

PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision**Item 6.4****1 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION DETAILS ...**

Ref: 18/02880/FUL
 Location: 44 Beulah Road CR7 8JE
 Ward: Thornton Heath
 Description: Demolition of existing house and rebuild to provide 1 x 3 bedroom flat, 3 x 2 bedroom flats and 1 x bedroom flat involving balconies, 1 car parking space, cycle and refuse storage.
 Drawing Nos: 04.1/Rev10, 04.2/Rev9, 04.3/Rev9, 04.4/Rev9, 05.1/Rev9, 05.2/Rev9, 06.1/Rev9, 06.2/Rev9, 06.3/Rev9, 06.4/Rev9.
 Applicant/Agent: Duyile Adegbuyi
 Case Officer: Christopher Grace

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
Houses	0	0	0	0
Flats	1(1 person)	3(3 person)	1(5 person)	0
Totals	1	3	1	0

Type of floorspace	Amount proposed	Amount retained	Amount lost
Residential	347Sq.m	0 Sq m	229Sq m
Number of car parking spaces		Number of cycle parking spaces	
1		10	

- 1.1 This application is being reported to Planning Committee because the Thornton Heath Councillor (Cllr Pat Clouder) has requested it be referred to the Planning Committee and objections above the threshold in the Committee Consideration Criteria have been received.

2 RECOMMENDATION

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

Conditions

- 1) Built in accordance with approved plans
- 2) Materials to be submitted for approval
- 3) Details to be provided:-
 - a) Finished floor levels
 - b) Hard and soft landscaping – including species / size and permeable surfaces
 - c) Boundary treatment – including private amenity space
 - d) Vehicle site lines along Beulah Road

- 4) Refuse storage requirements
- 5) Cycle storage requirements
- 6) Demolition and construction method statement
- 7) 19% reduction in carbon emissions
- 8) 110 litre water consumption target
- 9) Sustainable drainage/run off rates/surface water measures.
- 10) Security lighting
- 12) The ground floor units to be M4(2) compliant
- 11) Parking permit restriction
- 12) Parking to be provided before the building is occupied
- 13) No use of flat roof as terrace
- 14) Commence within 3 Years

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

Informative

- 1) CIL - granted
- 3) Code of Practice regarding small construction sites
- 3) Highways works to be made at developer's expense

Any [other] informative(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning

3 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal would involve the demolition of the existing two storey detached house and construction of a part-single/two storey building with a basement and accommodation in the main roof slope to provide a total of 5 flats.



- 3.2 The proposal would extend the footprint of the current building to the rear and would have the following dimensions:
 - A maximum of height 9.7m (7.5m high at eaves), 12.4m wide and maximum depth of 17m.
- 3.3 The proposed building would be constructed of the following materials:- render finish ; roof tiles; stone band course, cills and lintels; white fascia and soffits; stone plinth capping; timber frame windows and doors; glass balustrade.

- 3.4 The proposal would include parking for 1 vehicle widening existing single vehicle access off Beulah Road, storage for 10 bicycles within the building with refuse store area within the front garden approach.
- 3.5 The proposal would provide two private garden areas with access to a communal area to the rear at ground floor level. In addition there would be recessed balconies to the upper floor flats with a variety of tree/shrub planting in and surrounding the site boundary.

Amendments:

- The proposed drawings have been amended reducing the number of flats from 6 to 5; to include detail window and elevation changes; new internal layout incorporating cycle storage at basement level; new front and rear garden layout; recessed balconies; flat rear roof design; new front boundary treatment
- The proposal has been accompanied with additional sunlight/daylight and transport reports.

Site and Surroundings

- 3.6 The application relates to a vacant semi-detached house located on the east side of Beulah Road.



- 3.7 The surrounding area is residential in character with a mix of semi-detached and small terrace properties, small blocks of flats and detached properties. Adjoining the site to the north is a two storey semi-detached house (no.46), to the south a detached property divided into flats (no.42), both of similar design to the application property, with hipped roof forms set back from the road. The existing building has the following dimensions:-

- 9.6m high (7.5m at eaves), 13 deep with separate garage.

The site is located within an area of Surface Water Flood Risk (1:30yr) There are no other designations for the site identified on the Croydon Local Plan Policies map.

