



REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE

3rd April 2014

REPORT

Subject Heading:

P0108.14 – Land adjacent to 18 Ainsley Avenue, Romford

Proposed three bedroom detached dwelling (Received 5 February 2014)

Report Author and contact details:

Helen Oakerbee
Planning Manager (Applications)
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

Clean, safe and green borough	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Excellence in education and learning	<input type="checkbox"/>
Opportunities for all through economic, social and cultural activity	<input type="checkbox"/>
Value and enhance the life of every individual	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY

This planning application proposes the construction of a three bedroom detached dwellinghouse on a plot adjacent to 18 Ainsley Avenue, Romford.

Councillor Barry Oddy has called in the application as a matter of judgement of consistency with other similar developments within the area.

This application is considered to be unacceptable on the grounds that the proposed dwelling would appear cramped and represent an overdevelopment of the site and secondly, the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the payment of infrastructure costs in accordance with the planning obligation SPD.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that planning permission be refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed development would by reason of its design and proximity to the boundaries of this corner site, appear as an unacceptably cramped development being visually obtrusive and harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene, contrary to the aims and objectives of Policy DC61 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.
2. In the absence of a mechanism to secure payment of a contribution towards the cost of infrastructure associated with the development the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

REPORT DETAIL

1. Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is adjacent (to the west side) of the host property No.18 Ainsley Avenue which lies within a corner plot to the north of Ainsley Avenue and to the east of Burlington Avenue in Romford.
- 1.2 18 Ainsley Avenue is a detached 2 storey house which benefits from an attached side garage, rear single storey extension, front drive, rear lawn garden with a detached rear garage and rear parking access from Burlington

Avenue. The existing boundary contains a brick wall of approximately 1 metre high and landscaping.

- 1.3 The surrounding area is predominantly residential and characterised by mainly 2 storey semi-detached and terraced family dwellinghouses, many of which have existing extensions.

2. Description of Proposal

- 2.1 Full planning permission is sought for a three bedroom detached dwellinghouse, it would be 13.5 metres deep on the ground floor and 11.5 metres deep on the first floor, 4.75 metres height to the eaves, 7.3 metres height to the highest part of the ridge, and 5 metres in width. It would be constructed in tile and brick with render to match the materials of the host property.
- 2.2 The existing plot would be sub-divided, with the proposed dwelling having 190 square metres floor area. The proposed dwelling would have its own rear garden and off-street car parking area to the rear where there is an existing a double gate access form Burlington Avenue and hardstanding.
- 2.3 The ground floor of the proposed dwelling would comprise a kitchen unit to the front and a lounge to the rear with a utility room and WC in between, the first floor would contain three bedrooms and a bathroom.

3. Relevant Planning History

- 3.1 P0109.14 Two storey rear extension Approved 24 March 2014.

4. Consultations/Representations

- 4.1 19 Neighbour notification letters were sent. 2 letters of objection have been received to date, which are summarised as follows;

-Loss of street view upon entry into and out of Burlington Avenue/Ainsley Avenue

-The house will not be in line or character with existing properties

-Overlooking to neighbouring gardens resulting in loss of privacy as the proposal extends further rearwards than the host property

- There is barely room for a house on what is currently a garden

-Spoils outlook

-Increased parking problems

Officer's response, the above issues have been carefully looked at assessed within the paragraphs 9 and 10 below.

- 4.2 Essex & Suffolk Water – No objections
- 4.3 Environmental Protection – No objections subject to suitable conditions
- 4.4 Highways – No objections
- 4.5 London fire and Emergency Planning Authority – No objections

5 Relevant Policies

- 5.1 Policies CP17 (Design), DC33 (Car parking), DC61 (Urban Design), of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Documents are material planning considerations. In addition, Policies 7.4 (Local character) of the London Plan and Chapters 7 (Requiring good design) and 8 (Promoting healthy communities) of the National Planning Policy Framework are relevant.

6. Staff Comments

- 6.1 The issues in respect of this application are the principle of development, impact on the streetscene, design, amenity issues, and parking and highways implications.

