



REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE

3 October 2013

REPORT

Subject Heading:

P0839.13 – Service House, 37 Manor Road, Romford

The demolition of existing office building and the redevelopment of the site to provide a 4-/5-storey block with 42 residential units with associated parking and amenity space (Application received 8th July 2013; revised plans received 19th September 2013)

Report Author and contact details:

Helen Oakerbee, 01708 432800
helen.oakerbee@havering.gov.uk

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

Ensuring a clean, safe and green borough	[]
Championing education and learning for all	[]
Providing economic, social and cultural activity in thriving towns and villages	[X]
Value and enhance the life of our residents	[X]
Delivering high customer satisfaction and a stable council tax	[]

SUMMARY

This planning application is a resubmission following a recent refusal and relates to the demolition of the existing office building and the erection of block of 42 flats on 4-/5-storeys with parking and amenity space. The planning issues include the principle of development, design and impact on visual amenity in the street scene, impact on residential amenity, sustainability and affordable housing, parking and highway matters. These issues are set out in detail in the report below. Staff do not consider, as a matter of judgement, that the current scheme overcomes previous refusal reasons and consider that the proposal remains unacceptable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That it be noted that proposed development is for a fully affordable housing scheme. The development is not liable, nonetheless it is for the applicant to claim for relief from the Mayor and the CIL amount is calculated at £20 per sq.m. In this case, CIL amount is calculated at £20 per sq.m: $3,529\text{sq.m} - 1,200\text{ sq.m} = 2,329\text{sq.m}$ giving a CIL figure of £47,580 (subject to indexation) for the Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in accordance with London Plan Policy 8.3.

That the proposal is refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would, by reason of its height, scale, obtrusive bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature 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 proposal would, by reason of its scale, massing, bulk and layout result in an obtrusive and oppressive development adversely impact on the rear garden scheme and adversely impacting on outlook from neighbouring properties to the detriment of residential amenity, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.
3. The proposal would, by reason of an unacceptably excessive increase in traffic activity, result in harm to the living conditions of existing nearby residents through noise and congestion contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.
4. The proposal would, by reason of its design, including its form, external appearance and layout, not be of a sufficiently high quality of design and layout as to justify the excessively high density proposed, contrary to Policies DC2, DC3 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document.

5. In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal is contrary to Policy DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.

REPORT DETAIL

1. Site Description

- 1.1 While the application site address is in Manor Road, the site itself is located to the southern side of Rushdon Close. The site comprises a 3-4-storey office building with ancillary parking. There is an access drive which exits onto Rushdon Close near its junction with Manor Road. The building on site is at the highpoint of the area, ground levels fall significantly across the site from west to east and ground levels surrounding the site are significantly lower in Rushdon Close but only slightly lower to Manor Road and to the south of the application site. The site area is 0.28 hectares.
- 1.2 To the east of the application site is a recently completed 5-storey residential block with houses/flats further to the east adjacent to the railway line and on the opposite side of Rushdon Close. To Manor Road are mainly semi-detached two-storey housing and there are 3-storey flats to the south in Marwell Close.

2. Description of Proposal

- 2.1 The application is a resubmission following refusal in March this year (planning reference P1070.12) and seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing office building on the site and its replacement with a 42-unit flatted (as previously) block of 4/5-storey (previously 5/6-storey) height with ancillary parking and amenity space.
- 2.2 The proposal would be entirely for affordable housing and comprises 18x1-bed, 20x2-bed and 4x3-bed flats (previously 7 x. 1- bed flats, 23 x 2-bed flats and 12 x 3-bed flats). The development would provide parking at surface level to the east of the building accessed from the existing access road with underground parking with a new access directly from Rushdon Close) totalling 63 spaces.
- 2.3 The affordable housing would be split between shared ownership – 26 (previously 19) units and affordable rented – 16 (previously 23) units. There would be two separate entrances for each section with the entrance for the former being to the western elevation and that for the latter to the southern elevation.

