

1.0 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION DETAILS

Ref: 18/01996/FUL
 Location: 2 Purley Hill, Purley, CR8 1AN.
 Ward: Purley and Woodcote Ward
 Description: Demolition of the existing two storey property and garage structure, erection of a part two /part three storey building with roof level, creation of nine self-contained flats (C3), with associated landscaping, front lightwells, level changes, terraces, refuse store, cycle stores and car parking.
 Drawing Nos: 14-P- 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.
 Applicant: Sterling Rose.
 Agent: Sterling Rose.
 Case Officer: Barry Valentine.

	1B 1P	1B 2P	2B 3P	3 B 4P	3B 5P	Total
Existing Provision					1	1
Proposed Residential Mix	2	2	3	2		9

Number of car parking spaces	Number of cycle parking spaces
2 on site car parking spaces	14 on site cycle parking spaces

1.1 This application is being reported to Planning Committee as 58 objections have been received, which is above the threshold set out in the Committee Consideration Criteria and because the Ward Councillor (Cllr Simon Brew) made representations in accordance with the Committee Considerations Criteria and requested Committee consideration.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Planning Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission.
- 2.2 That the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions

- 1. In accordance with the approved plans.
- 2. Development to be implemented within three years.
- 3. Samples and details (as appropriate) of materials including window frames and lightwell balustrades.

4. Details on landscaping including replacement trees, play-space, accessibility, inclusiveness, and boundary treatments.
5. Sustainable Urban Drainage System.
6. Provision of on-site car parking – prior to occupation and permanently retained thereafter.
7. Refuse store to be installed prior to occupation.
8. Alternative design cycle store details to be submitted and installed prior to occupation.
9. Water use target.
10. Carbon Dioxide 19% reduction beyond 2013 Building Regulations.
11. Installation of one electric vehicles charging point.
12. Privacy screens to be installed prior to occupation of the development.
13. Obscurely glazed and non-opening up to 1.7m windows on flank elevations at ground and first floor level on main property.
14. Development to be carried out in accordance with arb report and construction method statement.
15. Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport.

Informatives

1. Community Infrastructure Levy.
2. Code of Practice regarding small construction sites.
3. Highway works to be made at developer's expense.
4. Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport.

- 2.3 That the Planning Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3.0 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

- 3.1 Demolition of the existing two storey property and garage, erection of a replacement part two /part three storey building with roof level, creation of nine self-contained residential flats (C3), with associated landscaping, front lightwells, level changes, terraces, refuse store, cycle stores and car parking.
- 3.2 The application was revised on the 9th July to provide further information in connection with the impact of the development on the TPO protected tree within the neighbour's garden, to correct an error on the application form regarding the site size and to provide demolition comparison drawings. Further public consultation was carried out in connection with these revisions/clarifications.

Site and Surroundings

- 3.3 The application site is a two storey detached property located on the north side of Purley Hill, approximately 50m east of the junction with Selcroft Road. The

property is in use as a single dwelling house. The property has an existing two storey garage building that is accessed from a dropped kerb.

- 3.3 The surrounding area is predominately residential and suburban in character. Properties are generally detached or semi-detached, and are generally two stories high. There are significant land variations across the site with the land sloping down from street level to the rear boundary.
- 3.4 There are no direct policy constraints identified in the Croydon Local Plan (2018).
- 3.5 The site is located in Flood Risk Zone 1 (low). The site itself is modelled as being at very low risk (less than 1 in 1000 years) from surface water flooding. The site is not deemed to be at risk from ground water flooding.
- 3.6 The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 0 (worst).

Relevant Planning History

- 3.7 No relevant planning history for the site.

