



<b>Application Reference:</b>	<b>P0464.18</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>98 &amp; 100 Woodfield Drive, Romford</b>
<b>Ward:</b>	<b>Romford Town</b>
<b>Description:</b>	<b>Proposed attached dwellings to No. 98 &amp; 100 Woodfield Drive, Gidea Park.</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Adèle Hughes</b>
<b>Reason for Report to Committee:</b>	<b>A Councillor call-in has been received</b>

---

### **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 The application was called in by former Councillor Frederick Thompson prior to the implementation of the delegated power changes agreed by Governance Committee and Council. The call-in has been honoured on the basis on which it was originally lodged.

### **2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 This application is very similar to that previously refused under reference P0560.17. It is Staff's view that the insufficient and poor quality provision of amenity space for three-bedroom, five person proposed dwellings in this location would result in a cramped layout harmful to the amenity of future occupiers. It is considered that the proposed dwellings would, by reason of their uncharacteristic form, scale, bulk, combined with their prominent corner location, fail to integrate satisfactorily with the donor properties and appear incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, this application is recommended for refusal on streetscene and amenity space grounds and the lack of a planning obligation to secure a financial contribution towards education.

### **3 RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 That the Committee resolve to refuse planning permission on the following grounds:
- 1) The proposed dwellings would, by reason of their uncharacteristic form, scale, bulk, combined with their prominent corner location, fail to integrate satisfactorily with the donor properties and appear incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene harmful to the character and

appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

- 2) The proposed development would, by reason of the poor quality amenity space provision, be insufficient for the requirements of the proposed family dwellings in this location, resulting in a cramped layout to the detriment of future occupiers and the character of the surrounding area. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Design SPD.
- 3) In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.

## **4 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS**

### **4.1 Proposal**

- The proposal involves two attached dwellings to No.'s 98 & 100 Woodfield Drive, Gidea Park.
- It is noted there is a discrepancy on Drawing No. 8297/P101 Revision A, as the proposed ground floor plan states that its to a scale of 1:200, which is incorrect, as it appears to be to a scale of 1:100, although this has not affected the determination of this application.
- It is noted there is a discrepancy on Drawing No. 8297/P102 Revision B, as the proposed first floor and roof plans state that they are to a scale of 1:200, which is incorrect, as it appears to be to a scale of 1:100, although this has not affected the determination of this application.

### **4.2 Site and Surroundings**

- The application site comprises of a pair of two storey semi-detached residential dwellings with attached garages and single storey rear extensions located on the northern side of Woodfield Drive, Gidea Park.

### **4.3 Planning History**

P0560.17 – Proposed attached dwellings to No. 98 & 100 Woodfield Drive – Refused on grounds of lack of internal space, poor quality amenity space provision, streetscene and planning obligation grounds.

## **5 CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

- 5.1 The views of the Planning Service are expressed in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section below.

## **6 LOCAL REPRESENTATION**

- 6.1 A total of 24 neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment.

6.2 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 9, which all objected

6.3 The following Councillor made representations:

- Former Councillor Frederick Thompson called this application in on behalf of Mr Keith Platt of 98 Woodfield Drive, the underlying applicant for committee consideration if it is recommended for refusal under delegated powers on the grounds that: the conversion into a small terrace is not out of keeping in the road which has several terraces from the original estate. The street scene is not meaningfully impacted by these sympathetically designed extension properties. Also from another point of view the additions will enhance the insulation of the donor properties more than that provided by a cavity wall filled with blown insulation. Furthermore the paved frontages provide excellent space for off-road parking

### **Representations**

6.4 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application, and they are addressed in substance in the next section of this report:

#### Objections

- Reference was made to the previous planning application, P0560.17 and overdevelopment. The previous reasons for refusal still apply to this application.
- Parking.
- Highway safety, as the proposed car parking spaces are located on a bend in the road.
- Overlooking.
- Loss of light, including to neighbouring rear gardens.
- Access.
- Loss of privacy.
- Overdevelopment.
- Noise, disruption and mess during construction works (Officer comment: Noise, disturbance, hours of construction and wheel washing during construction can be addressed by appropriate planning conditions).
- The proposal will be out of keeping in the streetscene.
- There is insufficient space to accommodate two additional houses.
- The rear gardens of the proposed dwellings are oddly shaped and are not of a sufficient size or quality for this area.
- It is suggested that those making a decision on whether the proposal is granted should view the site (Officer comment: The Case Officer has undertaken a site visit).
- Visual impact.
- Removal of trees and bushes (Officer comment: There are no Tree Preservation Orders on the site).

- The area of the proposed dwelling at 100a Woodfield Drive has reduced from 105 to 100 square metres.
- Queried if the lack of internal space has been addressed.

### **Non-material representations**

6.5 The following issues were raised in representations, but they are not material to the determination of the application:

- Insulation (Officer comment: Insulation is a building control matter and is not a material planning consideration).
- Reference to restricted covenants (Officer comment: These are not material planning considerations).
- Would have an adverse effect on property prices (Officer comment: Comments regarding the impact of the proposal on property value are not material planning considerations).
- Concerns that the alleyways adjacent to the site will be used for building materials, scaffolding and access for machinery and workmen (Officer comment: This is a civil matter and is not a material planning consideration).

