

# REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE

14 November 2013

# REPORT

**Subject Heading:**

P0074.13 – Land adjacent to 20 and 25  
Surridge Close and rear of 55-57  
Parsonage Road, Rainham – Erection of 6  
dwellings (1 detached, a pair of semi-  
detached properties and a terrace of  
three), extension of the access road and  
ancillary car and cycle parking (received  
22 January 2011; revised plans received  
28<sup>th</sup> February and 31<sup>st</sup> May 2013)

**Report Author and contact details:**

Helen Oakerbee  
Planning Control Manager (Applications)  
[helen.oakerbee@havering.gov.uk](mailto: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 report concerns an application for the erection of 6 houses with an extension to the existing access road with ancillary car and cycle parking. Staff consider that the proposal would accord with housing, environment and highways/parking policies contained in the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Documents and approval is therefore recommended, subject to conditions and the completion of a Legal Agreement.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

That the committee notes that the proposed development is liable for the Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in accordance with London Plan Policy 8.3. The applicable fee is based on an internal gross floor area of 680m<sup>2</sup> which equates to a Mayoral CIL payment of £13,600 (subject to indexation).

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

- A financial contribution of £36,000 to be used towards infrastructure costs in accordance with the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.
- All contribution sums shall include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 Agreement to the date of receipt by the Council.
- The Developer/Owner to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs associated with the preparation of the Agreement, prior to completion of the Agreement, irrespective of whether the Agreement is completed.
- The Developer/Owner to pay the appropriate planning obligation/s monitoring fee prior to completion of the Agreement.

That Staff be authorised to enter into such an agreement and that upon its completion planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

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

**Reason:** To comply with the requirements of section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. External Materials: Before any of the development hereby permitted is commenced, samples of all materials to be used in the external construction of the building(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the development shall be constructed with the approved materials.

**Reason:** To ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding area and in order that the development accords with the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61 and DC68.

3. Accordance with Plans: The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans.

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

4. Refuse/Recycling Storage: Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, provision shall be made for the storage of refuse and recycling awaiting collection according to details which shall previously have been agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

**Reason:** In the interests of the amenity of occupiers of the development and also the visual amenity of the development and the locality generally.

5. Cycle Storage: Prior to completion of the development hereby permitted, cycle storage of a type and in a location previously submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be provided and permanently retained thereafter, and in order that the development accords with the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

**Reason:** In the interests of providing a wide range of facilities for non-motor car residents, in the interests of sustainability and in order that the development accords with the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC36.

6. Sound Insulation: The buildings hereby permitted shall be so constructed as to provide sound insulation of 45 DnT,w + Ctr dB (minimal value) against airborne noise and 62 L'nT,w dB (maximum values) against impact noise to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To prevent noise nuisance to adjoining properties in accordance with the recommendations of the NPPF.

7. Screen Fencing: Before any of the buildings hereby permitted is first occupied, screen fencing of a type to be approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority, 2 metres high shall be erected on the shared boundaries between the new properties and at the boundaries of the new properties with the existing properties and shall be permanently retained and maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To protect the visual amenities of the development and to prevent undue overlooking of adjoining properties in accordance with Policy DC61.

8. External Lighting: The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until external lighting has been provided in accordance with details which shall previously have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing.

**Reason:** In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

9. Construction Hours: No construction works or construction related deliveries into the site shall take place other than between the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 on Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturdays unless agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. No construction works or construction related deliveries shall take place on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

10. Soft and Hard Landscaping: Prior to the commencement of the development, a soft and hard landscaping scheme, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority which accords with the general landscaping scheme as shown on the site plan P1106/03 Revision E. Once approved in writing the scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. All planting, seeding or turfing shall be carried out in the first planting season following completion of the development and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To enhance the visual amenities of the development and in order that the proposal complies with Policies DC60 and DC61 and the SPD on Landscaping.

11. Contaminated Land: Prior to the commencement of any works pursuant to this permission the developer shall submit for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority (having previously submitted a Phase I (Desktop Study) Report documenting the history of this site, its surrounding area and the likelihood of contaminant/s, their type and extent incorporating a Site Conceptual Model):

a) A Phase II (Site Investigation) Report if the Phase I Report confirms the possibility of a significant risk to any sensitive receptors. This is an intrusive site investigation including factors such as chemical testing, quantitative risk assessment and a description of the site ground conditions. An updated Site Conceptual Model should be included showing all the potential pollutant linkages and an assessment of risk to identified receptors.

b) A Phase III (Risk Management Strategy) Report if the Phase II Report confirms the presence of a significant pollutant linkage requiring remediation. The report will comprise two parts:

Part A - Remediation Scheme which will be fully implemented before it is first occupied. Any variation to the scheme shall be agreed in writing to the Local Planning Authority in advance of works being undertaken. The Remediation Scheme is to include consideration and proposals to deal with situations where, during works on site, contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified. Any further contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval.