Planning History

- 3.8 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:-

18/00995/FUL Refuse planning permission for demolition of existing building and erection of 8 flats comprising of 5x 2 bedroom and 3 x 1 bedroom flats

The application was refused for the following reasons:

- By reason of size, massing, siting result in unsightly intrusive and incongruous development with lack of architectural articulation;
- not include family sized units;
- Limited light and outlook and poor standard of accommodation;
- Inadequate refuse storage;
- Inadequate on-site parking or cycle storage.

4 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 The principle of replacing the existing residential building with one which replicates similar features to that of surrounding properties is considered to be acceptable.
- 4.2 The proposed new building would preserve the character of the area and would not have a harmful affect upon the appearance of the street scene along Beulah Road.
- 4.3 The proposed new building would not have a detrimental effect on the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers and would provide an acceptable living environment for the future occupiers.
- 4.4 The development would provide an appropriate level of parking encourage sustainable modes of transport other than the car, incorporate safe and secure vehicle access to and from the site and would have an acceptable impact on the highways network.
- 4.5 The development would incorporate sustainability requirements and incorporate sustainability technics as part of the overall drainage strategy.

5 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

- 5.1 The views of the Planning Service are expressed in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section below.
- 5.2 The following were consulted regarding the application:

6 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 The application has been publicised by way of neighbour letters. 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 neighbours consulted: 49 Objecting: 103 Supporting: 0

No of petitions received: 1 (31 Signatures)

Petition comments: Parking is a significant issue in Beulah Road; the application does not follow sections of the Local Plan regarding increase pressures on parking, the proposed plan only allows for 1 parking space. The application also fails to apply the Mayors London Plan. This development must incorporate at least 1 space per new build. The application does not comply with regard to privacy and light; demolition of the existing house will negatively impact on the character of this road; the increase density is unacceptable; Beulah Road is already densely populated with

local services stretched to the maximum; the road has no capacity for further intensification.

- 6.2 The following issues were raised in individual 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>Principle of development</i>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overdevelopment with too many flats; increase density to unacceptable levels; must be a limit to level of development 2. Increase pressure on local services. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See para 8.10. 2. Cil contribution to local infrastructure see para 8.10.
<i>Scale, massing, appearance</i>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of Victorian house of good quality, nature of bulk and bland design would appear overbearing, visual intrusive on outlook from neighbours ground floor window at no.46 detrimental impact. 2. Not-in-keeping, out of character; fail to preserve or enhance distinctive existing street character. 3. Loss of garden; loss of trees. 4. Building extends beyond rear line by 8m would be complete contrary to council policy; creates a pair of semi-detached properties. 5. Rear flat roof should not be used as a roof terrace. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal would replace the existing building with one of similar character see para 8.6 and 8.8. 2. The proposal would retain character to the front and street scene see para 8.8. 3. The proposal would retain a sizeable garden to the rear with no loss of trees see para 8.8 and 8.18 4. The building would ensure suitable separation, massing and scale with neighbouring properties see para 8.8. 5. A condition would prevent use of flat roof as a terrace report see para 8.15
<i>Daylight and sunlight</i>	
Loss of light by rear extension to neighbouring properties including kitchen diner of living room at no.46 impacting negatively on neighbours; development within 3m of 42	Officers consider that despite the lack of a detailed sunlight/daylight report, due to the position and height of the building the resultant impact on neighbours daylight/sunlight are acceptable within an urban setting. Refer to section 8.10-8.16 of this report.

