



<b>Application Reference:</b>	P1548.19
<b>Location:</b>	14 Haynes Road, Hornchurch, RM11 2HT
<b>Ward:</b>	Squirrels Heath
<b>Description:</b>	Full planning application for the demolition of a single-family dwelling and erection of six 2-storey Houses with accommodation in the roof, containing 5X4 bedroom and 1x3 bedroom, with associated access, 8 car parking spaces, refuse, recycle and bicycle storages area.
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Habib Neshat
<b>Reason for Report to Committee:</b>	A Councillor call-in has been received which accords with the Committee Consideration Criteria.

---

## 1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The proposed development has been subject to pre-application advice for a considerable period of time. The scheme has been revised several times by taking on board officer's advice
- 1.2 Councillor Melvin Wallace, has called in the application, concerning the loss of privacy and overbearing impact of the development upon the amenities of the adjoining occupiers.

## 2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The proposed development would provide suitable residential accommodation in a scheme which responds well to the specific site and location constraints by creating a contemporary design of buildings of balanced proportion using high quality materials.

- 2.2 Through careful design, siting and orientation, the scheme has sought to ensure its impact in terms of loss of light and privacy of the neighbouring occupiers would be acceptable.
- 2.2 The impact of the proposed development upon highways condition is acceptable. It would comply with key objective of the planning policies by providing six family housing units.

### **3 RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 That the Committee resolve to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions

#### **Conditions**

1. Time limit
2. Accordance with plans
3. Materials samples
4. Unknown contamination identification
5. Landscaping (as per details submitted)
6. Flank Window restriction
7. Boundary Treatment
8. External Lighting
9. Refuse & Recycling
10. Cycle Storage
11. Hours of construction
12. Car parking provision
13. Construction Methodology/Wheel Wash Facilities (Pre-commencement)
14. Removal of Permitted Development Rights
15. NOx Boilers
16. Delivery and Servicing Plan
17. Electric Vehicle Charge Points Provision
18. Flat roof areas not to be used for amenity space
19. No parking in access way
20. Access way should be layout out as approved
21. According to energy statement
22. According to ecology report.

#### **Informatives**

1. Approval following negotiation
2. CIL
3. Street numbering

## 4.1 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

### Proposal

- The proposal is to demolish the existing house and to replace it with a group of three semi-detached two storey buildings with further accommodation within the roofspace.
- The design would be articulated incorporating bay features, setbacks and recessed windows.
- The proposed building would be in brick, with zinc roof, aluminium windows.
- The proposal would provide five four bedroom houses and one three bedroom house. Each house would include a small garden to the rear.
- The existing access and drive way will be retained. The proposal will provide 8 car parking spaces, cycle storage and refuse store.

## 4.2 Amendments

- Over the past year the officers have been involved in negotiations on a number of pre application schemes with the applicant as follows;

### First Pre app submission

- The first scheme was submitted in May 2019. The proposed development incorporated 9 dwellings within a three storey block of flats and included 14 parking spaces. It was concluded that principle of development to increase supply of housing is acceptable. However, it was considered that the scheme was an overdevelopment taking into consideration the mass and the height of the proposed building in the context of the surrounding area.

### The second pre app submission

- This scheme was submitted in June 2019 for 7, two storey houses with accommodation in the roof and 14 parking spaces. The officers responded that the revised proposal was an improvement taking into consideration the reduced number of units from 9 to 7 and the change to a more appropriate design. The remaining issues were the position of the houses which were creating a poor quality public space for the site, concerns about overshadowing, loss of privacy, lack of access to Hardley Crescent and limited planting in a large area of hardstanding.

### **The third pre app submission**

- This was submitted in July 2019, for 6 two storey houses with accommodation within the roof and 10 parking spaces. The officers recommended a more contemporary style of development. Also that the mass of the third storey into the roof needs to be reduced and set back from the edges of the roof. The reduction of the dwellings to 6 units was considered acceptable.