Part B - Following completion of the remediation works a 'Validation Report' must be submitted demonstrating that the works have been carried out satisfactorily and remediation targets have been achieved.

c) If during development works any contamination should be encountered which was not previously identified and is derived from a different source and/or of a different type to those included in the contamination proposals, then revised contamination proposals shall be submitted to the LPA; and

d) If during development work, site contaminants are found in areas previously expected to be clean, then their remediation shall be carried out in line with the agreed contamination proposals.

For further guidance see the leaflet titled, 'Land Contamination and the Planning Process'.

**Reason:** To ensure the safety of the occupants of the development hereby permitted and the public generally, and in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policies DC61 and DC54.

13. Secured by Design: Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of the measures to be incorporated into the development demonstrating how 'Secured by Design' accreditation can be achieved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and shall not be occupied or used until written confirmation of compliance with the agreed details has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

**Reason:** In the interest of creating safer, sustainable communities, reflecting guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy 7.3 of the London Plan, and Policies CP17 'Design' and DC63 'Delivering Safer Places' of the LBH LDF.

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

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

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

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

17. No additional flank windows: Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended), no window or other opening (other than those shown on the submitted and approved plan) shall be formed in the flank wall(s) of the building(s) hereby permitted, unless specific permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has first been sought and obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

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

18. Removal of permitted development allowances: Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted development) (Amendment)(no. 2)(England) Order 2008, or any subsequent order revoking or re-enacting that order, no development shall take place to House 1 and House 6 as shown on approved plan reference 12.472.1 Rev B under Classes A, B, C, D, E, F, G or H unless permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has first been sought and obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

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

19. Access road materials: Before any of the development hereby permitted is commenced, samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the proposed access road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the development shall be constructed with the approved materials.

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

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

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

21. Obscure/fixed glazing: The proposed windows at first floor in the flank elevations shall be permanently glazed with obscure glass and thereafter be maintained and permanently fixed shut to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

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

22. Ground levels: Prior to commencement the developer shall submit details of proposed ground levels and finished floor levels to the Local Planning Authority; once approved in writing, the details shall be implemented as part of the approved scheme.

Reason: In order to ensure that the development is acceptable and does not have any unexpected impact on existing residential amenity in accordance with Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

## INFORMATIVES

### 1. **Community Safety - Informative:**

In aiming to satisfy Condition 13, the applicant should seek the advice of the Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor. The services of the local Police CPDA are available free of charge through Havering Development and Building Control. It is the policy of the local planning authority to consult with the Borough CPDA in the discharging of community safety condition(s).

### 2. **Highway Informatives:**

The Applicant is advised that planning approval does not constitute approval for changes to the public highway. Highway Authority approval will only be given after suitable details have been submitted, considered and agreed. Any proposals which involve building over the public highway as managed by the London Borough of Havering, will require a licence and the applicant must contact StreetCare, Traffic & Engineering on 01708 433750 to commence the Submission/ Licence Approval process.

Should this application be granted planning permission, the developer, their representatives and contractors are advised that this does not discharge the requirements under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 and the Traffic Management Act 2004. Formal notifications and approval will be needed for any highway works (including temporary works) required during the construction of the development.

The developer is advised that if construction materials are proposed to be kept on the highway during construction works then they will need to apply for a license from the Council.

### 3. **Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010:**

Improvements required to make the proposal acceptable were negotiated and submitted, in accordance with para. 186-187 of NPPF 2012.

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

- (a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) Directly related to the development; and
- (c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.



## **Mayoral CIL**

The proposed development is liable for the Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in accordance with London Plan Policy 8.3. The applicable fee is based on an internal gross floor area of 680m<sup>2</sup> which equates to a Mayoral CIL payment of £13,600 (subject to indexation). This a fixed rate tariff calculated on the basis of the new floorspace formed. The payment required here is based on a gross internal floor area at £20 per square metre. This payment is secured by way of a Liability Notice which will be issued on discharge of the last pre-commencement condition should planning permission be granted.

