with Gubbins Lane (comprising mainly Sycamores) would be removed. The trees are not subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

3. Relevant History

- 3.1 L/HAV/380/82 - Upgrading disused flat unit. Conversion of 2 shop units into 1 unit. New offices and parking - Approved, 26 June 1983
- 3.2 A/26/83 - Illuminated shop fascia sign - Approved, 31 March 1983

4. Consultations/Representations

- 4.1 Notification letters were sent to 24 properties and a representation from 1 neighbouring occupier has been received. The comments can be summarised as follows:
 - Lack of car parking provision within the scheme for both the residential and commercial units.
 - The development and addition of new dwellings will further exacerbate existing on street car parking issues within the area.
 - Insufficient servicing arrangements for the commercial units.
- 4.2 In response to the above: Car parking, traffic congestion and pedestrian visibility are discussed in 'Highway/ Parking' section which is set out below.
- 4.3 The following consultation responses have been received:
 - Thames Water - no objection.
 - London Fire Brigade Water Team - no objection.
 - London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority - no objection.
 - Environmental Health - no objection, recommended condition relating to noise insulation, a railway noise assessment and contaminated land precautions.

- Local Highway Authority - no objection, recommended conditions in relation to pedestrian visibility splays and vehicle cleansing.

5. Relevant Policies

- 5.1 Policies CP1 (Housing Supply), CP2 (Sustainable Communities), CP17 (Design), DC2 (Housing Mix and Density), DC11 (Non-designated Sites), DC33 (Car Parking), DC34 (Walking), DC35 (Cycling), DC36 (Servicing), DC55 (Noise), DC61 (Urban Design), DC63 (Delivering Safer Places), and DC72 (Planning Obligations) of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document are considered to be relevant.
- 5.2 Other relevant documents include the Residential Design SPD, Designing Safer Places SPD, Planning Obligations SPD (technical appendices) and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.
- 5.3 Policies 3.3 (increasing housing supply), 3.4 (optimising housing potential), 3.5 (quality and design of housing developments), 3.8 (housing choice), 3.9 (mixed and balanced communities), 6.9 (cycling), 6.10 (walking), 6.13 (parking), 7.3 (designing out crime), 7.4 (local character), 7.6 (architecture), 7.15 (reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes), and 8.2 (planning obligations) of the London Plan, are material considerations.
- 5.4 The National Planning Policy Framework, specifically Sections 6 (Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes) and 7 (Requiring good design), are relevant to these proposals.

6. Staff Comments

- 6.1 The main considerations relate to the principle of the development, the impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, the implications for the residential amenity of the future occupants and of nearby houses and the suitability of the proposed parking, access and servicing arrangements.

Principle of Development

- 6.2 The provision of additional housing is consistent with the NPPF and Policy CP1 as the application site is within a sustainable location in an established urban area.
- 6.3 In terms of the Local Plan the site is located within the Harold Wood Major Local Centre and would result in a net increase in the amount of commercial floorspace at the site in comparison to the existing building.

- 6.4 On this basis the proposal is considered to be policy compliant in land use terms and is therefore regarded as being acceptable in principle.

Density/ Layout

- 6.5 Policy DC2 of the LDF provides guidance in relation to the dwelling mix within residential developments. Policy DC61 states that planning permission will not be granted for proposals that would significantly diminish local and residential amenity.
- 6.7 The proposal would provide 6no. residential units at a density equivalent to approximately 110 dwellings per hectare. This complies with the aims of Policy DC2 which suggests that a dwelling density of between 50 to 110 dwellings per hectare would be appropriate in this location.
- 6.8 The 'Technical housing standards - nationally described space standard' document sets out requirements for the Gross Internal (floor) Area of new dwellings at a defined level of occupancy as well as floor areas and dimensions for key parts of the home.
- 6.9 The proposed flatted block would provide 6no. two-bedroom flats with varying floor space sizes, all of which meet or exceed the respective minimum standards as per the proposed number of rooms and number of occupants they are intended to serve. The bedrooms in these flats would also generally comply with the minimum standards set out in the technical housing standards with regard to floor area, width and ceiling heights. Given this factor it is considered that the proposed development would be in accordance with technical housing standards and the flats would provide an acceptable amount of space for day to day living.
- 6.10 Havering's Residential Design SPD does not prescribe minimum space standards for private gardens. The SPD does however state that private amenity space should be provided in single, usable, enclosed blocks which benefit from both natural sunlight and shading, adding that the fundamental design considerations for amenity space should be quality and usability. All dwellings should have access to amenity space that is not overlooked from the public realm.
- 6.11 The proposed first floor flats would each be provided with enclosed balcony and terrace areas ranging from 7 square metres to 10 square metres. At second floor, flat 4 would include an enclosed balcony, whilst flat 6 would be served by a projecting balcony with a floor area of 4.3 square metres.
- 6.12 It is considered that most of the occupants of the proposed flats would have access to a reasonable provision of private outdoor amenity space and in this instance would be adequate for the requirements of the two-bedroom apartments.