4.0 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The proposed development would create good quality residential accommodation that would make a positive contribution to the borough's housing stock and would make a small contribution to the Council achieving its housing targets as set out in the London Plan (2016) and Croydon Local Plan (2018). The proposed development provides an appropriate mix of units including two three-bed units.
- The proposed development would be of an appropriate mass, scale, form and design that would be in keeping with its context, thus preserving the appearance of the site and surrounding area.
- The proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers.
- The proposed development would result in some additional on street parking. However, this would not generate significant levels of parking stress such as to justify refusal of planning permission. The proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the operation of the highway.
- The proposed development subject to conditions would not cause unacceptable harm to visual amenity of trees.
- The proposed development subject to conditions would not have an adverse impact on flooding.

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 A total of 48 neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment by the way of letter. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

48 Individual responses: 48 Objections

6.2 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application, which are addressed in substance in the next section of this report:

Objections

- Overdevelopment of the site.
- The proposed building is overly large, increases the roofline height, does not respect the front and rear building lines and there is insufficient spacing to neighbouring windows.
- The density of residential development on this site, and when combined with other sites is too much.
- Proposed balconies represent a significant intrusion to the privacy and enjoyment of gardens.
- Unacceptable concreting of the front garden.
- Intensification of the use of the site will create noise disturbance.
- Privacy screens are not tall enough to stop overlooking.
- Unacceptable levels of overlooking to neighbouring properties windows.
- Additional planting should be installed along the boundaries to prevent significant harm to neighbouring properties' living conditions.
- Arboricultural statement is inaccurate. Many trees are not protected.
- The application drawings are misleading as they do not show certain trees in neighbours' gardens making it hard to work out the impact of the development.
- The TPO tree would be harmed by the development.
- Concern over root intrusions and canopy pruning from the development.
- No affordable housing is being provided.
- Not enough large family units is being provided.
- No level access is being provided making it unsuitable for the elderly and people with disabilities.
- The applicant's parking survey does not take account of when parking demand is at its highest and takes no consideration of Highway Code safe parking.
- Impact of visitor parking.
- Loss of mature planting and trees.
- The development would generate significant levels of traffic.
- The applicant has significantly underestimated the level of parking provision that the development would generate.
- Contractor's method statement is poor, irrelevant and misleading.

- Bin store will be visible from the street and neighbouring properties and is of an inappropriate design.
- Negative cumulative impact of several developments being considered or approved in the local area.
- Too many cycle spaces are being provided given the sites location on a hill.
- Bin store is insufficiently sized.
- Impact of the development during construction.
- Structural stability of the development and impact on neighbouring properties
- Impact on bin store in terms of odour/vermin.
- New residents will increase the risk of antisocial behaviour (Officer's response – There is insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposed development would cause anti-social behaviour given the residential nature of the use being proposed).
- Comparison drawings submitted are insufficient and do not show relationship of development to no.2.
- CGI is misleading in regards to the gap between properties and planting.

6.3 The following Councillors made representations:

- Cllr Simon Brew (Ward Councillor for Purley and Woodcote Ward) – Building too large for plot size and is overdevelopment, no other buildings have lightwells, parking provision on site is inadequate, parking survey has underestimated the number of cars the development will need, overlooking of terraces to neighbouring gardens, no disabled access, impact of the development on TPO tree.

6.4 The following issues were raised in the representations and are not material planning considerations:

- The development will devalue other houses (Officer's response – This is not a material planning consideration).

6.5 The following procedural issues were raised in representations, and are addressed below:

- No comparison drawings were submitted (Officer's response – These have now been received, and they were put out for further public consultation).
- No site notices were erected (Officer's response – The application was advertised by the way of letters to neighbouring residential properties in line with statutory consultation requirements).

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 Croydon Local Plan (2018), Mayor's London Plan (2016) and the South London Waste Plan 2012.

7.2 Government guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), issued in March 2012. 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 There is a draft revised NPPF which has been the subject of public consultation, which expired on the 10th May 2018. The draft revised NPPF incorporates policy proposals previously consulted on in the Housing White Paper and the Planning for the right homes in the right places consultation. The draft NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions and will gain more weight as it moves through the process to adoption. At present the draft NPPF in general is considered to carry minimal weight.

