

**1.0 APPLICATION DETAILS**

Ref: 20/01625/FUL  
 Location: 14 Oakwood Avenue, Purley CR8 1AQ  
 Ward: Purley and Woodcote  
 Description: Demolition of 1 no. detached family house and erection of 1 no. apartment blocks, comprising 20 new apartments, with associated hard and soft landscaping etc.  
 Drawing Nos: 19-139-P001A; P002A; P003A; P004; P005; P013D; P014D; P020F; P021D; P022D; P023C; P025E; P026D; P027E; P030B; P031B; P032B; P033B; P034C; P035B; P036.  
 Agent: David Ciccone  
 Applicant: Mayle Developments Ltd  
 Case Officer: Yvette Ralston

	1b2p	2b4p	3b4p	4 bed (+)	TOTAL
<b>Existing</b>	0	0	0	1	1
<b>Proposed (Market housing)</b>	6	8	3	0	17
<b>Proposed (Affordable housing)</b>	0	3	0	0	3
<b>TOTAL proposed</b>	6	11	3		20

Number of car parking spaces	Number of cycle parking spaces
20	38

1.1 This application is being reported to Planning Committee in accordance with the following committee consideration criteria:

- Objections above the threshold in the Committee Consideration Criteria
- Referral from Ward Councillor (Cllr Simon Brew )

**2.0 RECOMMENDATION**

2.1 That the Planning Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the completion of a legal agreement to secure the following:

- Affordable housing: 2 x London Affordable Rent units (2b4p), 1 x shared ownership unit (2b4p)
- Review mechanism to reassess viability upon completion with potential to increase the affordable housing financial contribution to 50% (habitable room)
- Carbon offset contribution of £27,972

- Air quality contribution of £2,000 to fund initiatives in the Council's Air Quality Action Plan
  - Contribution of £30,000 towards sustainable transport initiatives such as Electric Vehicle Charging Points and an off-site car club
  - Contributions to local employment and training (construction phase) of £12,500 plus Local Employment and Training Strategy
  - S278 and S38 Agreement for the implementation of the highway works
  - Monitoring fees of £9,000
- 2.2 That the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport has delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.
- 2.3 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. Commencement time limit of 3 years
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings and reports except where specified by conditions

#### Pre-commencement conditions

3. Construction Management Plan and Construction Logistics Plan
4. Pre-commencement tree protection condition including a trial trench to be hand dug in the location of the proposed building foundation in proximity to T1
5. Phase 1 contaminated land report
6. Piling method statement
7. Drainage and SUDS: Consultation with EA regarding groundwater source protection zone, justification for runoff infiltration time and works to be carried out in accordance with the FRA

#### Pre-Commencement Conditions except for demolition and below ground work

8. Material specifications/samples of external materials to be submitted
9. Landscaping and child play / communal amenity space and boundary treatment notably between private amenity spaces and communal areas, ambulant design of external stairs;
10. Full details of cycle and refuse storage to be submitted for approval, including lighting details
11. Submission of biodiversity enhancement strategy
12. Specification of ultra-low NOx boiler
13. Submission of details of mechanical ventilation system
14. Submission of visibility splays for vehicles

#### Pre-Occupation Conditions

15. Submission of Delivery and Servicing plan
16. Submission of car park management plan
17. Details of waste and recycling
18. ECVPs to be implemented on site
19. Energy efficiency
20. Secure by Design accreditation (D4)

#### Compliance Conditions

21. All proposed units to have access to all amenity areas irrespective of tenure
22. Noise standards for living rooms and bedrooms
23. Minimise light pollution
24. Accessible homes
25. Accord with the submitted Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Impact Assessment
26. Accord with recommendations of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
27. Water efficiency
28. Background noise levels
29. Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport

#### INFORMATIVES

1. Granted subject to a Section 106 Agreement
2. Community Infrastructure Levy
3. Code of practice for Construction Sites
4. Highways informative in relation to s278 and s38 works required
5. Compliance with Building/Fire Regulations
6. Thames Water informatives regarding underground assets, public sewers and Groundwater Risk Management Permit
7. 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 two storey detached dwelling
- Erection of a replacement four storey building including accommodation in the roofspace comprising 20 flats
- Underground car park with 20 parking spaces and 38 cycle parking spaces
- Relocation of vehicular crossover
- Communal and private amenity space, play space and hard and soft landscaping and land level alterations