- 6.13 Flat 5 is the only residential unit within the development that would not include a private balcony or terrace. Nevertheless, the majority of this unit would be positioned in the curved corner section of the building. As a result the living room area would be served by a generous amount of glazing, providing a light and spacious southerly aspect. Therefore it is considered that in this instance the proposed flat would be suitable for day to day living.

Design/Impact on Streetscene

- 6.14 Policy DC61 states that development must respond to distinctive local buildings forms and patterns of development and respect the scale, massing and height of the surrounding context.
- 6.15 The proposed new block would form a more prominent feature in comparison to the two storey terraced building that currently occupies the site. However, the appearance and style of the proposed building is considered on balance to be of a good quality modern design which seeks to recognise the corner plot location and form more of a salient feature within the streetscene.
- 6.16 It is acknowledged that to the east the proposed building would be juxtaposed to some extent with its setting adjacent to the traditional two-storey shop units of Station Road. On balance it is considered that the adjacent shop units offer little in terms of architectural quality to this section of the streetscene and the features of these buildings should not necessarily be replicated fully in the proposed re-development.
- 6.17 The application site forms a very conspicuous location in terms of its position adjacent to the junction of Station Road and Gubbins Lane. Given this prominence the site can be regarded with a degree of separation from the remainder of the row of shops leading down Station Road. It is recognised that the building would be larger than the building it replaces, but the additional scale and bulk of the development would be broken up by the glazing and the frontage proportions of the ground floor units would respect those of the adjacent shop units. Staff are of the view that the proposed building would also frame the end of the commercial row and serve to compliment the streetscene arrangement which gently rises together with the street level gradient towards the road junction.
- 6.18 On balance it is considered that the proposed development would contribute positively to the streetscene at the junction of Station Road and Gubbins Lane would serve to maintain and enhance the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy DC61.

Impact on Amenity

- 6.19 The Residential Design SPD states that new development should be sited and designed such that there is no detriment to existing residential amenity

through overlooking and/or privacy loss and dominance or overshadowing. Policy DC61 reinforces these requirements by stating that planning permission will not be granted where the proposal results in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of sunlight/daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy to existing properties.

- 6.20 The main consideration in terms of residential amenity relates to the impact on privacy, daylight and outlook for the occupants of the dwellings at 64 Gubbins Lane located to the north of the application site and the occupiers of the adjacent first floor flat at 5a Station Road, located to the east of the application site.
- 6.21 The 2.5 storey northern side elevation of the proposed block would be positioned approximately 16.5 metres from the main flank elevation of 64 Gubbins Lane. The new building would also include a first floor projecting balcony, positioned some 15 metres from the side elevation of 64 Gubbins Lane. The flank elevation at the Gubbins Lane property contains two first floor windows, however due to the positioning do not appear to serve as the main light source to habitable rooms.
- 6.22 In terms of the impact on privacy and overlooking Members may wish to consider the positioning of the buildings, the separation distances and that the views from the balcony would be focused towards the front garden and side elevation of 64 Gubbins Lane, rather than the private rear garden area.
- 6.23 In terms of the impact on daylight and outlook; likewise, given the positioning of the proposed building the majority of the bulk and massing would be set further to the south of the site reducing the potential for overshadowing and loss of sunlight to the front garden of 64 Gubbins Lane.
- 6.24 The proposed development would extend to the rear of the site in close proximity to the rear of the adjacent first floor flat at 5a Station Road. However, the proposal would partially retain an existing rear projecting section of the terrace which currently screens the first floor rear windows from the rear of the application site. As such the majority of the new development would not be visible from the rear windows of the flat and would not unduly impact on the privacy, daylight or outlook for the occupants of this dwelling.
- 6.25 Whilst it is recognised that there would be an intensification of both residential and commercial uses at the site, Staff are of the view that due to the building's positioning and design the proposal would not result in a more harmful impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers compared on what is present on the site currently.
- 6.26 On balance it is not considered that the proposed development would present any undue issues in relation to privacy, overlooking or loss of daylight and overshadowing in accordance with Policy DC61, the Residential Design SPD and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