7.4 The main policy considerations from the London Plan (2016) raised by the application that the Committee are required to consider are:

- Policy 1.1 Delivering the Strategic Vision and Objectives for London.
- Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply.
- Policy 3.5 Quality and design of Housing Developments
- Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
- Policy 5.12 Flood Risk Management
- Policy 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
- Policy 6.1 Strategic Approach
- Policy 6.3 Assessing Effects of Development on Transport Capacity
- Policy 6.9 Cycling
- Policy 6.13 Parking
- Policy 7.2 An Inclusive Environment
- Policy 7.4 Local Character
- Policy 7.6 Architecture

7.5 There is a new draft London Plan has been the subject of public consultation which expired on the 2nd March 2018. The GLA current programme is to have the Examination in Public into the Draft London Plan later in 2018, with the final document adopted in 2019. The current 2016 Consolidation Plan is still the adopted Development Plan. However the Draft London Plan is a material consideration in planning decisions and will gain more weight as it moves through the process to adoption. At present the plan in general is considered to carry minimal weight.

Croydon Local Plan (2018)

7.6 The new local plan was adopted on the 27th February 2018 and now carry full weight. The main relevant policies to this application are as follows:

- SP2: Homes.
 - *SP2.1 Choice of homes.*
 - *SP2.2 Quantities and locations.*
 - *SP2.7 Mix of homes by size.*
 - *SP2.8 Quality and standards.*
- DM1: Housing Choice for Sustainable Communities.
 - *DM1.2 Net loss of 3 bed or homes less than 120 sq.m.*
- SP4: Urban Design and Local Character.
 - *SP4.1 High quality development that responds to local character.*
- DM10: Design and Character.
 - *DM10.1 High quality developments, presumption for 3 storeys.*
 - *DM10.2 Appropriate parking and cycle parking design.*
 - *DM10.4 Private amenity space.*
 - *DM10.5 Communal amenity space.*
 - *DM10.6 Protection to neighbouring amenity.*
 - *DM10.7 Architectural detailing, materials respond to context, services, appropriate roof form.*
 - *DM10.8 Landscaping.*
 - *DM10.9 Lighting and light pollution.*
- DM13: Refuse and Recycling.
 - *DM13.1 Design, quantum and layouts.*
 - *DM13.2 Ease of collection.*
- SP6: Environment and Climate Change.
 - *SP6.3 Sustainable design and construction.*
Minor residential scheme 19% CO2 reduction.
Water efficiency 110 litres.
 - *SP6.4 Flooding and water management - c) SUDs.*
 - *SP6.6 Waste management.*
- DM25: Sustainable drainage systems.
- DM27: Protecting and enhancing our biodiversity.
- DM28: Trees.
- SP8: Transport and the Communication.
 - *SP8.5 and SP8.6 Sustainable travel choice.*
 - *SP8.7 Cycle parking.*
 - *SP8.12 and SP8.13 Electric vehicles.*
 - *SP8.17 Parking standards in low PTAL areas.*
- DM29: Promoting sustainable travel.
- DM30: Car and cycle parking.

8.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the Planning Committee are required to consider are:

1. Principle of development and quality of residential units created

2. Impact on the appearance of the site and surrounding area.
3. Impact of the development on neighbouring properties' living conditions.
4. Impact of the development on parking and the highway.
5. Impact of the development on trees.
6. Impact of the development on flooding.
7. Other planning issues.

Principle of development and quality of residential units created.