6.6 Highways: No objection to the proposals, subject to conditions regarding cycle storage, vehicle access, vehicle cleansing, informatives and a legal obligation to prevent future occupiers from obtaining car parking permits if minded to grant planning permission. For the parking for No.100, the vehicle crossing to the site cannot be the full width of the premises because of a street tree, but there is enough space to provide access to the parking bays. No cycle storage details have been provided.

6.7 Environmental Health – No objection on noise grounds, contaminated land or air quality.

6.8 Fire Brigade – No objection. No additional fire hydrants are required.

6.9 StreetCare Department – Waste and recycling sacks need to be presented by 7am on the boundary of each property on Woodfield Drive on the scheduled collection day.

### **6.10 Procedural issues**

The following procedural issues were raised in representations, and are addressed below:

- Lack of consultation. (Officer comment: The first set of neighbour notification letters were sent to incorrect addresses, so a second set of consultation letters were sent out to the correct properties).

## **7 PLANNING HISTORY**

- This application follows a previous planning application on the site – reference P0560.17, for proposed attached dwellings to No. 98 & 100 Woodfield Drive, which was refused planning permission for the following reasons:

1) The proposed layout of the development would be inadequate resulting in substandard accommodation for future residents through lack of

internal space. As a result, the development represents an overdevelopment of the site contrary to Policies DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD, the Technical Housing Standards, the Housing Standards Minor Alterations to the London Plan, Policy 3.5 of the London Plan and the Housing SPG 2016.

2) The proposed development would, by reason of the poor quality amenity space provision, be insufficient for the requirements of the proposed family dwellings in this location, resulting in a cramped layout to the detriment of future occupiers and the character of the surrounding area. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Design SPD.

3) The proposed dwellings would, by reason of their uncharacteristic form, scale, bulk, combined with their prominent corner location, fail to integrate satisfactorily with the donor properties and appear incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

4) In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.

- The issue in this case is whether the revised proposal overcomes previously stated concerns. In this respect, the current application differs from the refused scheme, P0560.17 in the following key areas:
  - The gross internal floor area of 98a Woodfield Drive has reduced from 107 to 105 square metres.
  - The gross internal floor area of 100a Woodfield Drive has reduced from 105.5 to 100 square metres.
  - The gross internal floor area of Bedroom 2 (a double bedroom) of 100a and 98a has increased from 10.8 and 10 square metres respectively to 11.5 square metres.
  - The depth of the single storey rear projection of 100a has reduced from approximately 2.8m to 1.8m.
  - The size of the rear gardens of 100a and 98a have increased from 28 & 32 square metres to 51 and 54 square metres respectively.
  - The size of the rear gardens for 100 and 98 Woodfield Drive have reduced from 104 & 110 square metres to 87 and 95 square metres respectively.
  - The boundary lines to the front of 100 and 98 Woodfield Drive have increased from a width of between approximately 6.2-6.3 metres to 6.9 -7 metres.

## **8 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider are:

- Layout, including the quality and usability of the amenity space.
- The visual impact and impact on amenity arising from the proposed development.
- Highways and parking issues.

### **8.2 Layout**

- The proposed dwellings at 98a and 100a have a gross internal floor area of 105 and 100 square metres respectively. The size of the dwellings meets the 93 square metres for a three bedroom, 5 bed spaces, two storey dwelling contained in the Technical Housing standards. In comparison with the previous application, P0560.17, the gross internal floor area of Bedroom 2 (a double bedroom) of 100a and 98a has increased from 10.8 and 10 square metres respectively to 11.5 square metres, which meets the guidance and has addressed previous concerns regarding the lack of internal space. The dwellings meet all the remaining criteria of the Technical Housing Standards. It is considered that the dwellings would have a reasonable outlook and aspect.
- The Council's Design for Living SPD in respect of amenity space recommends that every home should have access to suitable private and/or communal amenity space in the form of private gardens, communal gardens, courtyards, patios, balconies or roof terraces. In designing high quality amenity space, consideration should be given to privacy, outlook, sunlight, trees and planting, materials (including paving), lighting and boundary treatment. All dwellings should have access to amenity space that is not overlooked from the public realm and this space should provide adequate space for day to day uses. The Residential Design SPD states that the size, shape and slope of amenity space is key to its usability. Awkwardly shaped, narrow and very steeply sloping amenity spaces should be avoided.
- In comparison with P0560.17, the size of the rear gardens for 100 and 98 Woodfield Drive have reduced from 104 & 110 square metres to 87 and 95 square metres respectively. Staff consider that the rear gardens of the donor properties would be acceptable given their depth and proportions and would provide sufficient space for outdoor dining, clothes drying and relaxation.
- It is noted that the depth of the single storey rear projection of 100a has reduced from approximately 2.8m to 1.8m. In addition, the size of the rear gardens of 100a and 98a has increased from 28 & 32 square metres to 51 and 54 square metres respectively. Nevertheless, the rear garden amenity space for the proposed dwellings is rather narrow with a maximum width of between approximately 5.6 and 6 metres, which tapers to a point. Having regard to the local character of surrounding development, the proposed dwellings would have a relatively narrow and an uncharacteristically small irregular shaped rear garden in comparison to those generally to be found for the adjacent properties.
- The Design and access Statement states that the application site is within 500m of the Lodge Avenue entrance to Lodge Farm Park, which would offer opportunities for outdoor recreation. Policy DC20 (Access to Recreation and Leisure Including Open Space) of the LDF states that the Council will seek the