- 2.4 The proposed flatted block would be L-shaped and have maximum measurements of 34.95m (previously 34.6m) wide and 40.95m (previously 41.4m) deep (taken from Rushdon Close) with flat roofs with a height above ground level varying, due to the sloping ground levels across the site, nonetheless the maximum height would be 16m (previously 18.5m) above the existing lower ground level. In relation to the existing higher level the proposal would be 12m above ground level.
- 2.4 The two lower ground floor flats (west wing) and the two ground floor flats (east wing) would have a private garden area each with the other flats sharing a communal amenity area to the rear of the application site of 250sq.m (upper deck) and 180 sq.m (lower garden area). Balconies would be provided to each flat.
- 2.5 It is proposed to provide 25 surface parking spaces to the ground level with cycle storage and a turning head at the end of the existing access drive with 38 parking spaces and further cycle storage under the building/under the proposed amenity deck area.
- 2.7 Other documentation submitted with the application is as follows: Transport Statement, Contamination Assessment, Habitat Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report, Energy Assessment Report, Code for Sustainable Homes Report (Pre-assessment) and Planning Statement together with the Design and Access Statement.

3. Relevant History

- 3.1 P0387.11 Part change of use from B1 to D1 (basement, ground and first floor), restricted to health centres, non-residential education and training centres – Approved 29-07-2011
- 3.2 P1070.12 Demolition of existing building and erection of 5-/6-storey block containing 42 flats with ancillary parking and amenity space – Refused 06-03-2013 for the following reasons:
1. “ The proposed development would, by reason of its height, scale, obtrusive bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature 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 proposal would, by reason of its scale, massing, bulk and layout result in an obtrusive and oppressive development adversely impact on the rear garden scheme and adversely impacting on outlook from neighbouring properties to the detriment of residential amenity, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.
 3. The proposal would, by reason of an unacceptably excessive increase in traffic activity, result in harm to the living conditions of existing nearby

residents through noise and congestion contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

4. The proposal would, by reason of its design, including its form, external appearance and layout, not be of a sufficiently high quality of design and layout as to justify the excessively high density proposed, contrary to Policies DC2, DC3 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document.
5. In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal is contrary to Policy DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.”

4. Consultations/Representations

4.1 Notification letters were sent to 128 neighbouring properties, a site notice was posted and a press notice was placed in a local paper. There were 10 replies received raising objections to the scheme as follows:

- This is an elevated site which means that the development which will be the tallest in the area will appear even taller
- There is a waste water problem and the pumping station will not be able to cope with more dwellings
- Loss of privacy/overlooking
- Loss of light
- Unacceptable increase in noise
- Loss of value of surrounding properties
- Noise, disturbance, dirt, inconvenience etc. during the construction phase
- Occupiers of this block may not be suitable to existing occupiers
- Flats are not in character with the existing Victorian dwellings to Manor Road
- Children will have nowhere to go and will therefore be a problem
- The building will be an eyesore
- The quiet Victorian ideal is being destroyed
- It is not fair to have such a long period of building works in one place
- The building will not be big enough for the proposed occupiers
- Overdevelopment/overpopulated area
- Unacceptable increase in volume of traffic

4.2 Councillor Michael White has written to object to the scheme on the grounds that the proposal would be bulky and dominate the streetscene, adversely affecting the amenity of existing occupiers and that the area cannot absorb a further 135 people.

4.3 Councillor Andrew Curtin has written to object to the scheme on the grounds that there would be exactly the same number of new residential properties as the recently refused scheme, that there would be harm to the living conditions for existing nearby residents because of noise and congestion

caused by an unacceptable increase in traffic activity related to the 63 parking places, that the proposed scale, bulk and mass has not been reduced sufficiently, there are insufficient school places in the locality and there is also a lack of outdoor public space which the proposed development fails to address.

- 4.4 The Council's Environmental Health Service request a part 2A condition to be added as the Desktop Study indicated that there are potential pollutant linkages present on the site. Environmental Health also requested a noise insulation and construction and delivery hours condition.
- 4.3 The Highway Authority has no objection to the proposals as parking meets the required standard.
- 4.4 The Borough Crime Prevention Design Advisor has asked that a Secured by Design condition is attached to any approval.
- 4.5 Thames Water indicate that they have no objections with regard to sewerage infrastructure. In relation to surface water drainage they remind the developer that they need to make proper provision and that their prior approval is needed for any connection to a public sewer.
- 4.6 The London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority indicate that either the access should meet 16.3 of Volume 2 of the Building Regulations documents or a dry rising fire main should be provided. This would need to be resolved through the Building Regulations.