Principle of Development

- 8.2 Policy DM1.2 seeks to prevent the loss of small family homes by restricting the net loss of three bed units and the loss of units that have a floor area less than 120 sq.m. The existing unit is a 3 bed and measures approximately 193 sq.m. The development would however result in the net gain of three bed units with two being provided by the development.
- 8.3 Policy SP2.7 sets a strategic target of 30% of all new homes up to 2036 to have a three bed or more. The policy sets a specific target for major developments, but not minor developments, with the latter considered on a site by site basis. Two of the proposed units would be three bed units, which would amount to 22% of overall provision and would fall below this target. Notwithstanding this, officers are satisfied with the overall mix of accommodation, given the relatively small size of the site which limits the number of larger units that can be realistically provided and as there would be a net gain of family accommodation.
- 8.4 The London Plan (2016) sets a minimum ten year target for the borough of 14,348 new homes over the period of 2015-2025. The Croydon Local Plan (2018) to a minimum twenty year target of 32,890 over the period of 2016-2036. The Draft London Plan (2017) has provisionally set a minimum ten year target for the borough of 29,490 new homes over the period of 2019/20-2028/29. The proposed development would create additional residential units that would make a small contribution to the borough achieving its housing targets as set out in the London Plan (2016) and the recently adopted Croydon Local Plan (2018). There is no policy requirement for the provision of Affordable Housing as less than ten units are proposed.
- 8.5 London Plan (2016) policy 3.4 outlines what it considers to be appropriate density of development based on urban type and PTAL rating. The London Plan outlines that this table should not be used mechanistically. This policy should also be used with some caution as it is proposed to be removed under the emerging draft London Plan. For suburban area with PTAL ratings of 0 to 1, it recommends that development has between 150 and 200 hr/hectare. The proposed development is calculated as having 188 hr/hectare.

Quality of Units

- 8.6 The proposed development would provide good quality units that would make a positive contribution to the borough's housing stock. All the proposed units meet recommended minimum floorspace standards set out in both the London Plan

(2016) and DCLG's 'Technical Housing Standards: National Described Space Standards'. All the bedrooms would meet the minimum floor areas set out in the DCLG's 'Technical Housing Standards: National Described Space Standards'.

- 8.7 The units would receive good levels of light, outlook and aspect. All the residential units would be dual aspect, with key habitable rooms served by generously sized windows. The units located within the lower ground floor level have been designed to maximise light and outlook, with the main living/kitchen area benefiting from views over the garden. The main bedroom and secondary bedroom would look into a generously sized tiered front light wells that would be sufficient to ensure that these rooms receive good levels of light, as well as reasonable outlook. All units would have floor to ceiling height of 2.5m for at least 75% of GIA in accordance with the London Plan (2016) standards.
- 8.8 The proposed level of external amenity space provision for the development is acceptable. The two family sized three bed units would have access to their own private patio areas to both the front and rear of the property. The total area of the two patios measures approximately 18 sq.m per unit. Units 6 and 8 would each have access to a 6 sq.m terrace and unit 9 have access to a 6 sq.m dormer terrace balcony. In addition all the units would have access to 675 sq.m private communal amenity space. Direct access would be provided from the residential units to the communal amenity space which would help to ensure that it would be accessible and useable. Play space is shown on submitted plans in line with policy DM10.4(d) and this would be secured through the use of planning conditions.
- 8.9 In regards to accessibility, London Plan Policy 3.8 'Housing Choice' requires 90% of dwellings to meet M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' Building Regulations requirement, with the remaining 10% required to meet M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings'. The key issue in ensuring that M4(2) can be achieved within a development is to ensure, at the planning application stage, that the units can reasonably achieve level access. If level access cannot be reasonably achieved, then the units cannot be required to meet the M4(2) Building Regulations. The London Plan (2016) recognises that securing level access in buildings of four storeys or less can be difficult and that consideration should also be given to viability and impact on ongoing service charges for residents.
- 8.10 None of the units would meet M4 (2) standard. In this instance it is considered neither reasonable nor desirable to require the development or part of the development to be M4 (2) compliant. The site is located on a steep slope with the existing property's entrance set significant below street level. This is a defining part of the character of this side of the street. To create level access, the entrance would need to in effect come in at first floor level, which would create a building of an inappropriate design that would not be in keeping with its surrounding context. Alternatively a series of ramps would be needed to get down to the ground floor level which would occupy a significant percentage of the front garden area, again creating an insensitive design. Even if access was created it would only be reasonable to require the units at first floor level to be M4 (2)

compliant, as the applicant has raised concerns about the impact of installing a lift of service charges.