7. Principle of Development

- 7.1 The site lies outside the Metropolitan Green Belt, Employment Areas, Commercial Areas, Romford Town Centre and District and Local Centres. The principle of residential development is considered acceptable in land-use terms and the provision of additional housing is consistent with the NPPF as the application site is within an established urban area.
- 7.2 Policy CP1 indicates that outside town centres and the Green Belt, priority will be made on all non-specifically designated land for housing. The proposal is for the development of a residential dwellinghouse on an existing residential site. The proposal is therefore acceptable in principle and in accordance with Policy CP1.

8. Density/Layout

- 8.1 It is proposed to erect a detached house. Policy 3.5 of the London Plan states that Local Development Frameworks should incorporate minimum space standards. The Mayor has set these (for 3 bedroom 2 storey houses) at 74 square metres for 4 person, and 86 for a 5 person, and 95 for a 6 person house. The floor area of the proposed dwelling house is

approximately 108 square metres and therefore within accordance with the Mayor's standards.

- 8.2 The Havering Local Plan sets out a density range of 55-175 units per hectare for the Romford suburban area, the application site measures at 190 square metres which is 0.019 hectares. The proposal of 1 dwelling in this area and would be calculated to 53 units per hectares. Although it falls slightly short of the density matrix within the adopted plan, the density is considered acceptable as it is in character of the area, in that there are other houses that have been built on corner plot properties.
- 8.3 The Council's Design for Living SPD in respect of amenity space recommends that 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.
- 8.4 The application proposes the sub-division of the existing plot of the donor property to provide approximately 40 square metres of private amenity space for the rear of the proposed dwelling and leaving approximately 50 square metres for the existing dwelling. This is considered to be a sufficient amount and would not be significantly overlooked by other dwellings due to the existing side and rear boundary which are of a sufficient height.
- 8.5 Each habitable room within the dwelling would be of a suitable size and would be served with a clear opening for suitable light and outlook.
- 8.6 With the above taken into consideration, the living accommodation for the proposed dwelling house and the existing dwelling is considered to be adequate and usable.

9. Design and Appearance

- 9.1 Policy DC61 states that development should respond to local building forms and patterns of development and respect the scale, massing and height of surrounding physical context.
- 9.2 Within close proximity to the site of the proposed development there are a number of examples of corner plot developments detailed below:
- 9.3 No.30 Derby Avenue to the north of the application site, was given consent under permission P1982.08 for a new dwelling (Implemented), this is a new house attached to an end of terrace dwelling (No.28), it matched the terrace in terms of design, floorspace, height, width and depth with a single storey rear extension of 3.3 metres in depth.
- 9.4 No.28 Kimberly Avenue, adjoining Burlington Avenue, was given was given consent under permission P0285.04 for a new dwelling (Implemented), this

is a new house attached to an end of semi-detached pair of houses (No.28 & 26), it matched No.28 in terms of floorspace, height width and depth. Much like this application, the original donor property had an application (P0284.04) for a 2 storey rear extension to be read simultaneously to the new dwelling, however, unlike this application, it was considered acceptable as the extensions for the host and new property would be attached together to give a uniform appearance and would be subservient to the host dwelling, which is in character with the other similar properties within the street to have dwellings and extensions attached to the host dwelling.

- 9.5 With regard to other types of development that have been given permission nearby, such as the extension built on No.20 Ainsley Avenue (adjacent corner plot facing the application site), the majority of them are side and rear extensions which are ancillary to the main dwellinghouse.
- 9.6 The proposed house would be smaller in height and approximately 13.5 metres deep on the ground floor and 11.5 on the first floor. The depth is substantially greater than the majority of the other houses in the neighbourhood. It is acknowledged that the donor property has an existing rear extension and a proposal to erect a 2 storey rear extension of the same depth of the new house. However, the depth of the house is substantially deeper than the other houses within the neighbourhood, and narrower in width than any other, which would make it appear out-of-character.
- 9.7 The donor property is rather unusual within the neighbourhood being a detached property. The majority, if not all, of the other residential properties in the neighbourhood are semi-detached or terraced houses, however, proposing a detached house is not unacceptable in principle per se.
- 9.8 However, unlike the examples given above, staff consider that a detached dwellinghouse with its large size and bulk on a narrow corner plot, would appear extremely cramped and would make it appear out-of-character and prominent to the streetscene.
- 9.9 The width of the application site is 6 metres from the proposed boundary with host property and the boundary adjoining the footpath on Burlington Avenue. As mentioned above, the proposed property would be 5 metres in width, which would leave a 500mm gap on each side to the donor property and the highway.
- 9.10 Although not directly related to this proposed detached house, the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD is considered relevant, the document against which all applications are assessed, advises that side extensions to corner properties should maintain a separation of 1m from the back edge of the footway, in which the proposal would not be.
- 9.11 The application site on a corner plot is widely visible on the streetscene, as such, it would allow distant views to the proposed dwelling. The large size and bulk of the dwelling on a narrow plot would appear visually obtrusive, harmful and out-of-character to the appearance of the street scene.

