

PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision

Item 6.6

1.0 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION DETAILS

Ref: 19/04705/FUL
 Location: 16-18 Ash Tree Close, Croydon, CR0 7SR
 Ward: Shirley North
 Description: Demolition of the existing dwellings. Erection of 8 dwellings with associated access, parking, refuse and cycle stores.
 Drawing Nos: 919:1130/PL101 Rev C, 919:1130/PL102 Rev D, 919:1130/PL103 Rev C, 919:1130/PL104 Rev C, 919:1130/PL105 Rev A, 919:1130/PL106 Rev C and the site location plan scaled at 1:1250.
 Applicant: Mr Robert Turner (Turnbull Land)
 Agent: N/A
 Case Officer: Wayne Spencer

	1 bed, 2 person	2 bed, 3 person	2 bed, 4 person	3 bed, 5 person
Houses	0	0	0	8

Number of car parking spaces	Number of cycle parking spaces
8	16

1.1 This application is being reported to committee because the Ward Councillor Sue Bennett and Councillor Richard Chatterjee have made representations in accordance with the Committee Consideration Criteria and requested committee consideration and the number of representations which have been received are above the threshold of the Committee Consideration Criteria.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That the Planning Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions below:

1. Commence within 3 years
2. In accordance with the approved plans
3. Demolition and Construction Logistics Plan
4. External facing materials (including samples) to be approved
5. Hard and soft landscaping to be approved (to incorporate SuDS)
6. Details of lighting
7. Refuse/cycle stores to be installed/retained in perpetuity
8. Obscure glazing to upper floor north west and south east facing windows
9. Tree Protection in accordance with Arboricultural Report
10. Access road and car parking spaces to be provided as shown
11. EVCPs to be provided for parking spaces
12. 19% carbon dioxide reduction
13. Water usage off 110L per head per day
14. All units to be Part M(4)2 compliant
15. Removal of Permitted Development rights

16. Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport

Informatives

- 1) Community Infrastructure Levy
- 2) Code of practice for construction sites
- 3) Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport.

3.0 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

3.1 The applicant seeks full planning permission for the following:

- Demolition of the existing dwellings on site
- Erection of 8 x three bed dwellings
- Refuse and cycle stores to all new properties
- Associated private amenity spaces
- Associated hard and soft landscaping
- 8 parking spaces on site (1 per dwelling)

Site and Surroundings

3.2 The application site lies at the eastern end of Ash Tree Close at the end of the cul-de-sac. The site currently has a pair of semi-detached dwellings with east facing garden spaces which are to be demolished as a result of this proposal.

3.3 The surrounding area is residential in character with properties in Ash Tree Close, Ash Tree Way and Aylesford Avenue being predominantly 2-storeys in height with some properties which have accommodation included in the roof spaces over. The majority of the dwellings are terraced or semi-detached and are of similar character, form and design. The land to the south east is an allotment accessed from Aylesford Avenue.

3.4 The site is not within a Conservation Area and the building in question is neither nationally nor locally listed. The application site is within a PTAL 1a which is considered to have poor public transport options and is also at 'very low' risk of surface water flooding.

Planning History

3.5 08/01150/P – Demolition of existing buildings; erection of 6 two storey four bedroom terraced houses with accommodation in roof space; formation of access road and provision of associated parking – Permission refused

3.6 19/03263/PRE – Erection of 8 x 3-bed dwellings – Amendments suggested to improve the scheme

4.0 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The principle of the development is acceptable given the residential character of the immediate locality and the extant planning permission.

- The design, form and appearance of the development is appropriate given the context of surrounding area.
- The living conditions of adjoining occupiers would be protected from undue harm.
- The living standards of future occupiers are satisfactory and meet the National Housing Space Standards.
- The highway impact on the surrounding area would be acceptable.
- Sustainability aspects are controllable through the use of planning conditions.
- Flood risk mitigation measures are controllable through the use of planning conditions

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

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

6.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

6.1 The application has been publicised by way of consultation letters sent to the properties which are adjacent to the application site. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 59 Objecting: 59 Supporting: 0

6.2 The following issues were raised in representations. Those that are material to the determination of the application are addressed in substance in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section of this report:

Summary of objections	Response
<i>Townscape</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overdevelopment of the site leading to overcrowding • Change to established Ash Tree Close building line • Gable ended semi-detached buildings out of keeping with Ash Tree Close • Detrimental to the character of the area • Application to redevelop this site with 6 new dwellings was refused in 2008 – why is a larger quantum of development now acceptable? • Impact upon heritage of the area • Lack of street lighting to serve the development 	See paragraphs 8.3 – 8.6
<i>Neighbouring amenity</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of light and overshadowing impact • Overlooking and loss of privacy • Increase noise from additional residents • Noise and air pollution impact and disturbance during construction works • Lack of communal amenity/play spaces for children 	See paragraphs 8.12 – 8.15

<i>Environment</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of garden (green) space • Loss of trees and the impact upon wildlife/CO2 reductions/health • Lack of soft landscaping proposed • Lack of green space for future occupiers 	See paragraphs 8.6, 8.10, 8.21 and 8.22
<i>Highways and Refuse</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of parking provision (and visitor parking) potentially resulting in detrimental highways impact • Concerns over highway (including pedestrian) safety and manoeuvrability within the site • Swept paths encroach on neighbouring plots • Poor access for emergency or large delivery vehicles (during and post construction) • Poor refuse collection access • Lack of refuse storage provision • Refuse management of communal bin store and potential of vermin being attracted if not properly managed 	See paragraphs 8.16 – 8.18
<i>Flooding</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased flooding impact due to proximity of Chaffinch Brook 	See paragraph 8.20
Other comments	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure on local infrastructure with doctors and schools will be oversubscribed 	See paragraph 8.15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density of the development for a PTAL 1a does not conform to London Plan 	See paragraph 8.17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CIL payments made for Shirley North 	See paragraph 8.15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No affordable housing 	Not required as the scheme is for less than 10 units
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children will no longer be able to play in the street – detrimental to their mental health and wellbeing 	There is no requirement for play space to be provided – all dwellings have their own private amenity space which is policy compliant – See paragraph 8.10

6.3 The following comments have been received but are not material to the determination of this application and will require no further assessment:

Summary of comments	Response
Loss of a view	Not a material planning consideration
Damage to neighbouring property/boundary treatment	These matters are not material planning considerations and are covered by alternative legislation (Party Wall Act)

Neighbour does not want any planting to overhang the boundary	This would be a civil matter and not a material planning consideration
Concern over security of neighbouring property during construction works	This would be a civil matter between the neighbour and the developer
Compliance with fire regulations	Considered under Building Regulations
Impact on sewers, drainage and gas supply as a result of additional properties	Not a material planning consideration
Impact upon property prices	Not a material planning consideration
Impact on the community ruining the relationships built up between neighbours	Not a material planning consideration
Site not currently underused as suggested in the submission	Not a material planning consideration

6.4 Councillor Sue Bennett has objected and referred the application to Planning Committee on the following grounds:

- Inappropriate, exceptionally high housing and residential densities
- inadequate parking due to low PTAL rating
- extreme overlooking and invasion of privacy

6.5 Councillor Richard Chatterjee has objected and referred the application to planning Committee on the following grounds:

- Proposed Housing Density totally inappropriate given the PTAL 1a, rating
- Cumulative impact of the proposed, and other recently approved developments, is changing the character of the area without compensatory growth in local infrastructure, GP surgeries or public transport
- Full GIA dimensions not provided for each dwelling
- Minimum in-built storage space not stated on drawings
- Insufficient parking allocation
- Fails to respect the scale, height, massing and density of the surrounding properties
- Inadequate vehicle space within the site
- Access/egress swept paths encroach on neighbouring curtilages
- No allocation figures for amenity space allocation for each dwelling
- Loss privacy and overlooking
- No new street lighting shown for the new access road
- Inadequate refuse storage
- Refuse/cycle storage not integrated with the design concept and appear to be bolted-on afterthoughts
- Building workers' cars would cause significant obstruction to the local road network
- Demolition debris and delivery of construction materials will cause significant disruption and inconvenience to local residents
- The development is extremely close to flood risk from the Chaffinch Brook and therefore would exacerbate the existing potential for flood risk in this locality
- Additional development and loss of trees in the locality would create a further flood risk to surrounding properties in Ash Tree Way and Ash Tree Close
- Overdevelopment for the locality and does not respect the existing residential and housing densities

- The siting and layout would not respect or improve the existing pattern of buildings and the spaces between them
- Would appear a dominant and extremely poorly designed, out of character element in the street scene

6.6 Monks Orchard Residents Association (MORA) have objected to the application and their comments have been included in paragraph 6.2 above. Their main objections are on the following grounds:

- Similar scheme previously refused in 2008
- Overdevelopment – scale and massing inappropriate
- Inappropriate residential densities
- Inadequate parking due to low PTAL rating
- Lack of public transport options
- No CIL allocation to Shirley North
- Not convinced over space standard compliance
- Parking not screened from the road
- Inadequate manoeuvrability to allow access/egress to/from parking spaces
- Lack of amenity space per dwelling
- Overlooking/loss of privacy
- Out of character, harmful to street scene
- Lack of street lighting
- Inappropriate refuse/cycle storage
- Inadequate parking for construction vehicles
- Lack of flood risk mitigation

7.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

7.1 In determining any planning application, the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of its Development Plan so far as is material to the application and to any other material considerations and the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Council's adopted Development Plan consists of the Consolidated London Plan 2015, the Croydon Local Plan 2018 and the South London Waste Plan 2012.

7.2 Government Guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), issued in February 2019. The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, requiring that development which accords with an up-to-date local plan should be approved without delay. The NPPF identifies a number of key issues for the delivery of sustainable development, those most relevant to this case are:

- Promoting sustainable transport;
- Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes;
- Requiring good design.

7.3 The main policy considerations raised by the application that the Planning Committee is required to consider are:

- 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- 3.4 Optimising housing potential
- 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments

- 3.8 Housing choice
- 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.12 Flood risk management
- 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- 5.16 Waste net self sufficiency
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.2 An inclusive environment
- 7.3 Designing out crime
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.21 Woodlands and trees

7.4 Croydon Local Plan 2018:

- SP1.1 Sustainable development
- SP1.2 Place making
- SP2.1 Homes
- SP2.2 Quantities and location
- SP2.6 Quality and standards
- SP4.1 and SP4.2 Urban design and local character
- SP4.11 regarding character
- SP6.1 Environment and climate change
- SP6.2 Energy and carbon dioxide reduction
- SP6.3 Sustainable design and construction
- SP6.4 Flooding, urban blue corridors and water management
- SP8.6 and SP8.7 Sustainable travel choice
- SP8.12 Motor vehicle transportation
- SP8.17 Parking
- DM1: Housing choice for sustainable communities
- DM10: Design and character
- DM13: Refuse and recycling
- DM16: Promoting Healthy Communities
- DM23: Development and construction
- DM25: Sustainable Drainage Systems and Reducing Flood Risk
- DM29: Promoting sustainable travel and reducing congestion
- DM30: Car and cycle parking in new development

7.5 There is relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance as follows:

- London Housing SPG March 2016
- Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2019

Emerging New London Plan

7.6 Whilst the emerging New London Plan is a material consideration, the weight afforded is down to the decision maker linked to the stage a plan has reached in its

development. The Plan appears to be close to adoption. The Mayor's Intend to Publish version of the New London Plan is currently with the Secretary of State and no response had been submitted to the Mayor from the Secretary of State. Therefore, the New London Plan's weight has increased following on from the publication of the Panel Report and the London Mayor's publication of the Intend to Publish New London Plan. The Planning Inspectors' Panel Report accepted the need for London to deliver 66,000 new homes per annum (significantly higher than existing adopted targets), but questioned the London Plan's ability to deliver the level of housing predicted on "small sites" with insufficient evidence having been presented to the Examination to give confidence that the targets were realistic and/or achievable. This conclusion resulted in the Panel Report recommending a reduction in London's and Croydon's "small sites" target.

- 7.7 The Mayor in his Intend to Publish New London Plan has accepted the reduced Croydon's overall 10 year net housing figures from 29,490 to 20,790 homes, with the "small sites" reduced from 15,110 to 6,470 homes. Crucially, the lower windfall housing target for Croydon (641 homes a year) is not dissimilar to but slightly larger the current adopted 2018 Croydon Local Plan target of 592 homes on windfall sites each year.
- 7.8 It is important to note, should the Secretary of State support the Intend to Publish New London Plan, that the overall housing target in the New London Plan would be 2,079 new homes per annum (2019 – 2029) compared with 1,645 in the Croydon Local Plan 2018. Therefore, even with the possible reduction in the overall New London Plan housing targets, assuming it is adopted, Croydon will be required to deliver more new homes than our current Croydon Local Plan 2018 and current London Plan (incorporating alterations 2016) targets.
- 7.9 For clarity, the Croydon Local Plan 2018, current London Plan (incorporating alterations 2016) and South London Waste Plan 2012 remain the primary consideration when determining planning applications.