Environmental Issues

- 6.27 Environmental Health have raised no objections in relation to any historical contaminated land issues, but have recommended a precautionary standard contamination investigation condition.
- 6.28 The site is not located within a Flood Zone and presents no issues in relation to flood risk.
- 6.29 The proposal is not considered to give rise to any significant noise issues that would not normally be associated with residential or commercial occupation within a Major Local Centre.

Trees

- 6.30 The Gubbins Lane site frontage is lined by several young sycamore trees as well as a section of young self-sown vegetation. The trees would be removed as part of the development, but are not subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Given the type and quality of the trees and vegetation their removal is considered to be acceptable in this instance.
- 6.31 To the south of the site the mature Horse Chestnut tree located within the pavement edge adjacent to Station Road would not be affected by the proposed development.

Parking and Highway Issues

- 6.32 Policy DC33 seeks to ensure all new developments make adequate provision for car parking. In this instance the application site is located within an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 4, meaning that the site offers a good degree of access to surrounding public transport.
- 6.33 The existing service road from Gubbins Lane would be retained allowing the commercial units to be serviced from the rear of the site. The Local Highway Authority has raised no objection with regard to the proposed servicing arrangements, but have requested that additional information in relation to pedestrian visibility splays is requested via condition, to ensure the safe ingress and egress of servicing vehicles at the access entrance from Gubbins Lane.
- 6.34 The proposal would not include any dedicated off street car parking provision for the flats or commercial units and the objection received refers to this. The supporting statement highlights the close proximity of a number of public transport nodes including Harold Wood train station located directly

opposite and a number of frequent bus routes on Station Road and Gubbins Lane, as well as a taxi rank within 200 metres of the site.

- 6.35 The Local Highway Authority has raised no objections with regard to car parking, subject to the applicant entering into a S106 to prevent future residents and business operators from applying for resident or business parking permits. This would prevent subsequent overspill onto the surrounding highway network.
- 6.36 Commercial and residential refuse stores and a secure cycle storage facility would be provided to the north of the site in the single storey section of the building adjacent to the entrance to the servicing road. The refuse store would be set at a distance well within 25 metres from the highway and therefore within the distance reasonably expected for refuse collection operatives to walk to collect waste.

Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy

- 6.37 The proposed development will create 6no. residential units with 469 square metres of new gross internal floor space. Therefore the proposal is liable for Mayoral CIL and will incur a charge of £9,380.00 (subject to indexation) based on the calculation of £20.00 per square metre.

Infrastructure Impact of Development

- 6.38 Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (CIL Regs) states that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:
- (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.
- 6.39 Policy DC72 of the Council's LDF states that in order to comply with the principles as set out in several of the Policies in the Plan, contributions may be sought and secured through a Planning Obligation. Policy DC29 states that the Council will seek payments from developers required to meet the educational need generated by the residential development. Policy 8.2 of the Further Alterations to the London Plan states that development proposals should address strategic as well as local priorities in planning obligations.
- 6.40 In 2013, the Council adopted its Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document which sought to apply a tariff style contribution to all development that resulted in additional residential dwellings, with the contributions being pooled for use on identified infrastructure.