### **REPORT DETAIL**

#### **1. Site Description**

- 1.1 The application site comprises the end of rear gardens to 16 Glebe Road and 55 and 57 Parsonage Road and an area of land at the end of Surridge Close. There are a number of garden structures and trees/hedging within the application site boundaries. The site is "L-shaped" wrapping around the Mayfield Grove development and extends to a maximum depth of 73m and a maximum width of 67m. Ground levels are relatively level within the application site although there is a slight rise towards the properties in Mayfield Grove. The application site has an area of approximately 0.25 hectares.
- 1.2 The application site abuts the cul-de-sac end of Surridge Close although there is no existing vehicular access onto this road.
- 1.3 The surrounding area is residential in character with mainly two-storey detached and semi-detached properties including the recently completed development at Mayfield Grove. Nonetheless to the north-west of the application site is a large open area in the Metropolitan Green Belt.

#### **2. Description of Proposal**

- 2.1 The proposal follows the refusal of two, two-house schemes at the rear of No. 16 Glebe Road and is for the erection of 6, 2-storey houses (on an enlarged site area) with a new driveway forming an extension to the existing cul-de-sac of Surridge Close.
- 2.2 The site would be laid out with 1 house (House 1) to the rear of 16 Glebe Road, adjacent to 20 Surridge Close and the pair of semi-detached houses (Houses 2 and 3) being located adjacent to No.25 Surridge Close. The proposed new driveway would be located between these buildings and turn northwards such that the proposed terrace of three houses (Houses 4, 5 and 6) would be located on the eastern side of the extended driveway adjacent to (and north of) No. 5 Mayfield Grove.

- 2.3 House 1 would be located between 5m and 11m back from the proposed rear edge of the new driveway access. It would be located 1.65m from the shared boundary with No.20 Surridge Close and 6m from the shared boundary with No.s 2 and 3 Mayfield Grove. It would be 7.35m wide, 9.5m deep with a pitched roof with a ridge height of 7.65m above ground level. The proposed garden size is 244 sq.m.
- 2.4 Houses 2 and 3 would be located 6m back from the proposed rear edge of the new driveway access. They would be located 1.5m from the boundary with the garage access adjoining No.25 Surridge Close and 4.7m from this property's side elevation. They would each be 5.6m wide, 11.55m deep/9.65m deep (ground/first) with a pitched roof with a ridge height of 7.8m above ground level. Garden sizes are 116 and 101 sq.m respectively.
- 2.5 The terrace of Houses 3, 4 and 5 would be located a minimum of 5.2m back from the proposed rear edge of the turning head to the extended driveway access. It would be located 3.3m from the shared boundary with No.5 Mayfield Grove and approximately 3m from the shared boundary with No.59 Parsonage Road. Each terraced house would be 5.5m wide and 11.2m deep with a pitched roof with a ridge height of 7.6m above ground level. Garden sizes would be 167 sq.m, 132 sq.m and 149 sq.m respectively.
- 2.6 While there would be a variety of houses there would be a common material palette of brick and tile with gables.
- 2.7 The houses would be provided with two parking spaces each.
- 2.8 The driveway access would extend from the end of the Cul-de-sac to Surridge Close and turn north to provide a turning head in front of the proposed terraced properties. It would be 5.4m wide.
- 2.9 An Archaeological Assessment and a Contaminated Land report have been submitted with the application, together with details of a pre-application consultation undertaken by the application.

### 3. **History**

- 3.1 P0764.11 – Erect 2 x 2-storey houses with extending the access road to provide on-site parking – refused 18/7/11; subsequent appeal dismissed 24/5/12.
- 3.2 P0856.12 Erect 2 x two-storey houses with extending the access road to provide on-site parking - refused 11/9/12.

The reasons for refusal of the P0856.12 scheme were:

“1. The proposed development would, due to its height, depth and siting in close proximity to the shared boundary with No.s 2 and 3 Mayfield Close, result in the proposal being a cramped, visually intrusive and overly dominant form of development causing loss of outlook and a strong sense of enclosure adversely impacting on residential amenity, contrary to Policies DC3 and DC61 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control

Policies Development Plan Document and the Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Design.

2. The proposal would not make a contribution towards infrastructure costs and would therefore be contrary to Policy DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the draft Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations.”