### **Forth pre app submission**

- This scheme was submitted in September 2019, again for 6, two storey houses with accommodation to the roof and 9 parking spaces. This had incorporated a contemporary London vernacular style with the third floor considered to reduce the mass and the scale of the third storey roof accommodation in such a way that appears more as a 2 storey building.

### **Planning application**

- Full Plans submission was submitted in October 2019. The scheme incorporated 6 two storey Houses with accommodation to the roof and 9 parking spaces. The submission included Tree impact assessment, Energy Statement, Landscape Design, ecology report and daylight and sunlight statement.
- During the process of the application, further revision was requested. The main issues was the potential overlooking with the adjoining property at 12 Haynes Road. In order to address those issues the development was shifted away from the boundary with number 12 to create a separation between properties. Additionally the orientation of the window was directed away from the garden of this adjoining neighbour. Also the refuse storage area was relocated away from the living room window of number 12 Haynes Road.

## **4. Site and Surroundings**

4.3.1 The application relates to a single storey detached building on a site which measures approximately 1,400m<sup>2</sup>. The site is located on the western side of Haynes Road, in Hornchurch. The frontage to Haynes Road is limited to the vehicle access, with the remainder of the site located at the rear of properties on Hardley Crescent and Haynes Road.

4.3.2 The existing double storey detached dwelling is constructed from brown brick with a tiled pitched roof and is positioned on a NW-SE axis. The dwelling is set in a generous landscaped garden and parking is provided on hard

standing in front of the dwelling, a storage shed is located along the western boundary (to the rear of 16 and 18 Haynes Road).

- 4.3.3 There is also a pathway and gate to the rear of the house, providing a pedestrian access to Hardley Crescent.
- 4.3.4 The application building is not listed, nor it is within a conservation area and is not subject to an Article 4 direction.
- 4.3.5 The area is generally characterised by single and double storey semi-detached interwar dwellings with bay windows, brick, pebble dash or rendered walls and pitched tile roofs. The buildings are also generally within a generous plot of land.
- 4.3.6 Haynes Linear Park is located to the west of the application site. Gidea Park Railway Station is 800m to the west. Of notable community facilities is a private leisure centre within short distance of the application site.
- 4.3.7 The Public Transport Accessibility Level of the site is part 1b, part 2 – indicating an otherwise low level of public transport accessibility.

## **5 Consultation**

- 5.1 In accordance with planning performance agreement, the developer has consulted the local community on these proposals as part of the pre-application process.
- 5.2 On 23<sup>rd</sup> of August 2019 the applicant sent letters to several owners of the adjoining properties and additionally the brochure with their proposal for development for 14 Haynes Road. At that time the proposed scheme was the six 2 storey dwellings with accommodation within the roof, incorporating traditional house designs.
- 5.3 The applicant explains that they received several comments from the neighbours concerning overlooking/privacy, overdevelopment and highway safety issues. And in particular references were made to potential use of the site as a short cut from Haynes Road to Hardley Crescent.

### **Local representation;**

- 5.4 There have been two rounds of consultation. With respect to the original application a total of 63 neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment. The application has been publicised by way of one site notice displayed in the vicinity of the application site.

5.5 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application was 102, raising objections to the proposal. Also a petition signed by local residents (151 signatures) was received objecting to the proposals. With respect to the second round of consultation (January 2020) a total of 26 letters of objections were received. There is also an objection letter from the Emerson Park and Ardleigh Green Resident Association.