*Proposed CGI*

- 3.2 During the course of the application amended plans were received. Amendments were predominately to the elevations, ground floor layout and access arrangements and did not constitute material changes to the proposed scheme so re-consultation did not take place.
- 3.3 Re-consultation subsequently took place between 08/02/21 and 24/02/21 as the Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment had not previously been made publicly available (it was uploaded to the website on 16/01/21).
- 3.4 Amended drawings were received on the 16/02/21 which pulled the SW corner of the building back by 3.5m and provided further details of tree protection measures. These did not constitute material changes to the proposed scheme so re-consultation did not take place.

### **Site and Surroundings**

- 3.5 The site is located to the east side of Oakwood Avenue and comprises a large detached house on a wide plot with an extensive rear garden. The property on the site is a traditional suburban style 2 storey property in white rendered that has been extended over time. There is space for car parking on the front forecourt. The site slopes gradually upwards from the road towards the rear garden, and the road slopes upwards from the south to the north.
- 3.6 The area is suburban and residential in character, comprising detached properties of predominantly 2 storeys. There are TPO trees in the front gardens of 8-12 Oakwood Road. One notable protected beech tree sits on the boundary between number 12 and number 14, the application site, within the grounds of

number 12. The site is located within an Archaeological Priority Zone and has a PTAL of 0 which indicates the worst access to public transport. The site is at very low risk of surface water flooding.



*Aerial view of site*

## Planning History

3.7 Site history is set out below.

Reference	Description	Decision	Date
19/00296/HSE	Alterations, conversion of garage; erection of single storey side/first floor side/rear extensions and single storey rear extension to form annex	Approved	12.04.2019
16/04769/LP	Erection of single storey rear extension	Approved	24.10.2016
16/00743/P	Erection of single storey side/rear extension and an attached double garage.	Approved	18.04.2016
15/05418/P	Erection of two storey side and rear extensions and a detached garage	Approved	25.01.2016

### 3.8 Two pre-apps were submitted before the current application

Reference	Description
20/00296/PRE	Proposed demolition of 1no. detached family house and erection of 1no. apartment block, comprising of 22 new apartments, with associated hard and soft landscaping etc.
19/04047/PRE	Proposed demolition of 1 no. detached family house and erection of 1 no. apartment blocks, comprising of 25 new apartments, with associated hard and soft landscaping etc.

## 4.0 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The principle of the intensified residential development is acceptable given the residential character of the surrounding area and the need for housing nationally and locally.
- The proposal includes 15% affordable housing, which is currently the maximum deliverable amount as demonstrated by the viability review which has been independently assessed, with a review mechanism secured to reassess the viability upon completion.
- The proposal includes a mix of different sized units and provides a decent quality of accommodation and amenity space for residents.
- The design and appearance of the development is of a suitably high quality, and would not harm the character of the surrounding area.
- The proposed landscaping scheme will result in an enhancement to the street scene.
- The living conditions of adjoining occupiers would be protected from undue harm.
- The level of parking and impact upon highway safety and efficiency would be acceptable.
- Off-site mature trees and those protected by TPOs will be protected subject to compliance with the submitted tree protection plan
- Contributions will be secured to ensure a zero carbon development and other sustainability aspects have been assessed and will be delivered in accordance with conditions.

## 5.0 CONSULTATIONS

### Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) (Statutory Consultee)

- 5.1 The submitted strategy and overall approach are generally robust and sound. Justification is sought for the 0-12 minute runoff infiltration time used in the Flood Risk Assessment; it may be more appropriate to be split over 0-8 minutes given the small area of the site. In addition, the site is within a Groundwater Source

Protection Zone so liaison with the EA should be undertaken as part of a planning condition.