exacerbating light loss; light report does not contain any information of the impact of the new building on the levels of sunlight and daylight to adjacent properties.	
<i>Outlook</i>	
Overlooking of balconies to neighbouring properties and nursery building opposite along the front and living/kitchen areas of neighbouring properties including flats 1 and 3 at 42 and on 46 impacting negatively on neighbours; overlook into neighbouring properties; loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.	Officers consider that the proposal will have some impact on neighbour's outlook but this is considered to be acceptable. Refer to paragraph 8.10-8.16 of this report.
<i>Noise</i>	
It will cause nuisance, disruption and noise pollution	Officers consider that the introduction of residential use in the residential area would not lead to an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance. Refer to paragraph 8.10-8.16 of this report.
<i>Standard of accommodation</i>	
Cramped living conditions; very little storage; 42 was converted into 4 x 1 bedroom flats; no internal light survey done; only 1 small family sized unit; first and second floor levels no amenity space	Officers consider the proposal would provide a reasonable level of private and communal amenity provision in line with London Plan standards. Refer to paragraph 8.18- 8.19 of this report.
<i>Waste</i>	
Does not meet refuse standards; 18 bins required and would need to be enclosed.	The applicant plans includes refuse storage provision. Refer to paragraph 8.24 of this report.
<i>Transport</i>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase in traffic and parking problems. 2. Affect customers of neighbouring business; only 1 car parking space for 5 flats; people parking in neighbouring car park; there are currently 2 parking spaces not 1 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Officers consider the level of on-site parking and bicycle provision to be appropriate see para 8.23. 2. The proposal would retain single parking space within the front garden of the site and prevent prospective occupiers from applying for control parking permits see para 8.23. 3. Officers have considered all information submitted and consider level of parking

3. PTAL of 3 with parking survey questioned as some neighbours not included, results misleading; would require on street parking; create congestion; insufficient evidence to suggest the wider highway network can accommodate the additional parking pressures.	and impact; to be appropriate; and that detailed planning conditions would secure suitable and safe vehicle movement to and from the site, see para 8.23 of this report.
<i>Construction</i>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demolition of property may damage or make neighbouring property unsuitable; no structural survey undertaken. 2. Impact on health of neighbours; noise from construction impact on children in nursery opposite. 3. Air pollution; damage to properties 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The actual demolition would be responsibility of either Building Control or an independent approved building surveyor in respect to ensuring the appropriate Building Regulations are followed see para 8.18. 2. The applicant would need to submitted a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) to minimise impact during the build process see para 8.18. 3. The applicants are advised to follow the Council code of practice "Control of Pollution and Noise" for development on small sites see para 8.18.
<i>Trees</i>	
The proposal would result in loss trees boarding the property.	No protected trees have been identified on site. Refer to paragraph 8.15 of this report.
<i>Other issues</i>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is currently a 4 bedroom house not a 5 bedroom house. 2. Lack of consultation. 3. No size of rooms given; inaccurate plans as no screening. 4. Neighbour will not permit no.44 to build on party wall line; no party wall notice served. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal includes provision of family sized unit see para 8.20. 2. Neighbours have been re-consulted on the proposed amendments see para 6.3. 3. The propose flats would accord with Mayoral Technical housing guidance se para 8.21. 4. The issue of building along the party wall with no.46 would be a private matter for neighbours see para 8.14.

6.3 Councillor Pat Clouder has made the following representations:

- Inadequate plans and information to properly consider the impact on neighbouring properties and the character and appearance of the road (Officer comment; The

applicants have submitted detailed revised drawings to enable officers to correctly consider the impact on neighbouring properties and character of the road).

- Poor design, out of keeping with the high quality character and appearance of the neighbouring houses in the road (Officer comment. The proposed development would be of an appropriate design and would retain the character and appearance of the existing street scene).
- Overdevelopment of the site resulting in very cramped and substandard accommodation and creating basement accommodation (Officer comment. The proposal would be within density range for this location and would provide a sustainable building of suitable scale and form with good standard of living for all occupiers in line with policy requirements).
- Adverse impact of the neighbouring properties and nearby residents (Officer comment. All impacts on neighbouring properties and nearby residents have been fully assessed and are considered acceptable for an urban location).
- Adverse impact on existing traffic and parking congestion, raising safety concerns (Officer comment. All traffic impacts have been fully assessed and are considered acceptable for an urban location).

Same neighbours consulted on revised proposal; comments received on amended plans raises several of the points already identified in original consultations including poor design, infill inappropriate and against Council policy; insufficient parking for 5 flats, impact on parking along Beulah Road, impact on neighbours, no benefit to wider community, overlooking, noise and pollution during build, overdevelopment with too many flats, loss of greenery, lack of information in terms of impact on light and transport affects; no.46 will not permit 44 from building on party wall.

7 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)
- 7.2 Government Guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), issued in July 2018. 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:
- Achieving sustainable development (Chap 2)
 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes (Chap 5)
 - Promoting sustainable transport (Chap 9)
 - Achieving well designed places (Chap 12)

- Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change (Chap14).