### **Representations**

5.6 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:

- Insufficient parking for the proposed number of units
- Increased parking stress within surrounding roads
- Against the character of the area
- Poor amenity space for the family housing
- No front garden to provide acceptable landscaping
- Noise and disturbance
- Loss of privacy/overlooking
- Restrictions to emergency service and waste vehicles accessing the site and other properties
- Loss of light/overshadowing
- Impact upon wildlife
- Pedestrian safety
- Security concerns
- Flooding of the neighbouring properties
- Over development of the site
- The design, bulk and scale would not be in keeping with the character of the area.
- Right of access
- Public sewers under the development
- Access as cut-through
- Loss of trees
- The plans do not represent the reality, with respect to trees
- Furthermore, one of the ward councillors, has called in the application, concerning the loss of privacy and the overbearing impact of the proposed development upon the amenities of the adjoining occupiers.

### **Non-material representations**

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

- There is a significant issue with respect to whether there is a public access way to the rear of the site. Further issues raised with respect to disturbances associated with construction phase of the proposed development.

**Internal and External Consultation:**

5.8 The following internal consultation has been undertaken:

- Highway Authority: No Objection
- Environmental Health: No Objection subject to conditions
- Waste and Recycling: No objection subject to the provision of suitable and compliant waste and recycling facilities.
- Thames Water: No comment
- Fire brigade; No hydrant would be required

**6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

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

- The principle of development
- Supply of housing
- The quality of housing provided
- The aesthetic quality of the development
- The impact upon amenities of the neighbours in terms of loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight and sense of enclosure, noise disturbance
- Ecology
- Energy Efficiency
- Impact upon community infrastructure

**The principle of development;**

6.1.1 The provision of additional housing is supported by the Local Plan policy CP1, The London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2019) as the application site is within a sustainable location in an established urban area.

6.1.2 The proposal will cover an area of land which currently in residential use. Under the provisions of the NPPF, there is no priority given to garden land as

a re-developable brownfield site, in effect stating that each application within a garden should be considered on its own merits. In terms of the Local Plan the site lies outside the Metropolitan Green Belt, Employment Areas, Commercial Areas, District and Local Centres and is within a predominantly residential area.

- 6.1.3 On this basis the proposal is considered to be policy compliant in land-use terms and its continued use for domestic residential purposes is therefore regarded as being acceptable in principle.

**The quality of the proposed accommodation;**

- 6.2.1 The 'DCLG Technical Housing Standards - nationally described space standard' specifies minimum internal space standards required for new dwellings. The Technical Housing Standards stipulate minimum gross internal floor areas (GIAs) for dwellings/units based on the number of bedrooms, intended occupants and storeys, minimum bedroom sizes of 7.5m<sup>2</sup> for single occupancy and 11.5m<sup>2</sup> for double/twin occupancy, plus further dimension criteria for such spaces. London Plan Policy 3.5 and the Housing SPG echo such requirements and the SPG provides further criteria to ensure an acceptable quality of accommodation is provided for users including in relation to entrance and approach routes, access to private open space, outlook, daylight and sunlight.
- 6.2.2 The proposed dwellings would provide suitable accommodation for six families. All habitable rooms as well as the dwelling sizes comply with the national space standards.
- 6.2.3 The habitable room windows are generally well positioned and proportioned windows which would provide adequate levels of light within these rooms. However, there would be a number of first floor windows to two habitable rooms which have been angled to avoid direct overlooking and provide a degree of privacy for the adjoining occupiers.
- 6.2.4 The Council's SPG does not recommend minimum out door amenity space requirement. The latest revised London Plan recommends; a minimum of 5m<sup>2</sup> of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1m<sup>2</sup> should be provided for each additional occupant. The proposal would provide a range of private garden sizes, from 30m<sup>2</sup>, to 90m<sup>2</sup>, which is considered to be a satisfactory provision in this case.. In addition the proposed development has sought to ensure the area to the front of the houses are designed in a manner that could act also as communal space. It is therefore, considered that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of the provision of amenity space.