8.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider are:
- Principle of development
 - Townscape and visual impact
 - Housing Quality for future occupiers
 - Residential amenity for neighbours
 - Transport
 - Sustainability

Principle of development

- 8.2 The appropriate use of land is a material consideration to ensure that opportunities for development are recognised and housing supply optimised. The site is currently in residential use and has not been designated in the local plan, to be used for any other purpose. The dwellings to be demolished are family dwellings and it is proposed to erect 8 x 3-bed dwellings to replace these. As such, the proposal would be in accordance with the requirements of Croydon Local Plan 2018 Policy DM1.2. The site is outside of the Shirley Intensification Area and would therefore be considered a

'windfall' site. As such, the development would be considered acceptable in principle provided that respects the character and appearance of the surrounding area and there are no other impact issues.

Townscape and visual impact

- 8.3 The site currently contains two dwelling houses which are of two storeys in height with roof space over. The overall height of the proposed buildings would be three storeys in height and would introduce two blocks of four 3-bed dwellings with every 2 properties stepped back to create the appearance of pairs of semis when viewed from the Ash Tree Close.
- 8.4 Ash Tree Close is typically characterised by 2-storey semi-detached and terraced properties, some with roof space accommodation. All surrounding properties have similar scale and massing with traditionally styled appearance. The proposal would involve removing 2 semi-detached dwellings which naturally address the curve of the road however there is no objection to the removal of these dwellings and intensifying the residential capacity of the site in question, subject to appropriate parking, amenity spaces and refuse/cycle provision being made available. The dwellings would follow the slope of the land and would therefore appear slightly higher than the dwellings in Ash Tree Close when viewed from the road however the proposed dwellings are laid out in a staggered form which expresses the dwellings as pairs. Given the massing and height of the proposed buildings in relation to the scale and massing of the surrounding properties, it is considered that the scale and massing of the buildings would be acceptable in this location as the ridge heights are broadly in line with the existing contextual buildings. As this approach references the predominant contextual typologies of the area, it would be acceptable in this context. The height differences would not dominate the existing dwellings in Ash Tree Close due to the staggered nature and the massing is further broken up by the staggering. The building line to no.20 Ash Tree Close would be maintained given the generous offset from the front and rear boundaries. Although fully gabled dwellings are not typical of Ash Tree Close, the proposed dwellings being set back into the site would not address the street in the same way as the existing properties. As a result, the design approach with gable ends and bay features would be acceptable. As the dwellings are of a traditional styling, it is not considered that they would be significantly out of keeping with, or detrimental to, the existing street scene or the heritage of the area. Third party comments refer to a previous refusal for 6 dwellings in 2008 (reference 08/01150/P) however this decision pre-dates the adoption of the current Local Plan, the London Plan and the current Supplementary Planning Guidance. The current scheme conforms to the current development plan and associated documents and therefore the previous refusal can only be afforded limited weight when determining this case.
- 8.5 The dwellings would introduce front dormer windows to all new dwellings which are set in at both sides to prevent the front elevation being dominated by this massing. Plots 5-8 would introduce first floor level chamfered windows to the front elevation however this approach would not be unduly incongruous. The use of contrasting material treatment reinforces the pairing of the dwellings with a good use of brick detailing. The porch detailing gives good legibility to the entrances and the flank windows and features to the flank walls assist with breaking up the brick massing and add architectural interest. The juxtaposition of the built form combined with the design of the buildings would prevent the development from appearing incongruous with the surrounding built form. Suitable materials would be secured by planning condition.

8.6 The boundary treatment adjoining Ash Tree Close is shown as being 2 metre high hedging and a number of trees are to be planted to soften the appearance of the development from the public realm. The same boundary treatment would be included to both sides and the rear boundaries. This approach would be considered acceptable and all soft landscaping could be secured by planning condition. In addition, a suitable lighting scheme could also be secured by planning condition to justify acceptability.



Housing quality for future occupiers

8.7 The proposal results in an increased density on the site by eight additional residential units, all of which would be 3-bed, 5 person units. The scheme exceeds the density matrix (150-200) as set out within the London Plan at approximately 300 habitable rooms per hectare. However, given suburban setting combined with the similar footprint, form and spacing of the proposed dwellings in comparison to the surrounding properties, the acute need for new homes and the fact that the site is very close to the intensification area of Shirley, it is considered an appropriate density for this site.

8.8 The dwellings would need to be compliant with M4(2) of the Building Regulations providing step free access to these units for any future disabled residents and this would appear to be the case. It is considered that compliance with M4(2) rather than M4(3) would be acceptable in this case given the overall scale of the proposed development.