#### 4. **Consultation/Representations**

4.1 55 neighbouring occupiers were notified of the proposal. There were 41 replies objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Surridge Close will become a through road resulting in danger to children playing in/by the road and loss of security
- loss of trees/birds on the green at the end of Surridge Close
- construction traffic and filth, disruption and destruction during construction is unacceptable
- unacceptable increase in traffic and fumes along the Close
- overlooking/loss of privacy and intrusion; obscure glass will not stop this if windows can be opened
- unacceptable increase in noise, air and light pollution
- overdevelopment
- the property to be built on land to the rear of 2 and 3 Mayfield Grove would be too close and proposed intervening landscaping will result in loss of light
- Any loss of light will exacerbate an existing occupier's Seasonal Affective Disorder (SAD) affecting health and wellbeing
- The Planning Inspectorate has already decided that a two-house development in the rear garden of No. 16 Glebe Road would have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity and the proposed single, but larger property, would have the same unacceptable impact
- on-street parking spaces would be reduced for existing occupiers of Surridge Close resulting in more parking problems than there are already
- car vehicle lights will shine on neighbouring rear fences
- the proposal will increase security concerns where rear gardens would then be backing onto a roadway
- the green area at the end of Surridge Close should not be allowed to be lost to this development
- it would result in overdevelopment
- the gardens would not be usable
- back gardens should not be used for development – this was outlawed 25+ years ago and a dangerous precedent would be set
- overly bulky houses are proposed which are out of character
- the proposal will have an adverse impact on Mayfield Grove and farm Road
- Rainham does not have the infrastructure to cope with more houses
- there are often houses for sale in the area which indicates that no new houses are needed
- loss of residential amenity generally
- the average is for 3 cars per household such that there will be insufficient parking provided

- loss of possible bat habitat in the orchard
- Surridge Close is unique and deserves protection
- loss of sunlight and view
- emergency and servicing vehicles will not be able to access the new houses

4.2 The Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor has written to advise that the scheme does show crime prevention measures. He requests the addition of a condition and informative regarding Secured by Design and ones for boundary treatments, external lighting and details of cycle storage if permission is granted.

4.4 The Fire Brigade (LFEDA) indicate that the hammer head part of the entrance road appears large enough for Pumping Applicant to turn around, provided the area is kept clear of parked cars. Access arrangements must meet B5 of ADB Volume 1; this is a Building Regulations document and a separate Building Regulations application would be needed.

## **Background**

An application to register the site subject to this planning application has been made under Section 15 of the Commons Act 2006 to register the site as a Town or Village Green and this application which is entirely separate from the planning process has been submitted to the Council. At the time of drafting this report a decision has been sent out and will be reported to Members at the Committee meeting.

## **5. Staff Comments:**

5.1 The issues in this case are the principle of development, its impact in the streetscene, on residential amenity and parking/highways/servicing. Policies CP1, CP2, CP17, DC2, DC3, DC33, DC34, DC35, DC36, DC53, DC55, DC58, DC59, DC60, DC61, DC62, DC63 and DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The SPD on Residential Extensions and Alterations (as relevant), SPD on Residential Design, SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction and SPD on Planning Obligations. London Plan Policies 2.15, 3.3, 3.5, 3.8, 3.9, 4.2, 4.7, 6.9, 6.13, 7.3, 7.4 and 7.6, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are applicable.

### *5.2 Principle of development*

5.2.1 The site lies in the existing urban area. This scheme would mainly be provided on the end part of the rear gardens to No.16 Glebe Road and 55 and 57 Parsonage Road. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does not preclude such development, as material circumstances will be relevant. In this case the land has a frontage onto the public highway at Surridge Close and it is considered that the proposal would not therefore result in tandem development or of "back-land" development as such.

5.2.2 Policy CP1 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD states that "...outside town centres and the Green Belt, prioritising all non-

designated land for housing". The application site is on land which is not designated land in the LDF, such that its use for housing would be acceptable.

5.2.3 The NPPF indicates that sustainable development should normally be granted planning permission and the site would be in a sustainable location. The details of the scheme will be important in deciding whether the proposed development is acceptable.

### 5.3 *Density/Site Layout*

5.3.1 Policy DC2 sets out ranges of residential densities. In this location a density of 30-50 units per hectare would be expected. The site area is 0.25 Hectares and the proposal is for 6 houses. The proposed density is therefore 24 units per hectare which falls below the guidance range. However, the provision of the access road in the middle of the development reduces the area available for development such that the density of the land specifically developed is likely to be somewhat higher. Nonetheless density is only one indicator and the main consideration is whether the proposal provides a high quality of design and layout. The main consideration is whether the scheme is of a high standard of design and layout in accordance with Policies DC2 and DC61.