### **6.3 Design and appearance;**

- 6.3.1 The revised NPPF emphasises that the new design should seek to enhance the character of the area and that poor design should be rejected. Havering planning policies (in particular DC61) also require high quality design and require that the development must respect the scale, massing and height of the surrounding context.
- 6.3.2 The proposed development has been subject to significant revisions since it was originally proposed. The Council's planning and urban design officers have been involved in shaping the resulting scheme and the applicants have been cooperative and responsive to the advice given by the officers.
- 6.3.3 The built environment within the immediate vicinity predominately comprises detached and semi-detached buildings either in the form of bungalows or two storey houses. The buildings display variety of design and generally benefit from generous plots. There have been some modifications and extensions which has affected the character of the area. In particular there are a number of roof alterations and loft conversions, creating second or third floors.
- 6.3.4 The application building in terms of its configuration, siting, bulk, scale, design and lack of street frontage forms an atypical site among others in the area. The application building itself lacks any significant architectural merit and therefore there is no objection to its demolition.
- 6.3.5 The proposed buildings would be two storeys high with the third floor within a roof space being set back from the edges of the roof to the front and rear so that the buildings would appear as a two storeys. The proposed building would use high-quality materials including two types of facing bricks, zinc roof and grey aluminium windows.
- 6.3.6 The site's particular characteristics creates a difficulty in achieving a traditional form of design. Therefore, the aim of the scheme has not been to create a development that appears simply as a traditional infill development, but instead it envisages a scheme to appear and feel as a small "close" that creates more visual interest and evoke sense of intimacy.
- 6.3.7 The strategy to adopt a design to reflect contemporary London vernacular design is considered to be the right approach in this case.
- 6.3.8 The individual houses incorporate a small amenity space area to the rear. However, the open space to the front which is depicted to be used for parking and manoeuvring of vehicles has been designed in a manner which would offer an opportunity to be used as communal amenity space.
- 6.3.9 The architectural features, including the setbacks, bay feature projection, use of materials, roof configuration all help to introduce articulations into the

design and create a set of buildings of visual interest. Further, the regularity in siting, spacing of the houses, eschewing variety of the design would result in a “mews” style development that responds well to the site constraints.

6.3.10 Although the proposed houses are sited away from the immediate street scene and are somewhat hidden by the surrounding buildings and to some extent by tree coverage, the proposed design is attractive and well-proportioned proposals that are primarily influenced by the concealed location. Their scale as two storeys with setback pitched roof, is appropriate to their location, demonstrating a responsive rather isolated form of development for the site.

6.3.11 The proposal has improved through the pre-application process and the applicant has been responsive in taking on comments. The quantum of development has decreased during this process, and is now at a level that could be reasonably accommodated within this site from an urban design point of view. The creation of a terrace of six single-fronted houses makes efficient use of the site and provides a clearly defined new street. The provision of the second floor bedroom within the pitch of the roof has helped to limit the height of the scheme and address overshadowing issues. The proposal is contemporary in style, and this approach is followed through consistently with the material palette, approach to detailing, window/door opening, and roof profile. This achieves a scheme of reasonable architectural quality that could integrate with the surrounding housing.

6.3.12 In conclusion, the proposed development does not have a significant street frontage. However, it would create a small court yard development with its own design which would have an acceptable impact upon the surroundings.

#### **6.4 Impact on neighbour amenities;**

6.4.1 Policy DC61 of Havering Councils states; “Planning permission will not be granted where the proposal results in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of sunlight/daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy to existing and new properties.”

6.4.2 Given the site location to the rear of a number of dwellings, it is important the proposed dwelling would be well proportioned and suitably located to mitigate any impacts on neighbouring amenities.

6.4.3 The site is bounded to the west by 24 Hardley Crescent, the far end of Hardley Crescent and front of 15 Hardley Crescent. To the North the application side is bounded by the side garden of number 12 Haynes Road, to the east lies the garden of 20 Haynes Road whilst the rear gardens of 14, 16 and 18 Haynes Road form the south side of the application side.

6.4.4 The main amenity issues to be considered are; the loss of daylight / sunlight, loss of privacy and noise, disturbance whether the buildings would appear over-dominant from surroundings resulting in loss of outlook. All these issues would be considered in depth below.