Impact on the appearance of the site and surrounding area.

- 8.11 The existing property is not protected from demolition by existing policies. As such, the property and associated structures could be demolished under existing permitted development rights through the prior approval process without planning permission. The demolition of the existing building is acceptable subject to a suitable replacement designed building being agreed.
- 8.12 The proposed bulk and mass of the development is considered acceptable. Policy DM 10.1 states that there is a presumption in favour of three storey development. The proposed ridgeline of the development aligns appropriately with the ridgeline of the neighbouring property no.3. The setting of the front building line back from the existing by approximately 2.8m would not have a harmful impact on the street scene as the property is located at the end of street, rather than in the centre of a consistent row of house where the change would be more noticeable. The development significantly extends beyond the established rear building line, but this is acceptable as the change would not be widely visible from the street, due to the site not being located in a conservation area and given that the green character of the area would largely be retained due to the site's large 675 sq.m rear garden.
- 8.13 The width of the development is appropriate, as a 4.6m gap would be maintained between the flank wall of the proposed development, and the two storey side wall of no.4's two storey side extension that was approved under planning permission reference 10/01085/P. On the opposite eastern boundary i.e. the rear boundary of no.57, a 1.8m gap would be maintained to the boundary. The simple roof form of the development is appropriate and helps reduced the perceived mass of the development when viewed from the street.
- 8.14 The proposed front lightwells, whilst not characteristic of Purley Road, would form discreet and respectful features of the street scene due to them being set into the site away from the pavement. The appearance of the lightwells has been softened through the use of staggered planted tiers which will help them blend into this suburban green context.
- 8.15 The proposed traditional design would respect features and detailing common to neighbouring properties. The development would be finished in materials of a traditional appearance, further details of which are recommended to be secured by condition.
- 8.16 The tiered design of the proposed front garden area helps to replicate to some extent the tiered nature of the existing garden. The car parking spaces would be finished in grasscrete which would help soften their appearance. The bin store has a simple design and is set back from the road and effectively screened by planting. The visual impact of the bicycle store has been reduced by virtue of the tiered nature of the front garden's design. However, the current design of the bicycle store with its incongruous galvanised steel roof is inappropriate for this

more suburban front garden setting. An alternative design is recommended to be secured via condition. The provision of only two car parking spaces create the opportunity to create more natural front garden area, a condition is recommended requiring a landscaping plan to be submitted to ensure this opportunity is exploited.

- 8.17 Overall, the proposed development would have an appropriate mass, form, scale and design that would be in keeping with its context, thus preserving the appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Impact of the development on neighbouring properties' living conditions.

- 8.18 The proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties' living conditions. Properties in Selcroft Road to the east and Hill View Close to the north/rear would not have their light or outlook unacceptably harmed due to the separation distance of at least 30m from the rear elevation of these properties and the proposed flank and rear walls of the development.
- 8.19 The property that would be most affected by the development is no.4 Purley Hill. This property has no windows located on its flank elevation. The rear elevation of no.4 faces in a north westerly direction at an angle away from the proposed development whose rear elevation faces in a northerly direction. The result of this is that despite the rear elevation of the development extending beyond the rear building line of no.4, the development would not have a significant impact on the light and outlook to windows serving this property. The development complies with BRE's 45 degree test indicating that the proposed development would not result in a noticeable reduction in terms of sunlight and daylight to neighbouring properties.
- 8.20 The development would result in a slight increase in a sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties, most noticeably to the garden area of no.4. However, the impact is not deemed significant enough to justify refusal of planning permission with the mass of the development sufficiently staggered away from side boundaries such as to prevent a cliff like effect occurring.
- 8.21 The proposed development would not result in unacceptable levels of overshadowing to neighbouring gardens given the orientation of the development and its staggered massing away from the boundaries.
- 8.22 The proposed development would not cause an unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring properties' windows in Selcroft Road and Hill View Close due to the separation distance of over 30m. A condition is recommended requiring the windows at ground and first floor levels on the side elevation of the main property to be obscurely glazed and non-opening up to a height of 1.7m from the finished floor level in order to prevent undue overlooking. The windows on the side wall of the rear addition element at ground floor level would not cause unacceptable loss of privacy as the built form of the development would restrict direct views into the windows of no.4, and due to the significant separation distance to windows in Selcroft Road.