9.12 Staff consider that the proposal would be overdevelopment as it would amount to a cramped form of development within the corner plot and would detract from the character of the local area and would therefore be unacceptable in this instance. It is therefore considered that the development would not safeguard and preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore unacceptable and fails to accord with Policy DC61 and advice contained within the NPPF.

10. Impact on Amenity

10.1 Policy DC61 of the LDF requires new development not to harm the amenities of adjoining occupiers by reason of noise and disturbance, loss of light, overlooking or other impacts.

10.2 The nearest neighbouring properties of the proposed dwelling would be the adjoining the donor dwelling No.17 Kimberley Avenue and No.20 Ainsley Avenue. As mentioned above, the donor property would not be materially affected as it does not have side facing windows. As mentioned above, an application has been made for a 2 storey rear extension to the donor property, in the event that both applications were given consent a condition would be required to ensure completion of the extension application prior to the commencement of the new dwelling. Therefore, both occupants would not be affected by loss of light and outlook nor any overlooking issues. In regards to the other two neighbours, the distances are considered to be substantial enough to not create material amenity impact as the distances to No.17 and No.20 are 16 metres and 36 metres distance away respectively.

10.3 It should be noted that if the Committee considers that planning permission be granted for this development, it would be subject to a condition for the completion of the proposed extension in planning permission P0109.14 (as mentioned above).

10.4 With the above taken into consideration, staff are therefore satisfied that the proposed development is sufficiently removed from residential properties and unlikely to result in any material harm. The development is considered to be acceptable in this respect and to accord with the principles of Policy DC61.

11. Parking and highway issues

11.1 The application site is in a part of the Borough that has a PTAL rating of 1-2, Policy DC2 of the LDF indicates that in this part of the Borough parking provision for residential development should be 2 to 1.5 spaces per unit. The proposal provides four car parking spaces, two for the donor and two for the proposed dwelling. The parking provision is in line with policy guidelines and considered acceptable.

- 11.2 The two parking spaces to the rear of the property is for the new dwelling and already exists with its own hardstanding access and double gate opening, there would not be any external alterations to this current arrangement.
- 11.2 With the above taken into consideration with the appropriate conditions, it is considered that the proposal considered being acceptable and accords with the principles of Policy DC 33.

12. Mayoral CIL and Section 106 implications

- 12.1 The total additional internal floor space would be 108 square metres floor area, this would equal a Mayoral CIL contribution of £2160.
- 12.2 A financial contribution of £6000 per dwelling unit towards the infrastructure costs arising from the development would be required to fulfil the requirements of the Planning Obligations SPD.
- 12.3 The proposal is for one dwellinghouse, therefore the contribution required would be £6,000.
- 12.4 The applicant was been made aware of the contributions payable in the event of planning permission being granted. It should be noted that there is no agreement in place to secure the financial contribution.
- 12.5 As such in the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

13. Conclusion

- 13.1 Staff consider that the principle of residential development in this location is suitable, however the site is not considered to be appropriate for the a detached dwelling.
- 13.2 The proposal would appear as a cramped overdevelopment of the site, adversely impacting on the character of the streetscene and in particular the openness of this corner location.
- 13.3 There was nothing submitted or agreed by the applicant in securing a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal.
- 13.4 For the reasons outlined above within the report, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable and refusal is recommended as it would be contrary to the provisions of the Havering Supplementary Planning Documents and

Policy DC61 and DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications and risks:

None directly arising from this application.

Legal Implications and risks:

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

Human Resource Implications:

None

Equalities and Social Inclusion Implications:

None directly arising from this application.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application form, drawings and supporting statement received on 5th February 2014.