5. Relevant Policies

- 5.1 Policies CP1 (housing supply), CP2 (sustainable communities), CP9 (reducing the need to travel), CP10 (sustainable transport), CP17 (design), DC2 (housing mix and density), DC3 (housing design and layout), DC6 (affordable housing), DC7 (lifetime homes and mobility housing), DC32 (the road network), DC33 (car parking), DC34 (walking), DC35 (cycling), DC36 (servicing), DC40 (waste recycling), DC50 (sustainable design and construction), DC51 (renewable energy), DC53 (land contamination), DC55 (noise), DC60 (trees and hedges), DC61 (urban design), DC63 (crime), DC70 (archaeology) and DC72 (planning obligations) of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Documents, Planning Obligations SPD and the Residential Design SPD are also relevant.
- 5.2 Policies: 3.3 (Increasing Housing Supply), 3.4 (Optimising Housing Potential), 3.5 (Quality and Design of Housing Developments), 3.7 (Large Residential Developments), 3.8 (Housing Choice), 3.11 (Affordable Housing Targets), 6.9 (Cycling), 6.10 (Walking), 6.13 (Parking), 7.1 (Building London's Neighbourhoods and Communities), 7.2 (Inclusive Design), 7.3 (Designing out Crime), 7.4 (Local Character), 7.5 (Public Realm), 7.6 (Architecture) and 8.3 (Community Infrastructure Levy) of the London Plan

(2011) and the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Design (November 2012).

- 5.3 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 6 "Delivering a wide Choice of Homes", and Section 7 "Requiring Good Design".

Background

Members will be aware that a similar planning application (P1070.12) appeared on a Regulatory Services Meeting agenda earlier this year. Officers recommended approval subject to a legal agreement and conditions, nonetheless after Members debated the application at some length they decided to place different judgement on the arising issues such that the scheme was unacceptable and decided to refuse the scheme for the refusal reasons listed under Paragraph 3.2 above. Members will need to consider whether the current application overcomes the refusal reasons to the degree that planning permission can be granted.

6. Staff Comments

- 6.1 The main issues to be considered are the principle of development, the site layout and amenity space, design/street scene issues, amenity implications, and parking and highways issues.

6.2 Principle of Development

- 6.2.1 The site lies outside the Metropolitan Green Belt, Employment Areas, Commercial Areas, Romford Town Centre and District and Local Centres. The site does not lie in a designated area and, in line with Policies CP1 and DC11 (non-designated employment land), the redevelopment of the land for residential is considered to be acceptable in principle in land use terms. The provision of additional housing is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 6.2.2 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan states that DPD policies should offer a range of housing choices, in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types, taking account of the housing requirements of different groups. Policy 3.5 states that Local Development Frameworks (reiterated in the SPD) should incorporate minimum space standards. The Mayor has set these at 86m² for a 3 bed 5-person flat; 74m² for a 3 bed 4-person flat, 70m² for a 2-bed 4-person flat, 61m² for a 2-bed 3-person flat and 50m² for a 1-bed 2-person flat. All the proposed flats would be in line with these minimum guidelines and are considered acceptable.
- 6.2.3 Policy CP1 indicates that outside town centres and the Green Belt, priority will be made on all non-specifically designated land for housing. The site is presently occupied by an office block. Previous commercial sites closer to the railway line have now been replaced by housing development with the existing use of the land for commercial purposes being somewhat out of character. The proposal is therefore an opportunity to remove this use from a residential area and replace it with a land use more compatible with the

surroundings. The proposal is therefore acceptable in principle and in accordance with Policy CP1 and Policy 3.3 of the London Plan which seeks to increase London's housing supply.