The main policy considerations raised by the application that the Committee are 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
- 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide
- 5.3 Sustainable design
- 5.14 Water quality and wastewater infrastructure
- 5.17 Waste capacity
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.6 Architect

Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2018:

- SP2 Homes
- SP4 Urban design and local character
- SP6 Environment and Climate Change
- SP8 Transport and communication

Croydon Local Plan Policies 2018:

- DM1 Homes
- DM10 Design and character
- DM13 Refuse and recycling
- DM23 Development and construction
- DM25 Sustainable drainage systems
- DM29 Promoting sustainable travel and reducing congestion
- DM30 Car and cycle parking in new development

8 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Principle of development
2. Townscape and visual impact and consideration of density
3. Residential amenity/Daylight & Sunlight for neighbours
4. Housing/Affordable Housing/Mix/Tenures
5. Housing Quality/Daylight & Sunlight for future occupiers
6. Transport
7. Sustainability

- 8. Waste
- 9. Flooding

Principle of Development

- 8.2 In considering this proposal the local planning authority has had regard to delivering a wide choice of homes in favour of sustainable development in line with the principles of paragraph of the NPPF, Policy 3.3 of the London Plan relating to increase housing stock; policies SP2.1 of the Croydon Local Plan in providing a choice of housing for all people at all stages of life and DM1 in supplying new housing.
- 8.3 The proposal would replace an existing house with 5 flats. The provision of a new residential building within this setting would add to the Council housing stock. The proposal would have regard to the building height and its location along Beulah Road; the surrounding character and characteristics associated with many of the existing buildings; maximising the sites potential and retaining the general residential character of the area.
- 8.4 It is therefore considered that subject to an appropriate scale of development in line with NPPF requirements of sustainability and good design, and a full assessment of amenity considerations, conserving the natural environment, with regard to suitable traffic considerations, there is no objection in principle to the introduction of further residential accommodation in this location.

Townscape and visual impact and consideration of density

- 8.5 In general townscape terms the surrounding area is residential in character; mainly terraced properties, with fewer detached and semi-detached properties, of various heights and depths set back from the main road surrounded by large gardens
- 8.6 Neighbours have stated that the loss of the building would negatively impact on the character of the road. The existing house is one of 3 properties of similar design and form along this side of the road. Collectively the 3 buildings do possess some character however the buildings are not situated in a conservation and are not listed. The properties either side have been altered whilst retaining the original character therefore the removal of no.44 to be replaced with a building of similar character does not give rise to concern in design terms.
- 8.7 Concerns have been raised over the size, scale, bulk and massing of the proposed development and inappropriate overdevelopment of the site. Neighbours consider the alterations to be out of character with the area resulting in an intrusive and oppressive building in this location; which would result in unacceptable intensification and a detrimental impact. Furthermore they consider that the proposal would visually ruin the character of the road.



- 8.8 The proposal would retain the character to the front and as amended reduced the scale and form at the rear from 3 to 2 storeys. The two-storey side infill would be set back and only visible along the front either directly opposite or when closely approaching the building. The rear element would be 8m long 5m longer than the current two storey element, however the proposal would still retain a sizeable garden to the rear. The building would ensure suitable separation either side of the boundary with neighbouring properties. A similar two storey rear extension of comparable height and length exists at a neighbouring property at no.38 to the south. The applicant has provided contextual elevations to demonstrate that the proposal would be of a suitable massing and scale when viewed from along Beulah Road and from neighbouring rear properties. The proposal would retain the front garden approach adjacent to the public pavement which would respond positively both visually and physically to the local context
- 8.9 Details of materials and finishes including landscaping and surface coverings would be controlled by condition. Overall the building is considered in design and appearance terms to be acceptable.
- 8.10 Representations have raised concern over the intensification of the site and overdevelopment. The site is a suburban setting with a PTAL rating of 3. With a site area of 0.05 hectares the proposed density is 100units/ha 300habitable rooms/ha. Table 3.2 of the London Plan sets a density range of u/ha and hr/ha of between 45-170u/ha and 200-450hr/ha. The proposal would be within the density range set out in the London Plan. The London Plan identifies that density is only the start of the planning housing development and not the end. Furthermore the application of the density range should not be applied mechanistically. The range, for a particular location, is broad enabling account to be taken of other factors including local context, design and transport capacity which, where appropriate, can provide a tool for increased density in certain situations. It is considered that in view of the sites location, design, transport capacity and parking provision the density range is justified. The application would be subject to Mayoral and Council CIL charges. The proposal would be in line with NPPF, London Plan and Croydon Local Plan requirements of sustainable development in promoting housing, good design and conserving the natural environment;

Residential Amenity Daylight/Sunlight, outlook and privacy for neighbours.