8.9 The National Space Standards and the London Plan states that 3-bed 5 person dwellings split over three floors should provide a minimum internal floor space of 99m². The floor plans show that all eight dwellings measure approximately 106sqm. Having assessed the room sizes and the associated fenestration detailing on the proposal, the habitable rooms of all proposed dwellings would have a good outlook and would have adequate sized windows to allow a significant amount of natural light to enter all of the habitable rooms within these dwellings.

8.10 All dwellings will have private accessible, rear garden amenity spaces and all exceed the minimal space standards contained within the London Plan Housing SPG. They would all receive adequate daylight and sunlight and none of the spaces infringe upon any of the privacy of the existing or proposed residential properties. The Council consider that the standard of accommodation provided by the proposed development would be acceptable for all future occupiers.

8.11 It was raised at the pre-application meeting that the safety and security of the new route through will be critical and would need to include a continuous, dedicated pedestrian route. This has been included within the scheme and, in order for the development to be considered acceptable, the route would need to be well-lit to discourage anti-social behaviour. An external lighting requirement could be secured as part of the landscaping condition.

Residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers



8.12 The closest building to no.20, plot 1, would be set away from the boundary by 900mm at its closest point and this distance would increase as the building projects rearwards into the site. The building maintains a clear 45 degree angle between the built form and the rear facing windows of no.20 given that the new building tapers further away as it continues rearwards into the site. The rearward projection of plot 1 in relation to the rear windows of no.20 is not a significant projection and that fact that no.20 is angled away from the proposed development would ensure that daylight and sunlight to no.20 would not be adversely affected by this proposal. The only ground floor window of no.20 is on the opposite side to the proposed building on plot 1, next to no 22. The development has also been designed so that the built form cascades away from no.20 as it continues eastwards. The dwellings would be at least 10 metres away from the boundary with no.14 at its closest point. The development would breach the 45 degree angle from no.14 however, at the point where the properties breach this, the dwelling would be over 10 metres from the boundary between the site and no.14 and over 20 metres from the dwelling itself. The separation distances being proposed

combined with the juxtaposition, design and massing of the development would prevent the dwellings from having a significantly overbearing impact upon either nos.14 or 20 and both properties will achieve a good level of daylight and sunlight to the rear facing windows and their associated rear garden spaces. .

- 8.13 Croydon's Suburban Design Guide SPD requires a separation distance of at least 18 metres to be maintained between the existing habitable room windows of the adjacent building and the habitable room windows of any new build elements. In addition, the first 10 metres of rear garden space of the existing dwellings would need to be protected from any overlooking resulting from this development. The fenestration arrangement, in particular plots 5 and 6, and the positioning of the openings were not acceptable initially as the upper floor front facing windows of plots 5 and 6 overlooked the first 10 metres of the rear garden of no.14. However, the scheme has now been re-designed to provide a chamfered element which now ensures that there would be no direct overlooking to the rear garden of no.14. The side boundary of the rear garden of no.14 Ash Tree Close required strengthening and additional planting was added. Since the chamfered element has been introduced, the density of this planting has been reduced and this would be acceptable given that the main reason for such planting was for overlooking mitigation purposes. The additional trees which are now proposed to the boundary of no.14 Ash Tree Close will assist in screening the development from no.14 as well as softening the appearance of the development from this property. The upper floor side windows being proposed to each of the dwellings break up the brick façades where the staggering of the built form occurs and allows for additional natural ventilation to the rooms they serve. These windows serve either non-habitable rooms/spaces or serve as secondary windows to the habitable rooms and, as such, they could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7m to protect the privacy of the future occupiers of the adjoining properties.
- 8.14 With regards to potential noise impact from future occupiers, although the residential density on the site would increase the building would need to meet current Building Regulations standards which include relevant sound proofing measures. Therefore, it is not considered that eight residential units in this location would result in a significant increase in noise disturbance. Noise and disturbance during construction works would be controlled by Environmental Health legislation relating to hours of construction and the need for site hoardings and are therefore not material planning considerations.
- 8.15 With regards to third party comments not addressed above, concern was raised regarding the impact that the development would have upon the local doctor's surgeries and school place provision. Given the overall scale of the proposed development and the fact that only eight family units are to be provided, it is not considered that the development would have a significant impact upon doctor's surgery and school provision to warrant the refusal of permission on these grounds. In addition, the development would be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), which would contribute financially to both health and education infrastructure.