5.3.2 The London Plan indicates at Policy 3.5 (and Table 3.3) that for 4-bed houses for 6 people should be a minimum of 107 sq.m (gross internal area: gia) and 2-bed houses for 4 people should be a minimum of 83 sq.m and 3 bed houses for 5 people should be a minimum of 96 sq.m. House 1 is a 4 bed house for 6 people with a Gross Internal Area (GIA) of 123 sq.m; the semi-detached houses (Houses 2 and 3) are both 2 bedroom for 4 people have a (GIA) of 101 sq.m each and the terrace (Houses 4, 5 and 6) is of 3 bed houses for 5 people with a (GIA) of 111 sq.m each. All units would be in excess of the minimum internal space standards.

5.3.3 In respect of the site layout, the new driveway access would extend from the existing eastern end of Surridge Close and then turn at right-angles and northward away from Glebe Road/towards Farm Road extending to the rear of the site with houses to the west, east and south of the new cul-de-sac section. Private gardens would be provided to the rear of each house with 2 parking spaces provided for each property.

5.3.4 The Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Design states that every home should have access to suitable private and / or communal amenity space through one or more of the following: private gardens, communal gardens, courtyards, patios, balconies and roof terraces. Although the SPD does not stipulate any size requirements, the aim is to encourage developers to bring forward schemes involving imaginative and innovative provision of amenity space. The proposed separate amenity spaces for each property at a minimum of 101 sq.m (House 3) and maximum of 244 sq.m to House 1 are considered by Staff to be appropriate to the nature and size of the proposed units such that this scheme would provide an acceptable level of amenity space. In addition, they are similar to those in Surridge Close and larger than those in Mayfield

Grove which adjoin the application site; Staff therefore consider that this would be acceptable.

5.3.5 Staff therefore consider that the proposed layout would be acceptable.

#### 5.4 *Design/Impact on Street/Garden Scene*

5.4.1 The surrounding area is of mainly 2-storey houses. The proposal would result in 6 houses, nonetheless only the three houses located directly along the continued section of Surridge Close would be directly visible in the existing streetscene with the others forming a new street scene around the bend in the new access driveway.

5.4.2 To the southern side of Surridge Close, House 1 would step forward slightly where the road bend is proposed. As a single detached house, Staff consider that the proposed design and form of the development would be in character with existing two storey development. Similarly, the two-storey semi-detached pair to the northern side of Surridge Close would be stepped back slightly and Staff consider that the two-storey development would also be in general character with the existing residential development in the Close.

5.4.3 The rear elevations of the proposed development (Houses 1, 2 and 3) would not extend significantly beyond the rear elevations of No.20 Surridge Close/No.25 Surridge Close and Staff therefore consider, in line with the SPD on Residential Design, that these houses would have an acceptable impact on visual amenity in Surridge Close's streetscene and garden environment.

5.4.4 House 1 would have an impact on the rear garden environment of properties in Mayfield Grove. This is in part because the rear gardens of properties in Mayfield Grove are particularly limited in both depth and (because of garages locate to the rear in some cases) width. The minimum depths of gardens to No.s 2 and 3 Mayfield Grove are 8.8m and 10m respectively. The previously refused two-house scheme was located 1m from the shared side boundary and therefore a minimum of 9.8m from the rear elevation of No.2 Mayfield Grove and approximately 11m from the nearest elevation of No.3 Mayfield Grove. The proposed single house would be located 6.4m away from the side boundary with No.2 Mayfield Grove and therefore a minimum of 15.2m away from its rear elevation. In relation to No.3 Mayfield Grove, the proposed house would be located a minimum of 16.4m away. While a matter of judgement, Staff consider that the proposed house is sufficiently distant from the rear of the existing property as to not result in any significant loss of amenity to the existing occupiers from the physical form of the proposed development.

5.3.5 A new streetscene would be formed with a terrace of three two-storey houses to the eastern side of the extended road with the pair of semi-detached properties to its west. The front elevation of the proposed terrace roughly aligns with the rear elevations of the residential properties to Mayfield Grove. The terrace's proposed rear elevation extends beyond the front elevation of the nearest property to the western side of Mayfield Grove, namely No.5 Mayfield Grove. As such, the new properties would be partly visible at the northern end of Mayfield

Grove. The proposal indicates that for the properties to the north of those in Mayfield Grove that levels would be reduced slightly below those currently. This is to reduce the impact on these existing properties and it is therefore appropriate that a suitable condition is attached requiring proposed ground levels. Staff consider that the proposed slightly lower ground level would result in the properties having an acceptable impact in the new streetscene and rear garden environment, together with the proposed arrangement with properties set well back with some front landscaping and vehicle parking to the front of each property would not appear overly dominant or obtrusive in the new streetscene to the Surridge Close extended driveway access, nor would the properties appearing at the end of the vista to Mayfield Grove appear unacceptable in respect of visual amenity in either streetscene, in line with the Residential Design SPD.