- 6.2.5 As the site/surrounding area has a history of commercial use and the Contaminated Land Report submitted by the applicant confirms, land contamination is present. It is recommended that issues of land contamination be dealt with by condition in the event that planning permission is granted.

6.3 *Density and Site Layout*

- 6.3.1 The application site is ranked as being within a low Public Transport Accessibility Level Zone (PTAL 1-2), with the density range of 30-50 units per hectare (200-250 habitable rooms per hectare). The proposed development of 42 units (112 habitable rooms) on the 0.28ha site represents a density of 150 units (400 habitable rooms) per hectare. This is considerably above the recommended density range but may not be unacceptable given that flatted development is normally of higher density. While the advised density ranges are only one of a number of criteria employed to assess the appropriateness of a proposal and it is the overall quality of the development and its layout which is of greatest importance, Members previously considered that the density proposed (which has not changed) was unacceptable.

- 6.3.2 In terms of site layout, the proposed development has a larger overall footprint than the existing office building. It would have a similar appearance to the adjoining flatted block and would mirror its L-shape with the amenity areas appearing joined up.

- 6.3.3 There would be a communal amenity space with the flats all having either access to a private garden area or balcony. Staff therefore consider the development to have a reasonably spacious setting.

- 6.3.4 It is proposed to provide units to Lifetime Homes standards with 4 to wheelchair accessible standards in order to ensure that the proposal meets the provisions of Policy DC7 in respect of Lifetime Homes.

6.4 *Design and Visual Impact in the Streetscene*

- 6.4.1 In considering the previous 5-/6-storey scheme (P1070.12), a refusal reason was as follows: "The proposed development would, by reason of its height, scale, obtrusive bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature 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."

- 6.4.2 There are two main differences between this and the recently refused scheme: firstly the scheme has been reduced to 4-/5-storey which means that it is no longer high enough to be considered under the Tall Buildings

Policy and secondly, while the number of flats has remained the same, there has been a significant shift from larger to smaller flats, for example the number of 3 bed flats has decreased from 12 to 4 and the number of one-bed flats has increased from 7 to 18. The scheme retains its five-storey element to the northern section while the western wing drops a floor from 5- to 4-storeys resulting in the removal of the 6-storey core which connected the two sections which are on two different levels. The flat roof now extends across the whole of the top floor and the set-back penthouse accommodation has been removed.

- 6.4.3 There is a significant slope across the application site with the existing building, Service House and its parking area, being located at the highest point in the locality. Rushdon Close has been cut down to the railway line, between properties in Manor Road such that it is significantly lower than natural ground levels which rise from Manor Road to the application site then fall sharply down to Rushdown Close itself. As such, from the highest ground level adjacent to the west wing of the building, the building would be on 4-storeys with a maximum height of 12m. The other section on 5-storeys fronting onto Rushdon Close would be located on the lower ground level and would have a maximum height in relation to this road of 16m above ground level.
- 6.4.4 It should be noted in considering this application that the office itself has failed to find a suitable tenant for some years and this proposal would remove this building, replacing it with much needed residential development, as has happened in Rushdon Close generally over the last 10 years where commercial development has been replaced by residential.
- 6.4.5 The proposed 4-/5-storey building replaces an existing 3-/4-storey office building and would be directly adjacent to an existing 46-unit flatted residential block which is itself on 5-storeys. The existing block is also L-shaped and the proposed development would mirror this part of the former The Build Centre development such that its shallower section would be adjacent to the shallower section of this building with the deeper section at the outer extent creating a similar two-level amenity courtyard area to the rear with parking underneath the decked area and matching each other for height above ground level. The proposed block's section fronting onto Rushdon Close would be 16m high, i.e., the same height as the existing adjoining flatted building's 16m height above ground level.
- 6.4.6 Staff consider that the scale, the proposed height and the building's relative height due to this being a high point in the locality and bulk of the building and its highly visibility from Rushton Close and that it would be visible from longer views in Manor Road, would result in it being an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene. Staff do not consider that the refusal reason relating to harm in the streetscene has been overcome by the current proposal.