- 6.41 There has been a recent change to the effect of the CIL Regs in that from 6th April 2015, Regulation 123 of the CIL Regs states that no more than 5 obligations can be used to fund particular infrastructure projects or infrastructure types. As such, the SPD, in terms of pooling contributions, is now out of date, although the underlying evidence base is still relevant and up to date for the purposes of calculating the revised S106 contributions.
- 6.42 The evidence background to the SPD, contained in the technical appendices is still considered relevant. The evidence clearly show the impact of new residential development upon infrastructure - at 2013, this was that each additional dwelling in the Borough has a need for at least £20,444 of infrastructure. Therefore, it is considered that the impact on infrastructure as a result of the proposed development would be significant and without suitable mitigation would be contrary to Policy DC72 of the LDF and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.
- 6.43 Furthermore, evidence clearly shows a shortage of school places in the Borough - (London Borough of Havering Draft Commissioning Plan for Education Provision 2015/16-2019/20). The Commissioning report identifies that there is no spare capacity to accommodate demand for secondary, primary and early years school places generated by new development. The cost of mitigating new development in respect to all education provision is £8,672 (2013 figure from Technical Appendix to SPD). On that basis, it is necessary to continue to require contributions to mitigate the impact of additional dwellings in the Borough, in accordance with Policy DC29 of the LDF.
- 6.44 Previously, in accordance with the SPD, a contribution of £6000 per dwelling was sought, based on a viability testing of the £20,444 infrastructure impact. It is considered that, in this case, £6000 towards education projects required as a result of increased demand for school places is reasonable when compared to the need arising as a result of the development.
- 6.45 It would therefore be necessary to require a contribution to be used for educational purposes. Separate monitoring of contributions would take place to ensure that no more than 5 contributions are pooled for individual projects, in accordance with CIL legislation. It is considered that a contribution equating to £36,000 for educational purposes would be appropriate.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 Having regard to all relevant factors and material planning considerations Staff are of the view that this proposal would be acceptable.
- 7.2 Staff consider that the proposed development raises considerations in relation to the impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene and the impact on the amenity of the neighbouring residents. On balance the proposal is considered to be acceptable in all material respects.

- 7.3 Staff are of the view that the siting, scale and location of the proposal would not be disproportionate or have a harmful impact on the character of the streetscene or result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in all other respects and it is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and the completion of a legal agreement.
- .

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

Financial contributions will be sought through the legal agreement.

Legal implications and risks:

Legal resources will be required for the completion of a legal agreement.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities implications and risks:

The Council's planning policies are implemented with regard to equality and diversity.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application form received on 9 October 2015, amended drawings and supporting statements received 10 March 2016.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE

28 April 2016

REPORT

Subject Heading:

P1020.15: 57 Rockingham Avenue

Garage conversion of double garage with extension to form a granny flat for family on site (Application received 12 November 2015)

Ward

Hylands

Report Author and contact details:

Helen Oakerbee
Planning Manager
helen.oakerbee@havering.gov.uk
01708 432800

Policy context:

Local Development Framework
The London Plan
National Planning Policy Framework

Financial summary:

None

The subject matter of this report deals with the following Council Objectives

Havering will be clean and its environment will be cared for	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
People will be safe, in their homes and in the community	<input type="checkbox"/>
Residents will be proud to live in Havering	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY

The application is for the alteration and extension of an existing detached garage, to enable its conversion into a residential annexe connected with the existing dwelling at 59 Rockingham Avenue. The proposal is judged acceptable in all

material respects but this is subject to conditions and also completion of a legal agreement to ensure that the unit remains as an annexe to the main dwelling and not a separate residential unit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the application is unacceptable as it stands but would be acceptable subject to applicant entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the following:

- That the residential annexe hereby approved shall be permanently retained as an annexe to the existing dwelling at 57 Rockingham Avenue and shall not be sub-divided or sold off separately from the main dwelling.
- The Developer/Owner pay the Council's reasonable legal costs in association with the preparation of a legal agreement, prior to completion of the agreement, irrespective of whether the legal agreement is completed.
- The Developer/Owner to pay the appropriate planning obligation/s monitoring fee prior to completion of the agreement.