provision of formal/informal play space within 400 metres from the home and Policy DC61 (Urban Design) that development should meet the needs of people of all ages, the proposal fails to meet both policies.

- Staff consider that the amenity space for the new dwellings is of poor quality, given that its irregular shape, narrow proportions and small size. It is Staff's view that the insufficient and poor quality provision of amenity space for three bedroom, five person proposed dwellings in this location would result in a cramped layout harmful to the amenity of future occupiers contrary to the Design for Living Supplementary Planning Document.

### **8.3 The visual impact of the proposal**

- Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document seeks to ensure that all new developments are satisfactorily located and are of a high standard of design and layout. In this regard it is important that new developments are compatible with the character of the local street scene and the surrounding area.
- In comparison with the previous application, P0560.17, the boundary lines to the front of 100 and 98 Woodfield Drive have increased from a width of between approximately 6.2-6.3 metres to 6.9 -7 metres, although Staff consider that this does not constitute an improvement and would not in any way mitigate the visual impact of the proposed development in the streetscene. The design, size and siting of the proposed dwellings remain the same as the previous application.
  - 5) The triangular shaped site occupies a prominent location on a bend in Woodfield Drive. There are significant concerns regarding the uncharacteristic form, scale and bulk of the dwellings, given their angled facades, which would appear incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. There are concerns that the proposed dwellings do not replicate the width and proportions of the donor properties. There are concerns that the proposed houses are (2 metres) wider than the donor properties, which would appear disproportionate and lack a symmetrical appearance. The proposed front elevation of the proposed dwellings does not accurately portray their angled elevations, although this has not affected the determination of this application. Given that the proposal remains largely the same as the previous application, Staff consider that the proposed dwellings would, by reason of their uncharacteristic form, scale, bulk, combined with their prominent corner location, fail to integrate satisfactorily with the donor properties and appear incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

### **8.4 Impact on residential amenity**

- Staff considered that the previous application, P0560.17, would not result in a significant loss of amenity to neighbouring properties.

- It is considered that the proposal would not have a significant impact on No. 96 Woodfield Drive, as it the proposed dwellings would generally align with its front and rear facades and there would be a separation distance of approximately 3.6m between 98a Woodfield Drive and the western flank wall of this neighbouring property, which would help to mitigate its impact.
- It is considered that the depth of the rear gardens of No.'s 93 to 101 Stanley Avenue would help to mitigate the impact of the proposal. Staff consider that the proposed dwellings would not result in a significant loss of light to the rear gardens of neighbouring properties over and above existing conditions as there are vehicular accesses either side of the site, which would help to mitigate the impact of the proposal.
- It is considered that the proposal dwellings would not create any additional overlooking or loss of privacy over and above existing conditions. The proposed dwellings do not have any flank windows. The first floor bathroom windows on the rear facades of the dwellings are shown on the plans as being obscure glazed and this can be secured by condition if minded to grant planning permission.

#### **8.5 Parking and Highway Implications**

- Staff considered that the previous application, P0560.17, would not result create any parking or highway issues. The site has a PTAL of 2 and therefore attracts a parking standard of 1.5 to 2 spaces per unit. There would be two car parking spaces each for the donor and proposed properties, which is acceptable.
- The Highway Authority has no objection to the proposals, subject to conditions regarding cycle storage, vehicle access, vehicle cleansing, informatives and a legal obligation to prevent future occupiers from obtaining car parking permits if minded to grant planning permission. For the parking for No.100, the vehicle crossing to the site cannot be the full width of the premises because of a street tree, but there is enough space to provide access to the parking bays. It is considered that the proposal would not create any highway safety issues, as the Highway Authority has no objection to the proposal. The plans show a new timber fence either side of No.'s 98 & 100 Woodfield Drive and a condition can be placed regarding a pedestrian visibility splay if minded to grant planning permission. The plans show permeable paving to the front gardens of the proposed dwellings and details of this can be requested through a landscaping condition if minded to grant planning permission. It is considered that the proposal would not create any parking or highway safety issues.

#### **8.6 Financial and Other Mitigation**

- The proposal would attract the following section 106 contributions to mitigate the impact of the development:
  - Up to £12,000 towards education.
- The proposal would attract the following Community Infrastructure Levy contributions to mitigate the impact of the development:

- £3,760 Mayoral CIL towards Crossrail

## **9 Conclusions**

- All other relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.