5.4.5 The proposal involves the development of a terrace in an area behind/beyond existing development to Surridge Close/Mayfield Grove, nonetheless the proposed houses align with existing development to Mayfield Grove and Staff therefore consider that these properties would not result in harm to the rear garden environment.

5.4.6 Staff therefore consider that the design and siting of the proposed dwellings would not appear materially obtrusive in the street scene, nor would it have an adverse impact on the rear garden environment. They would introduce an element of backland development, nonetheless Staff consider that it would not result in it being overbearing or intrusive.

## 5.5 *Impact on Amenity*

5.5.1 Houses 1, 2 and 3 are proposed to be set back from the Surridge Close highway the same distance as the existing properties. Houses 2 and 3 would be slightly deeper than No. 25 Surridge Close at first floor and significantly deeper at ground floor level. Nonetheless Staff consider, given the distance between No. 25 and the proposed House 2 and as No.25 has its own extension at ground floor level, that there would be no undue impact on this adjoining occupier's amenity. Windows to the side elevations at first floor level can be fitted with obscure glass and fixed shut (or restricted) to prevent any loss of privacy. A suitable condition can be attached to any grant of planning permission. Staff do not therefore consider that this part of the development would result in any adverse impact by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy or outlook.

5.5.2 In relation to Houses 4, 5 and 6, this terrace would follow the same alignment as properties 1-5 to Mayfield Grove. Proposed House 6 would be closest to No.6 Mayfield Grove's front elevation, nonetheless Staff consider at a minimum distance of 6m away and as the angle of view from the rear windows would be oblique, that there would not be any significant loss of privacy or interlooking between these two properties. Windows to the side elevations at first floor level can be fitted with obscure glass and fixed shut (or restricted) to prevent any loss of privacy.

5.5.3 Staff consider that there would be no undue loss of privacy or overlooking into the existing properties and that the proposed development would also not suffer from a reduced level of residential amenity due to the orientation and relative positioning in relation to existing residential development.

5.5.4 Staff therefore consider that the proposed development would result in an acceptable level of amenity for the new occupiers whilst not affecting existing residential amenity to an unacceptable degree.

## 5.6 *Highway/Parking/Servicing*

5.6.1 The car parking requirements for developments in this location is 1.5-2 parking spaces per dwelling. 2 parking spaces are proposed to each of the 6 dwellings. This would be acceptable.

5.6.2 In respect of access, the proposed development would take access from Surridge Close. Highways have indicated that the access driveway is private but otherwise have no objections to the proposed driveway exiting onto Surridge Close.

5.6.3 In line with Annex 6, suitable provision would need to be made for both cycle parking and refuse/recycling awaiting collection on site and would be subject to suitable planning conditions for its implementation and retention.

## 6. *Section 106 agreement*

6.1 The dwellings would result in additional local infrastructure demand such that a financial contribution is needed in accordance with Policy DC72 and the draft SPD on Planning Obligations, totalling £36,000.

## 7. *Mayoral CIL*

7.1 The proposed development is liable for the Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in accordance with London Plan Policy 8.3. The applicable fee is based on an internal gross floor area of 680m<sup>2</sup> which equates to a Mayoral CIL payment of £13,600 (subject to indexation)

## 8. *Other Issues*

8.1 The Secured by Design Officer asks that suitable conditions are attached in relation to Secured by Design (and an informative), external lighting, cycle storage and boundary treatment.

## 9. **Conclusions**

9.1 The proposal is for 6 houses. Staff consider that the proposal would be acceptable in principle and that the details of the scheme are acceptable such that the scheme would be in accordance with Policies DC2, DC33, DC36 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.



## IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

### **Financial Implications and risks:**

None

### **Legal Implications and risks:**

A legal agreement would be needed to ensure that suitable contributions are made to local infrastructure arising from the proposed development.

### **Human Resource Implications:**

None

### **Equalities and Social Inclusion Implications:**

The Council's planning policies are implemented with regard to Equalities and Diversity.

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Application forms and plans received 22 January 2011; revised plans received 28<sup>th</sup> February and 31<sup>st</sup> May 2013)