That the Head of Regulatory Services be authorised to enter into a legal agreement to secure the above and upon completion of that agreement, grant subject to the conditions set out below:

1. Time limit - The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

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

2. Accordance with plans - The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason: The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

3. Matching Materials - All new external finishes shall be carried out in materials to match those of the existing building(s) to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

4. Porches - Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, no porches shall be erected to the front or side of the extension hereby permitted, without the express permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In the interests of amenity and to enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over future development, and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

5. Removal of permitted development rights - Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), no extension or enlargement (including additions to roofs) shall be made to the annexe hereby permitted, without the express permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In the interests of amenity and to enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over future development, and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

6. Flank windows - Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), no window or other opening (other than those shown on the submitted and approved plan) shall be formed in the flank wall(s) of the annexe hereby permitted, unless specific permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has first been sought and obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In order to ensure a satisfactory development that will not result in any loss of privacy or damage to the environment of neighbouring properties which exist or may be proposed in the future, and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

7. Sub-division - The garden area shall not be subdivided at any time and nor shall there be any additional pedestrian or vehicular accesses into the site.

Reason:-

In order that the annex approved remains ancillary to the main dwelling and that the development accords with Policy DC61 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

8. Occupancy - Any residential occupation of the building hereby approved shall be limited to immediate family members of the family occupying the main house at 57 Rockingham Avenue for residential purposes and shall not be occupied by any other persons.

Reason:-

In order that the annex approved remains ancillary to the main dwelling and that the development accords with Policy DC61 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

9. Incidental Use - The outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be arranged or disposed of as a separate unit of residential accommodation from the use of the main dwelling.

Reason:-

In order that the annex approved remains ancillary to the main dwelling and that the development accords with Policy DC61 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

Informatives:

1. The planning obligations recommended in this report have been subject to the statutory tests set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and the obligations are considered to have satisfied the following criteria:-
 - (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.
2. Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

REPORT DETAIL

1. Site Description

- 1.1 The subject site is located at the end of Rockingham Avenue with access from a private driveway. The site contains a two-storey dwelling. The detached garage is located to the west of the dwelling and is constructed of brick and tile and with a gabled roof with the ridge running parallel to the front.
- 1.2 The surrounding environment is an established residential area. The primary characteristics of the area are large, two-storey detached dwellings located at the front of the site with garages either located standalone or attached to the dwelling.

2. Description of Proposal

- 2.1 The proposal is for extensions and alterations to the existing garage to convert it into a granny annexe which will be ancillary to the main dwelling on the site. The proposal consists of a 3.3m rear extension and 3m side extension which will be single storey with a maximum height of 3.5m (gabled roof). The garage doors will be retained.

3. History

- 3.1 P0897.14: Proposed garage conversion with extension to rear to form a self-contained residential accommodation for granny flat with separate front gate entrance - withdrawn

P1697.14: Garage conversion with extension to form granny flat - withdrawn

4. Consultation/Representations

- 4.1 A total of 27 parties were consulted as part of the planning application process. No objections have been received.
- 4.2 Highways raise no objection to the proposals.
- 4.3 The Fire Brigade confirm no additional fire hydrants are required and they are satisfied with access arrangements.

5. Relevant Policy

- 5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework is relevant to this application.

5.2 Policies 3.5, 7.4, 7.6 and 8.3 of the London Plan are material considerations.

5.3 Policies CP1, CP17, DC3, DC32, DC61 and DC72 of the LDF are relevant, as is the Residential Design SPD.

6. Staff Comments

6.1 The issues arising from this application are the principle of development, its impact on local character and amenity, the suitability of the residential accommodation and resultant living environment, the impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers and parking and highway issues.

6.2 Principle of Development

6.2.1 The Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD defines a residential annexe as accommodation that is ancillary to the main dwelling within the residential curtilage and must only be used for this purpose. The guidance states that the annexe must form part of the same planning unit, sharing facilities, including access, parking and garden areas.