6.5 *Rear Garden Environment*

- 6.5.2 A second refusal reason in relation to the recently refused scheme is as follows: “The proposal would, by reason of its scale, massing, bulk and layout result in an obtrusive and oppressive development adversely impact on the rear garden scheme and adversely impacting on outlook from neighbouring properties to the detriment of residential amenity, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.”
- 6.5.3 The proposed eastern flank elevation facing the adjoining 5-storey flatted building would be located between 3.25m and 6.45m away (previously just over 3m away) from the 5-storey block. Staff consider that the proposed building would not appear overly dominant as it would be of a similar depth adjacent to this block and, while there are windows in the side elevation, the main outlook from these existing flats is to the front (onto Rushdon Close) and rear (their own amenity space). In addition, the proposed rear landscaped deck would be located at the same relative height and distance away from the building as exists at the recently constructed 5-storey flatted development.
- 6.5.4 In relation to the existing mainly 2-storey properties in Manor Road, the proposed 4-storey west wing would replace the existing 3-storey office block (as viewed from these properties). The west wing is proposed to be located some 53m (excluding balconies) from the existing rear elevations of the Manor Road properties; a similar distance away as the existing office block. Staff consider that at this distance the proposed additional floor would not appear overbearing or overly dominant in the rear garden environment. As the building would be located to the east/north of properties fronting Manor Road at the junction of Rushdon Close, Staff consider that it would not result in any significant loss of light or overshadowing to these properties and that the amended scheme would overcome the concerns raised in the refusal reason in this respect.
- 6.5.5 In relation to the existing 3-storey flatted block properties on the opposite side of Rushdon Close, the proposed building would be to the south. Nonetheless given that it would be on the opposite side of the road way and that the nearest point of the new building would be 24m away, it is not considered that the proposed building would appear out of character.
- 6.5.6 In relation to the existing 3-storey flatted properties to the south of the application site in Marwell Close, the proposed building’s west wing would be approximately 16.7m (previously 16m) away from this existing building’s nearest point. This remains significantly closer than the existing building, Service House. The current scheme is for a 4-storey element to this elevation rather than the originally proposed 5-storey building, nonetheless it would be a storey higher than the existing 3-storey office building and its 12m height would be located 1.6m from the shared boundary. While this part of the proposed building would have a similar width as the existing Service House and there is an intervening boundary tree screen within the

Marwell Close flats' grounds, Staff consider that the proposed development would not, as a matter of some judgement, overcome the previous refusal reason relating to impact in the rear garden environment. This is a matter of some judgement and Members may wish to place different weight on this element of the scheme.

- 6.5.7 Staff consider, given the earlier refusal reasons and that the scheme would be a single block of approximately 16m in height and just under 35m in width to Rushdon Close and nearly 41m deep extending into the application site on 4-storeys with no setback at the highest level and close to the boundary with existing flatted developments, that the current proposal would continue to represent a bulky and overly dominant development such that it would have an adverse impact on the rear garden environment and the residents' outlook. This matter has required significant judgement and Members may consider that the overall changes to the proposal are sufficient that it overcomes this earlier refusal reason, particularly given that the existing adjoining block is of the same height and of a similar scale to that now proposed.

6.6 *Impact on Residential Amenity*

- 6.6.2 There were two refusal reasons in relation to the earlier scheme which are relevant to consideration of residential amenity impact: "The proposal would, by reason of its scale, massing, bulk and layout result in an obtrusive and oppressive development adversely impact on the rear garden scheme and adversely impacting on outlook from neighbouring properties to the detriment of residential amenity, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD." And, "The proposal would, by reason of an unacceptably excessive increase in traffic activity, result in harm to the living conditions of existing nearby residents through noise and congestion contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD."
- 6.6.3 Excluding the newly constructed flatted development, the nearest residential properties would be the flatted blocks to Marwell Close which would be approximately 16m from the proposed west wing. There are currently windows to all the elevations of the existing Service House building. It is proposed to have balconies and a landscaped deck area. While the proposed balconies would be closer to the Marwell Close flats than these existing windows and would be to residential rather than office accommodation, Staff consider that as windows have been removed and that there would be no principal windows in the elevation facing the Marwell Close flats and that as the scheme has been reduced from 5-storey to 4-storey, that at a distance of 16.7m away, there would be no significant loss of privacy as a result. The proposed block would be located to the north of these flats and there would be no loss of light or overshadowing from the proposed development. This is a matter of judgement on which Members may place different weight.