#### **Loss of daylight / sunlight**

6.4.5 By reason of its location, height and depth the proposal would not have a significant impact upon the amenities of the adjoining occupiers. The proposal will comply with the Building Research Establishment guidance. All affected windows would pass the 25 degree rule.

6.4.6 The applicant has also provided shadow diagram studies which indicate that the proposal is also in compliance with the sunlight standard set out in BRE guidance.

6.4.7 It is therefore concluded that the proposal would not result in a significant loss of daylight or sunlight to the neighbouring buildings.

#### **Loss of privacy;**

6.4.8 Due to its location, this aspect of the development has been the most challenging to design a scheme which would avoid significant loss of privacy to the neighbouring buildings.

6.4.9 Within back-land and infill development, minimum distances between the new and existing buildings are particularly important to ensure that the development would not result in loss of light and outlook and that privacy between the existing and new developments is maintained. Havering Residential Design Guide does not recommend a particular minimum separation distance between buildings or between the buildings and the garden boundaries. The guidance recommend rather than keeping distances to minimum level, any scheme should come up with appropriate mitigating measures to ensure the privacy of the adjoining neighbours are safeguarded.

6.4.10 Normally (within the urban area such as London context), a minimum separation distance of 18 to 22m at first floor level are recommended to be achieved between rear elevation of new houses and the existing to prevent loss of privacy. Further, a minimum distance of 9 to 11m should be maintained from the upper levels to boundaries with adjoining gardens.

#### **The impact upon 14 to 16 Haynes Road;**

6.4.11 The distances between the upper floors of the proposed houses and all the upper floors of the existing houses at 14 to 16 Haynes Road range from 22-24m in all areas, which is considered to be the optimum level in securing acceptable privacy. Furthermore, a minimum distance of 12 metres would be achieved between the upper floor windows of the proposed houses and the

boundary gardens of the adjoining houses. Therefore, the proposal would pass the normal test for privacy with respect to these neighbours.

#### **The impact upon 12 Haynes Road**

6.4.12 The back to back separation distance between the windows of number 12 Haynes Road and the proposed first dwelling unit is over 23m. However, officers have been concerned with the proximity of first floor windows of the proposed first house with the garden of number 12 Haynes Road which stood at about 1 metre to the boundary with number 12. Hence, in the final revision, the houses have been positioned away from the side boundary of number 12 by a minimum of 2.65m. Also one parking space (originally planned along the boundary with number 12) has been deleted from the scheme to be replaced by soft landscaping area. This separation is considered to be sufficient to ensure trees to be planted to provide a degree of screening between the proposed buildings and the garden of number 12. Furthermore, the closest window to proposed first house has been angled so that there would be no direct overlooking onto the garden of number 12.

#### **Impact upon number 18 Haynes Road**

6.4.13 The back to back distance between the application building and number 18 Haynes Road would be 23m which is an acceptable separation distance. However, number 18 Haynes Road benefits from a deeper garden in comparison with the buildings at number 14-16. Thus the proposal would not provide the normally recommended distance of 9m. In this case the first floor window of the last house has been angled away from the rear garden of number 20 to safeguard the privacy. This approach would ensure that the proposal would not create undue over-looking onto the privacy of the adjoining dwellings.

#### **Impact upon 20 Haynes Road**

6.4.14 The scheme has ensured that there would be no first floor window on the flank wall. The main bedroom window to the first floor is angled away from the rear garden of number 20. Therefore, the impact upon this neighbour in terms of loss of privacy is acceptable.

#### **Impact upon buildings in Hardley Crescent**

6.4.15 The proposed plots at number one and number two would face the front of number 15 and Hardley Crescent. The proposed units 3-5 would face the flank of number 24 Hardley Crescent and therefore, there would be no significant impact upon the privacy of these neighbouring buildings.