- 8.23 The rooflights located on both flank elevations roofslopes would not cause significant loss of privacy given the height they are located on the property and the angled nature of the opening which would help to a large extent limit the viewing angle.
- 8.24 The proposed dormer balconies on the rear elevation at second floor level would not cause significant harm to neighbouring properties' privacy (especially in view of the size and depth of the terraces). The design of the recessed balconies would further direct views down the length of the garden, away from immediate neighbouring properties windows. The terraces at rear first floor level would have 1.7m high privacy screens along their sides that would prevent direct views into neighbouring windows. A condition is recommended to ensure these screens are installed prior to use. The separation distance of over 30m to properties at the rear in Hill View Close is sufficient to prevent the proposed terraces at both first and roof level causing unacceptable loss of privacy. The terraces and other openings would have some views over parts of neighbouring properties' gardens, but such views are not considered to be sufficiently harmful to neighbouring privacy to justify refusal of planning permission. Use of the gardens and lightwells by residents of the development would not cause unacceptable loss of privacy given that views experienced would be similar to views that can already be experienced from the existing garden or from the property.
- 8.25 The proposed terraces would not generate significant level of noise disturbance due to a combination of their modest size and the distance from neighbouring properties' windows. The proposed intensification of the use of the site would not be sufficient to create significant levels of noise disturbance to justify refusal of planning permission.
- 8.26 Along the western boundary of the development there would be a side alleyway path. Sections of this path would be raised 1.2m above existing land levels, with the path also being closer to no.4 than the existing side path. The neighbouring property has expressed concerns that this would adversely impact their privacy by virtue of creating a raised area that would have direct views of their patio/garden and potentially into their windows. However, the loss of privacy to is not considered to be significant as this path is unlikely to be regularly used, with the garden more directly accessible through the property itself. People are unlikely to dwell in this area due to the nature of the space. Any impact on privacy can be appropriately mitigated through the use of mature planting and appropriate boundary treatments, both of which are recommended to be secured via condition.

Impact of the development on parking and the highway.

- 8.27 London Plan (2016) policy 6.13 sets out the maximum car parking standard for new developments. Under this policy in low PTAL areas, one and two bed units are required to have less than 1 parking space per unit, three bed units up to 1.5 parking spaces per unit, and four or more bed units up to 2 parking spaces per unit.