- 8.11 The proposed development would have some impact on the immediate neighbours either side of the application site at no.46 to the north and the flats at 42 to the south.
- 8.12 Neighbours have raised concern over the infill between 44 and 46, the impact of the new building in terms loss of light to 46 and outlook from rear openings and garden of 46.



- 8.13 The rear elevation of no.46 comprises of French doors to a dining/kitchen at ground floor level and bedroom window at first floor level. The proposed infill immediately adjacent to the boundary would be flush with the rear elevation with this neighbours property. The proposed single storey side section would not extend beyond the end of 46. The proposed two storey element would project 8m in total (5m beyond the rear line of the current two storey outrigger) and would reduce the current distance between the two storey element and boundary with 46 from 2.4m to 1.68m.
- 8.14 In terms of neighbour concerns building along the party wall line between nos. 44 and 46 would be a private matter for both owners. The proposed side infill and single storey section would not result in loss of light to the rear openings of no.46 because there are no windows along the side flank elevation of this neighbours property and the side extension would not extend beyond no.46 own extension. The applicants have not provided a detail sunlight and daylight analysis of the impact of the proposal on the rooms to the rear of 46. However based on the orientation and inspection of the premises the rear openings of 46 receive unobstructed sunlight from early morning up to 12.30pm. The proposal would result in a reduction in some sunlight for this neighbour. However based on the orientation of the property officers consider the impact on sunlight from the proposal would not be significant. An inspection of 46 confirms the ground floor to be an open plan living dining area which receives alternative light from windows in front of the building. Based on this assessment officers consider that the proposed reduction in sunlight would not be significant to justify refusal on this basis alone. The occupier of 46 would continue to receive reasonable levels of daylight due to the internal layout of the ground floor and open aspect to the rear of the site.
- 8.15 The set back of the two storey element from the boundary of 46 and the open plan aspect to the rear garden would mean that the proposal would not appear overtly dominant or overbearing. In terms of outlook the proposal would be very similar to that at no.38. A single obscured glazed window at first floor level would be included within the side elevation toward 46 but should not result in overlooking or loss of privacy for this neighbour. The inclusion of inset balconies is not considered to result in undue level of overlooking over and above that which 46 currently experiences. The proposal would be larger than the present building when viewed from the rear garden of 46. However the additional massing would not be unduly dominant and the inclusion of a flat roof design would reduce its overall visual impact. A condition restricting the use of the flat roof should further protect neighbour amenity from overlooking.
- 8.16 No. 42 is to the south of 44 and is a detached building divided into 4 flats, two of which (one at ground and one at first floor level) have rear living rooms and side kitchen windows which face towards the rear garden of 44.



- 8.17 The position of the proposed building to the north of no.42 north means that the proposed building would not result in any loss of sunlight for the occupiers of 42. The proposal would bring the rear half of 44 closer to the boundary with neighbours at 42. However as revised the two storey rear element is not considered to be overtly dominant or overbearing for these occupiers with a reasonable separation maintained between both sites. The proposal would not result in undue impact on outlook from the rear living room windows of these flats with the rear kitchen windows containing windows in side and rear of no.44. A condition requiring the proposed single window in the side elevation of the two storey element to be in obscured glass would prevent any undue overlooking or loss of privacy for these neighbours.
- 8.18 Neighbours have raised concerns regarding demolition of the existing building and impact on neighbouring properties either side. The actual demolition would be responsibility of either Building Control or an independent approved building surveyor in respect to ensuring the appropriate Building Regulations are followed. In addition the potential for increase in noise and disturbance as a result of the proposal is also of concern. In view of the close nature of the adjoining residential properties it recommended that a demolition / construction logistics plan be provided in order to reduce amenity considerations, traffic impacts and safeguard the development during the build; the detail of which is to be controlled by condition. An informative requiring the developers act in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice entitled 'Control of Pollution and Noise from Demolition and Construction Sites' should reduce any possible nuisance to local residents. Neighbours have raised concern over loss of trees, however no protected trees are identified on this site
- 8.19 The proposal would therefore be in line with Council policy DM10 in terms of amenity.