6.4.16 The unit at number 6 would face the garden of number 24 Hardley Crescent and therefore, it could result in the potential loss of privacy to this house.

Hence, a number of mitigating measures have been adopted to prevent the loss of privacy to this neighbour as follows;

- There would be no accommodation at the roof level.
- There would no clear windows at the first floor level directly overlooking the gardens of the application site.
- The main window to first floor window is well recessed and is angled towards the end of the garden.

6.4.17 The first floor side windows of all units at first floor level are shown to be obscurely glazed and a condition would recommended that these are maintained as obscured glazed and fixed closed below 1.7m internal height and that there should be no other opening on the flank other than those indicated to prevent any overlooking from the flank elevations.

6.4.18 In summary every effort has been made to ensure the privacy of the neighbouring buildings would be safeguarded and the levels of amenity afforded are considered to be acceptable.

## **6.5 Noise disturbance**

6.5.1 In general terms, it is noted that the development would create increased activity along the existing road and also increased activity at the site with the creation of new dwellings. This activity is however for a low-medium density residential development and the level of activity would not be out of keeping or at odds with those expected within the existing residential area. It is not considered this activity would be unreasonable or harmful in this suburban residential context.

## **6.6 Impact upon highways condition**

6.6.1 The NPPF recognises that sustainable transport has an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also contributing to wider health objectives. In particular it offers encouragement to developments which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and those which reduce congestion. The NPPF also outlines that developments which generate significant vehicle movements should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport options can be maximised. It is also expected that new development will not give rise to the creation conflicts between vehicular traffic and pedestrians.

6.6.2 London Plan Policy 6.3 and Policies T1 - T6 of the Draft London Plan seek to ensure that impacts on transport capacity and the transport network, at both a corridor and local level, are fully assessed. Development should not adversely affect safety on the transport network. This is also echoed by DC33 of Havering Councils CS and DCPDPD which indicates proposals will not be

supported where they would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the capacity or environment of the highway network. The London plan seeks to ensure a balance is struck to prevent excessive car parking provision that can undermine cycling, walking and public transport use and through the use of well-considered travel plans aim to reduce reliance on private means of transport.

- 6.6.3 The existing access would be retained. The gap between the buildings with respect to the access way is almost 7m. The proposal would seek to maintain a green buffer zone adjacent to number 12 which would consequently reduce the gap to 4.2m. However, even with the reduced width the scheme would allow two cars to safely pass each other. Furthermore, the surfacing details provide a marked area for pedestrians to ensure safety of the pedestrian is not compromised. The applicant has also demonstrated that there will be sufficient visibility splay, at the entrance of the access way to ensure there would be no hazard to highway safety.
- 6.6.4 The application site has a PTAL rating of 1b at its entrance to Haynes Road and 2 from its access to Hardley Crescent. London Parking Standards for residential dwellings recommends that a maximum of 1.5 parking spaces could be provided for the development with the density range of 40-80 dwellings per ha. The proposal would provide 8 car parking which would exceed the number of the proposed houses. The proposal would comply with the maximum parking space requirement with respect to the London Plan.
- 6.6.5 There is a fear that the proposal would have a potential that it would over-spill in Haynes Road or Hardley Crescent. There is no parking restriction in either road. However, the on-street parking availability is rather negligible because the majority of the houses in either road benefit from wide cross overs and front drives. Hence it is considered that there would limited opportunity for over-spill parking onto adjacent roads.
- 6.6.6 The layout also indicates the provision of turning space within the site, ensuring vehicles can enter and leave the site in forward gear. It is also demonstrated that there would be sufficient visibility splay allowing safe access to Haynes Road.
- 6.6.7 The volume of the car trips generated from the proposed use of the site would not be significant. It is considered that the use of the access track to serve the six dwelling would be unlikely to result in material harm to highway safety of Haynes Road. The proposed access would be sufficiently wide to allow either two cars or a pedestrian and a car to pass each other safely. There would be clear views down the track for drivers of vehicles entering or leaving the site to see other vehicles on it. The Highways officers have been consulted and cannot substantial any reason for refusal and have not raised any objection.