- 6.6.4 The properties to Manor Road will be located over 50m from the proposed development (14m from the rear boundary fences). While the block will be visible from the rear elevations and gardens of these properties Staff consider that at this distance the proposal's reduction from 5-storey to 4-storey to the west wing with a maximum height reduced to 12m above ground level that it would not appear visually intrusive or adversely affect outlook. The balconies to the west wing facing the rear of properties in Manor Road would be located a minimum of 12m from the nearest rear fence; a similar distance away as existing windows to Service House. Staff therefore consider that no undue loss of privacy or overlooking would occur as a result.
- 6.6.5 The properties on the opposite side of Rushdon Close would be located approximately 24m away from the proposed building. Staff consider that as the proposed building would be wider and taller than the existing Service House and located to the south of these existing properties, that there would be likely to be some loss of direct sunlight. Nonetheless Staff consider that as the proposal would not affect direct sun-light in the afternoon or evening and probably not at all during the summer months, that there would be no significant loss of light to these occupiers. There would be windows and balconies to the elevation fronting onto Rushdon Close and a new pedestrian entrance/vehicular access would be formed to the proposed under building car park area. At a distance across a public highway where noise and activity would be greater than to the rear of the flatted block and at a distance of 24m, Staff consider that there would be no undue loss of residential amenity to these existing occupiers.
- 6.6.6 Windows would be located in the east wing's elevation facing the existing, newly built flatted block at a distance of between 3.25m and more than 6m (previously 3m) away. The existing block has a series of secondary windows to bedroom (ground floor) and kitchen areas (2nd - 4th floor) and secondary bedroom and a primary window to a small bedroom at 5th floor level. Staff consider that while most windows to the proposed development would be secondary and could therefore be fitted with obscure glazing, there is a window to a habitable room (bedroom) on each floor. Except on floor 5, these windows would be opposite the kitchens of the existing block and Staff consider that a degree of interlocking would occur; nonetheless it is considered that given the arrangement of windows this would be at an oblique angle and that this would not result in a substandard of accommodation for either proposed or occupiers of the recently completed development. At the 5th floor level the proposed three windows would be located further away at just over 5m and could be fitted with obscure glass and fitted with restrictors to prevent any undue loss of privacy. This is a matter of judgement and Members may place different weight such that they may consider that the outlook of the existing flats would be unduly compromised.
- 6.6.7 The second refusal reason relating to residential amenity was that there would be an unacceptably excessive increase in traffic activity such that it would result in harm to the living conditions of existing nearby residents by

reason of noise and congestion. The most affected neighbouring occupiers would be those fronting onto Rushdon Close where a new pedestrian entrance/vehicular access would be formed to the proposed under building car park area opposite existing flats. The current proposal would result in the same number of car parking spaces, i.e., 63 which is the minimum requirement of Annex 5 of the LDF range 1.5-2 parking spaces per unit. It should be noted that although the number of spaces would be the same as previously it is likely that numbers of trips may be lower as the current scheme involves smaller units whereas the refused scheme has 12x3-bed units and 23x2-bed units (81% of the total), the current proposal has 4x3-bed and 20x2-bed (57% of the total) with the remainder of the units being 1-bed (23% of the 42 flat total) with 30 less habitable rooms and accommodation for 31 less people than the refused scheme. Staff nonetheless consider that the same number of parking spaces would be provided as previously, and although there would be likely to be a reduction in the number of trips made reducing car-borne traffic noise and congestion, that that the amount of traffic would remain significant and adversely impact on the living conditions of nearby residents. However this is a matter of judgement and Members may place different weight on this issue and decide that the proposed trip generation and therefore noise and disturbance level would be acceptable in terms of its impact on existing residential amenity.