Transport

- 8.16 The application site is in an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) accessibility rating of 1a indicating poor access to public transport links and an enhanced reliance on private motor vehicles. The proposal does include one parking space per dwelling and the Transportation Team confirmed that a parking ratio of 1:1 would be acceptable provided that the vehicles are able to enter and leave the site

safely without the need for excessive reversing. A swept path analysis has been submitted with this application showing the manoeuvres required to get in and out of the proposed spaces and it is considered that there would be adequate space within the site to avoid excessive reversing. The parking spaces do include manoeuvres which encroach upon the delineated footpath in the site and the open frontage of the adjoining plots. However, the Transportation Team consider this arrangement to be acceptable as it relates to a relatively small number of spaces. It is recognised that large vehicles, including emergency vehicles, would find access into the site and manoeuvrability difficult however it is possible for vehicles to temporarily park at the end of Ash Tree Close in emergencies. It has been demonstrated that a fire appliance could park close to the site and the agent has confirmed that the fire hose would reach the required distance to the rearmost part of the furthest house from the fire appliance. The proposal would appear to conform to the required fire standards under Building Regulations however these matters are not material considerations under this planning application and will need to satisfy Building Regulations and the requirements of the London Fire Commissioner should planning permission be granted. The development would be subject to an acceptable Demolition/Construction Logistics Plan in order to prevent undue noise and air pollution during the construction works and to ensure that construction vehicles use appropriate delivery routes and park their vehicles in a suitable location. The submission of this could be controlled by planning condition.

- 8.17 The proposed development would require covered secure cycle storage to be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the London Plan and the London Cycling Design Standards with 2 cycle spaces per dwelling (a total of 16 spaces). The cycle spaces are shown to be located within the rear gardens of each of the dwellings apart from plots 6 and 7 who will have a cycle store at the end of the access road. It is considered that these would be easily accessible for future occupiers however details of the appearance of the cycle stores would need to be secured by planning condition to ensure that it meets London Plan requirements and has no significant impact upon the character or appearance of the area.

Refuse storage

- 8.18 The refuse vehicle would not be able to enter the site and turn within it. The site would rely upon the existing refuse collection service which operates in Ash Tree Close and therefore the development would need to conform to the Council's Refuse and Recycling Guidance. The refuse collection area is within 30 metres of each dwelling and the collection area is within 20 metres of the collection vehicle (i.e. the closest point a refuse vehicle can access). Having a refuse store within each of the dwellings themselves would have compromised the internal spaces and the external stores are to be screened, secure and would be integral to the landscaped area as a whole. The Council would require these stores to be retained for as long as the development exists and the capacity and appearance of these stores would be secured by planning condition.

Sustainability

- 8.19 Conditions would be imposed requiring a 19% carbon dioxide emission reduction target and a water use target of 110L per head per day, in line with policy requirements. No renewable energy provisions have been shown on the submitted documentation however such provision will be secured by planning condition.

Flood Risk

8.20 The site itself is within an area which is at 'very low' risk of surface water flooding. Surface Water Drainage is proposed to be addressed via connection to Thames Water's surface water drainage system and SuDS in the form of permeable paving in order to disperse surface water to the soft landscaped areas and reduce surface water run-off. The Chaffinch Brook is approximately 35 metres from the site at its closest point and the site does not fall within an area at risk of flooding from this source. As such, the SuDS approach to this scheme is considered to be acceptable and the provision of such mitigation measures can be controlled via a suitably worded planning condition.

Trees and Ecology

8.21 The proposed development would not involve the loss of any on-site trees and the existing trees surrounding the site are proposed to be retained. Arboricultural information submitted with the application has been assessed and the Council considered that all trees can be retained and can be adequately protected from damage during the construction phase. Additional planting of trees is proposed which will help to soften the appearance of the development and their strategic planting will allow safe access and egress from the site. In conclusion, the development would be acceptable from a tree perspective and the implementation of further on-site trees, including an appropriately chosen species, would be controlled by planning condition. It is not considered that the positioning of the proposed building would have a detrimental impact on the health (or future risk of intensive pruning) of the existing or proposed trees.

8.22 The site does not have any known biodiversity or ecology designations. As such, it is considered that the development would not have any significant impact upon ecology or biodiversity. The landscaping for the development would be subject to a planning condition.

Conclusion

8.23 The proposal would result in the optimal redevelopment of the site which would contribute to local housing need by providing a total of eight new homes within the Borough. The development would not be significantly harmful to the character of the area and would not have a significant impact on the amenities of adjoining occupiers. Landscaping, parking and energy systems are all acceptable in principle and can be secured by condition. It is therefore recommended that planning permission is granted.

8.24 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account.