6.6.8 There are three issues that raise some concerns for officers;

- Refuse vehicles could not turn wholly within the application site.
- Ad hoc parking on the access road could not be controlled
- The level of noise generated by vehicles using the access road as well as parking

#### **Refuse vehicles**

6.6.9 Refuse storage areas are located within a satisfactory distance for refuse to be collected. Therefore, there would be no need for the refuse vehicle to enter the site and collection can safely take place on the street.

#### **Ad hoc parking on the access road**

6.6.10 The gap between the buildings which accommodates the access way is particularly wide and would lend itself for ad-hoc parking. There is the potential also that the landscaping buffer zone could be compromised and used for parking purposes. The access way falls within the application site, therefore a condition can be attached to ensure that no “ad hoc” parking takes place on the access road.

#### **Noise generated by vehicles using the access road and the court yard**

6.6.11 On the site visit it was revealed that the existing access way has an even surface and not laid with a solid surface. The increase use of the access way in its current condition would be likely to result in further erosion of the surface with formation of bumps. Should this happen the vehicles would have to, on occasion, rev their engines to negotiate the bumps. Further, the impact noise from the loose material in contact with the tyres would result in additional noise being generated from the use of the track. Therefore, a condition is recommended to ensure the track is upgraded in a manner that has been indicated on the plan to prevent a material increase in vehicular noise and disturbance along the access track to the car park.

6.6.12 Attention has been paid to the provision of cycle parking provision, covered storage space for sufficient number of cycles and as such the proposal would provide sustainable transportation modes. Nonetheless, details with respect to cycle parking would be conditioned.

6.6.13 Given the above analysis it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact upon the safe and free flow of traffic in this section of the highways.

## **7 Financial and Other Mitigation**

- 7.1 The council introduced the Community Infrastructure levy (CIL) with effect from 15 September 2019. The CIL charge covers a wide range of infrastructure as set out in the regulation 123 list. CIL is chargeable on the relevant net additional floorspace created by the development. The charge is non-negotiable and is calculated at the time that planning permission is granted. In this case the proposal is liable for the Mayor of London Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Havering CIL (HCIL). Mayoral CIL is calculated at £25.00 per square metre, subject to indexation. HCIL is charged at an approved rate of be £125/m<sup>2</sup> of GIA, subject to indexation. The net additional floor space would be 540m<sup>2</sup>. The development would be liable for a Mayoral CIL at the rate of £13,500 and Havering CIL at rate of £67,500.

## **8 Other Planning Issues**

### **8.1 Trees / Landscaping**

There are a number of trees on site, however, none are subject to any Tree Preservation Order. Further, the existing trees are not of the quality of protection. A number of trees would be lost. The proposal incorporates landscaping which is well designed and aims to improve the quality of the development whilst softening its impact where necessary. A condition will be recommended that the scheme is implemented in accordance to the approved landscaping.

### **Ecology**

- 8.2 The applicant has submitted a study which evaluates the ecological value of the site and provided advice as how appropriate measure to be taken to safeguard the future ecological value of the site. A condition is recommended to ensure the advice contained with the scheme is accordingly implemented.

### **Energy Efficiency**

- 8.3 The applicant has submitted details with respect to the improving the energy efficiency of the proposed houses, including photo-voltaic solar cells, insulations, and low energy lighting as well as providing electric charging point for cars. A condition is recommended to ensure these measures are implemented accordingly.



## **9 Conclusions**

9. The proposal would contribute towards meeting the housing need in the Borough and would make effective use of a sustainable site. The layout of the proposed development would provide an acceptable standard of amenity for the future occupiers and there would not be a significant loss of amenity to neighbouring properties. The design of the proposed building is acceptable and meets policy guidance. All other relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out the recommendation