6.7 *Sustainability/Renewables*

- 6.7.1 The proposed development is considered capable of gaining Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3, which is in accordance with Policy DC49. In the event that Members were minded to grant planning permission this could be secured by condition to ensure the development attains this standard.
- 6.7.2 It is indicated that predicted carbon dioxide emissions from the development could be reduced by 20% through the use of on-site renewable energy equipment. The development would therefore accord with the target set out in the London Plan. The Council's Energy Officer is satisfied with the proposal in respect of sustainability subject to suitable conditions. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in this respect and conditions could be imposed to ensure the development demonstrates this level of reduction of CO2 emissions is met.

6.8 *Highways / Parking Issues*

- 6.8.1 The existing access into the site would be retained and a new vehicular/pedestrian access to be formed from Rushdon Close. This is considered to be acceptable, and meets the access and servicing needs of the development.
- 6.8.2 The development proposes a total of 63 parking spaces, which is a ratio of 1.5 spaces per unit overall. The application site is located in a low PTAL area (PTAL 1-2) where the expected parking provision range is 1.5-2 spaces per unit. In view of this, the proposed parking provision is considered

to be within the acceptable range and would accord with the density matrix in Policy DC2.

6.8.3 The proposal includes cycle storage provision for the flats in the parking area at lower ground floor level. This would accord with Policy DC36 and would encourage alternative means of transport. Staff consider, having regard to the package of measures proposed and the location of the site, that the parking provision is acceptable.

6.8.4 Policy DC40 advises that planning permission will only be granted for developments where suitable waste and recycling storage facilities are provided. In this case the proposal would see the provision of a refuse storage enclosure in the parking area at ground level and near the entrance at lower ground floor level which are considered suitable. A suitable condition could be attached to require provision.

6.9 Affordable Housing

6.9.1 The proposal results in development for which an affordable housing contribution is required in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan. Policies CP2 and DC6 set out a borough wide target of 50% of all new homes built in the borough to be affordable. The applicant has indicated that the proposal would be for 100% affordable housing with 100% Council nomination rights on the rented properties (which comprise 27 of the 42 proposed dwellings). This is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policy DC6.

6.10 The Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy

6.10.1 The proposed development is for a fully affordable housing scheme may not be liable for the Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in accordance with London Plan Policy 8.3. Nonetheless it is for the applicant to claim for relief from the Mayor and the CIL amount is calculated at £20 per sq.m. In this case, 3,529sq.m - 1,200 sq.m = 2,329sq.m giving a CIL figure of £47,580 (subject to indexation).

6.11 Planning Obligations

6.11.1 In accordance with the Draft Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document a financial contribution of £6,000 per dwelling to be used towards infrastructure costs arising from the new development is required. This should be secured through a S106 Agreement for the amount of £252,000. The applicant has agreed to the payment of this planning obligation, nonetheless in the absence of a mechanism to effect this, a refusal reason is again included.

6.12 Other Issues

6.12.1 Policy DC63 requires new development to address safety and security in the design of new development. The proposal is considered acceptable in principle in this respect, subject to the imposition of conditions and an informative requested by the Borough Crime Prevention Design Advisor.

7. Conclusion

7.1 In conclusion, residential development on the site is considered to be acceptable in principle and would result in the removal of an existing commercial use. The proposal is considered to be unacceptable for the reasons given in the report and refusal is recommended. Nonetheless significant judgement has been made on a number of issues and Members may place different weight on these and consider that the proposal overcomes the refusal reasons put forward in relation to the previous scheme (planning ref. P1070.13). If planning permission is forthcoming, a financial contribution towards infrastructure costs would be required.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

If planning permission is forthcoming, financial contributions would be required through a legal agreement

Legal implications and risks:

Legal resources would be required, if planning permission is granted, to prepare and complete any legal agreement.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities implications and risks:

The proposed dwellings would be 100% affordable with those for rent being allocated for Council tenants and the building would be constructed to meet the Lifetime Homes Standard with some capable of adaptation to wheelchair units which means that they would be available to those in housing need and be easily adaptable in the future to meet the changing needs of occupiers.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application forms and plans received on 8th July 2013, revised plans received 19th September 2013.