6.2.2 The layout, design and physical relationship between the house and the proposed annexe are therefore important considerations, and the proposed annexe must demonstrate clear connections with the main dwelling. The size and scale of the accommodation to be provided should be proportionate to the main dwelling. As a guide, the scale should be such that the annexe could be used as a part of the main dwelling once any dependency need has ceased.

6.2.3 Although it is capable of independent occupation by virtue of its facilities, it would be unlikely to be occupied by anyone other than people closely associated with the occupants of the main house and who would therefore be content to share the remaining curtilage area to the main dwelling and live closely overlooked by those in the main house. It is considered the relationship with the curtilage of the main dwelling would limit this to use as an annexe. The applicant has confirmed that the conversion is intended to be used by the elderly mother of the applicant as residential accommodation and Staff are satisfied that the development is to be undertaken as an annexe to the main house. It is recommended however that the applicant enter into a legal agreement as there is a concern that it would be relatively easy to sub-divide the plot in the future, given the location of the annexe building to the front site boundary and the ability to access it from Rockingham Avenue independent of the house.

6.3 Design and Impact in Streetscene

6.3.1 Given the setback from the public highway and the location and scale of the extension the proposal will not have an adverse effect on the street scene.

6.3.2 The surrounding environment comprises of large-scale, standalone dwellings on large plots of land. The proposal introduces an extended outbuilding with a footprint of 47sqm within a side garden environment. Visually it is considered the proposal would be satisfactory and the retention of garage doors on it would further reinforce the building's outward appearance as a garage. The extensions to be building will be to the rear and will not be readily visible from the street. The building is also set back approximately 30m from the highway. Given the orientation of the building the proposed extensions will not be visible. There will not be any adverse effects on the street scene as a result.

6.3.3 The proposal will create additions to the existing garage within the area of side garden. While this increases the size of the building this is still largely in keeping with the size and scale of other outbuildings in the surrounding area. The proposed development is not considered to be incongruous.

6.4 Impact on Amenity

6.4.1 The proposed extension will be located within the rear garden environment of No. 57 Rockingham Avenue. Given the screening provided by the existing fence and vegetation, the size and scale of this extension will not have adverse overlooking, dominance or overshadowing effects on the adjoining site. The common boundary tapers in towards the subject site which diminishes the bulk of the building as viewed from the adjoining site.

6.5 Highway/parking

6.5.1 The development is considered as an annexe to the main dwelling and is expected to share facilities, including parking with the main dwelling. The proposal shows scope for additional car parking space on the site, which can be accommodated within the area of private driveway, therefore the loss of the garage space will not generate additional on-street parking demand. This application has been assessed by Havering's Highway Engineers who raise no objections to the proposal.

6.6 Section 106

6.6.1 Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (CIL Regs) states that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:

- (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.

6.6.2 The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD states that in order for a residential annex to be defined as accommodation ancillary to the main dwelling within the residential curtilage the annex must form part of the same planning unit and share facilities, including access, parking and garden areas.

6.6.3 The applicant has provided information relating to the future use of the garage, which will be used as a granny annex ancillary to the main dwelling. It will not be used as a separate unit of residential accommodation. It is not therefore judged that the proposal requires the payment of an infrastructure contribution towards education provision.

6.6.4 It would however be necessary for the applicant to enter into a legal agreement to ensure that the building will be used as a secondary and incidental part of the main residential activity on the site and not as a separate planning unit.

7. Conclusion

7.1 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle and not to have any adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity. The proposal is judged to provide a suitable level of residential accommodation provided it is used as an annexe to the main dwelling, and thereby maintains access to the shared amenity area and to off street parking provision. In order to secure this and given the potential for the outbuilding to be separately occupied in the future, it is considered that the applicant should enter into a legal agreement to prevent the sub-division and independent occupation. Subject to prior completion of this legal agreement and planning conditions the proposal is judged to be acceptable.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications and risks:

None.

Legal Implications and risks:

Legal resources will be needed for the completion of the legal agreement.

Human Resource Implications:

None.

Equalities and Social Inclusion Implications:

Planning policies take into consideration equalities issues. The proposal will provide a form of accommodation that meets the particular needs of an individual.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Planning application P1020.15, received 12.11.15

This page is intentionally left blank