- 8.28 The proposed development would provide two car parking spaces for the nine units. The applicant has submitted a Transport Technical Note produced by Markides Associates. This parking survey using 2011 census data for the Purley Ward estimates that the development would generate the need for six car parking spaces. In officer's view, the development is likely to generate a higher demand than the Purley Ward average due to its location on a hill, and the poor PTAL rating of the site. Officers are of the opinion that the development would generate closer to 9 car parking spaces (i.e. one per unit). Therefore under the applicant's estimate there would be a predicted displacement of 4 cars, whereas under the council's estimate there would be a predicted displacement of 7 cars onto the road.
- 8.29 The applicant has submitted a parking study that measures car parking capacity in surrounding streets. In line with the Lambeth Methodology this was carried out on two consecutive weekdays nights, on Wednesday 31st January and Thursday 1st February 2018. The survey is carried out on weekday nights as this is when residential parking demand is generally the highest. Within 200m or less walking distance of the site, there was 103 and 102 parking spaces identified as being available from a total of 124, which amounts to 17 and 18% respectively. There is therefore significant on-street parking capacity on surrounding roads to absorb any parking demand as a result of the development, including when taking into account the potential parking impact of other developments approved and/or under construction in the local area. Given the significant amount of parking space availability on surrounding streets, there is insufficient evidence to suggest that residents from the development would park dangerously and therefore have a detrimental impact on highway or pedestrian safety. The development given the small number of units created, would not cause significantly levels of traffic.
- 8.30 The existing property has a dropped kerb on the western side of the property which would be reused as a part of the development. In terms of parking layout, the two car parking spaces would largely replicate the existing arrangement, with cars likely to leave the parking spaces in a rear gear. Whilst this is not ideal, given that this already happens on this site, as well as at neighbouring properties, this is considered acceptable.
- 8.31 The London Plan (2016) requires new residential development to have 20% active electric car charging provision and 20% passive provision. A planning condition is recommended to accommodate these requirements.
- 8.32 The London Plan (2016) requires one cycle parking space to be provided for all one bed units and two cycle parking spaces for all 2+ bed units. To be London Plan (2016) compliant 14 cycle parking spaces would need to be provided. The submitted site layout plan and drawing 16-P-9 shows a cycle store with a capacity of 14 cycle parking spaces. A condition is recommended requiring an alternative design store with the same capacity (see paragraph 8.16), and for this revised designed cycle store to be installed prior to occupation.

Impact of the development on trees.

8.33 The applicant has submitted an Arboricultural Method Statement by Arbtech. There are no TPO protected trees within the site, but there is TPO'd Common Beech Tree located in the rear garden of 57 Selcroft Road. The information submitted by the applicant is sufficient to ensure that the proposed development would not cause harm to the health and visual amenity of this protected tree. This tree will be appropriately pruned so as not to harm its canopy, and the construction would be carried out in such a way not to unduly harm this tree's root system. Appropriate measures have also been taken in regards to the unprotected trees on, and adjacent to the site. A condition is recommended to secure this.

Impact of the development on flooding,

8.34 The site is located in Flood Risk Zone 1 (low) and is at very low risk (more than 1 in 1000 years) from surface water flooding. The applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment (FRA) that appropriately identifies the extent of risk and a planning condition is suggested, which secures a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS). A further planning condition is recommended to help ensure efficient water use.

Other Planning Issues

8.35 The standard requirement to reduce carbon dioxide emissions (19% beyond the 2013 Building Regulations) would be delivered through compliance with an imposed planning condition

8.36 A bin store area is proposed within the front garden. The bin store contains 1100L recycling bin, nine 120 litre general waste bins and one 140L food waste bin. The size of the bin store is appropriate. A condition is recommended requiring this bin store to be provided prior to occupation. The bin store is located sufficiently away from neighbouring windows that its impact on neighbouring properties' amenity in terms of odour would not be significant. The applicant has confirmed that the building will be managed by a management company who will be based locally. They will be making bi weekly visits to ensure the management and maintenance of the site. This will include regular cleaning down on the bin stores. There will also be a resident's management association that will ensure any complaints are appropriately highlighted to the management company.

8.37 The impact of the development during construction is considered to be sufficiently controlled by other legislation such as the Noise Act 1996. Placing further conditions on the development to control demolition and construction would be overly onerous given the scale of the development.

8.38 Given that the development would need to comply with building regulations, there is insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposed development would cause structural harm to neighbouring properties. In the event that some harm was unforeseeably occur, then neighbouring properties would be sufficiently protected under other legislation such as the Party Wall Act 1996.

9 Conclusion

- 9.1 The proposed development would provide good quality residential units that would make a positive contribution to the borough's housing stock. The mix of residential units is acceptable, with two of the units being three beds. The proposed development would be of an appropriate high standard of design which would not cause harm to the appearance of the surrounding area. The development would not cause significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity and would not have an adverse impact on flooding. The proposed development provides an acceptable level of parking and would not have a significant impact on the operation of the highway. The development would not result in unacceptable harm to or loss of trees.

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