Housing Tenure

- 8.20 The proposed development would provide a combination of one, two and three bedroom flats. The proposal would provide a range of housing, including 1 replacement family sized flat which is fully supported. The proposal would be in line with the principles of the NPPF in delivering a wide of choice of quality homes and London Plan Policies 3.8 housing choice, 3.9 mixed and balance communities.

Housing Quality/Daylight and sunlight for future occupiers

- 8.21 All 5 flats would accord with the Mayoral Technical housing guidance in terms of floor space requirements. Each of flats would have more than one form of outlook and should receive good levels of sunlight and daylight including the split level 1 bedroom unit which would occupy the roof. This arrangement is, therefore, considered acceptable, on balance.
- 8.22 Each flat would have its own private amenity space with a shared communal play area to the rear in line with Council requirements The combination of the private areas and communal garden would be in excess of Mayoral minimum guidelines. The proposal would include extensive landscaping and planting. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with the principles of the NPPF in delivering a wide of choice of quality homes and London Plan Policies, 3.6 Children's and young people's play area and CLP policies.

Transport

- 8.23 The site is located within an area of PTAL 3 which is considered to be moderate rating. The proposal includes a single off street parking space. Neighbours have raised concern over the lack of parking associated with the provision of 5 flats; and the lack of detail and inaccuracy of the applicants transport survey and have submitted an alternative transport survey which they believe properly reflects parking difficulties of the area. Transport officers have considered the submission and given the PTAL rating of the site consider the level of parking in association with the proposed cycle provision to be appropriate. The applicants have submitted cycle parking in line with London Plan requirements. Transport officers do recognise that the site is located close to a Control Parking Zone. Given the proximity of the site and any potential for future parking to be an issue, it would be reasonable to control prospective occupiers from applying for control parking permits.
- 8.24 The applicant is to meet the cost of any new access improvements associated with the development. Furthermore the introduction of visibility splays would ensure that vehicles leaving the site in forward gear.
- 8.25 Therefore subject to suitable details the proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with London Plan policies 6.3 assessing effects on development capacity, 6.9 cycling, CLP policies SP8, DM29 and DM30.

Sustainability

- 8.26 The Council would seek new homes to meet the needs of residents over a lifetime and be constructed using sustainable measures to reduce carbon emissions. In line with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan, the development proposals should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions. The development would need to achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 19% beyond the 2013 Building Regulations and demonstrate how the development will achieve a water use target of 110 litres per head per. Subject to condition the proposal would be in accordance with NPPF guidelines on meeting climate change; London Plan Policy 5.2 minimising carbon dioxide, 5.3 sustainable design, 5.14 water quality and waste water infrastructure; CLP policies SP6 environment and climate change, energy and carbon dioxide reduction, sustainable design construction and Croydon Local Plan policies.

Waste

- 8.27 The proposed plans indicate the location for the waste storage facilities in the front garden approach within a reasonable distance for collection. It is considered that if a suitably screened and enclosed bin store in this location is detailed then this would be acceptable. In order to ensure that a suitable level of bin provision is provide a condition requiring details of this space should ensure that the proposal is in line with the principles of London Plan policy 5.17 waste capacity and Croydon Local Plan Policy DM13.

Flooding:

- 8.28 The property has been identified as being located within an area of surface water flood risk (1:30yr). The applicants have stated that the site is located in a low risk flood zone.. Using the SUDS model, it shows that there is a possibility to reduce

surface water runoff rates and volumes and in turn reduce flood risk. The proposed development would need to provide full details of suitable SUDS measures which would need to be submitted for consideration to ensure that the proposal would introduce adequate safeguard against potential flooding. These would need to be in line with the Councils requirements to demonstrate suitable runoff rates. Therefore subject to a suitable worded condition the proposal would be in line with the principles of the NPPF in meeting flooding requirements; London Plan policy 5.12 flood risk management; CLP policies SP6 and DM25.

Conclusions

- 8.29 The recommendation is to grant planning permission.
- 8.30 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account.