OFFICER COMMENT: A conditions will be included to address these points

Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) (Statutory Consultee)

- 5.2 The archaeological desk based assessment dated January 2020 by ABRA has been assessed and the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest and there is no discernible on-going archaeological interest. No further assessment or conditions are therefore necessary

Thames Water

- 5.3 No objection in regards to the waste water network and sewage treatment subject to a condition requiring submission of a piling method statement given that the proposed development is located within 15 metres of a strategic sewer, and an informative regarding groundwater discharge to the public sewer. With regard to water supply, the site falls within the area of the Sutton & East Surrey Water Company.

Secure by Design

- 5.4 No objection subject to conditions for the development to achieve Secure by Design accreditation. The following specific points were raised:
- Controlled access to the rear garden from the street is required
  - The front fence should be 1.8m in height to prevent access
  - Windows and doors looking out to the communal garden should have defensible space
  - Tree branches should be maintained so they are not lower than 2m to allow natural surveillance
  - Doorset requirements are specified for the doors and windows above the main porch, the ground floor south flat and the refuse store to meet security requirements
  - An access control system is required to the car park and from the car park to the main building core as well as lighting specified and CCTV
  - The door to the cycle store to be clarified and CCTV included
  - The postal strategy is to be discussed with the SbD Officer
  - An access control system to the block with video and audio link and data logins is required.

OFFICER COMMENT: The points raised will be secured by condition as part of the SbD accreditation prior to occupation. The request for a 1.8m fence at the front on either side is noted, however it is considered that such a high fence at the front would have a harmful impact on the design aesthetic so will not be pursued, and the 1.1m high balustrades with hedging as proposed will be retained.

## Ecology

- 5.1 No objection subject to securing biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures as outlined in the Ecological Appraisal.
- 5.2 The views of the Planning Service are expressed in the Material Planning Considerations section below.

## **6.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATION**

- 7.1 The application was publicised by 13 letters of notification to neighbouring properties. A site notice was displayed and a press notice placed in the Croydon Guardian on 21/05/20.
- 7.2 The re-consultation between 08/02/21 and 24/02/21 is ongoing at the time of writing this report so further representations will be addressed and submitted to the Committee in an addendum.
- 7.3 The number of representations received from in response to the initial notification and publicity of the application are as follows. It should be noted that there are multiple / duplicate entries submitted by the same objectors and these have been counted individually:
- 7.4 No of individual responses: 492; Objecting: 485; Supporting: 4 (and 3 neutral)
- 7.5 4 supporting representations were received on the grounds that flats are more affordable than houses and will boost the housing stock for Croydon; parking will be hidden in the basement; the large plot sizes on the road are suited to flats.
- 7.6 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.

<b>Objection</b>	<b>Officer comment</b>
<i>Impacts on neighbouring amenity</i>	
Harmful to local amenity - invasion of privacy due to windows and balconies.	Addressed in paragraphs 8.26-8.32 of this report.
Loss of daylight for neighbours.	Addressed in paragraphs 8.26-8.32 of this report.
Breach of 45 degree line from number 12 and inadequate tree planting to mitigate.	Addressed in paragraphs 8.26-8.32 of this report.
Rear of the building extends 20m beyond the rear of number 16 and at 15m high will be a visual intrusion and overbearing.	Addressed in paragraphs 8.26-8.32 of this report.

Overlooking towards neighbours on Oakwood Avenue (12,16) Riddlesdown Road (126A, 124) and properties down the hill (e.g. 17, 11, 13, 15 Oakwood Ave) - privacy impacts and light pollution	Addressed in paragraphs 8.26-8.32 of this report.
Acoustic impacts on neighbours from passive or mechanical ventilation systems to basement	A condition will be included to control noise from any ventilation systems
The children's playground will generate noise	This would not be unreasonable in a residential area
<i>Design and character</i>	
Overdevelopment - Scale is too large, higher than adjacent properties and would appear intrusive in the street scene.	Addressed in paragraphs 8.10-8.17 of this report
The site is already wider than others so the building will appear enormous	Addressed in paragraphs 8.10-8.17 of this report
Balconies not in keeping with the road	Balconies are considered to be sympathetically designed and well integrated
Harmful to the character of the area / not in keeping	Addressed in paragraphs 8.10-8.17 of this report
Front paving and hardstanding will be visually dominant	Addressed in paragraphs 8.10-8.17 of this report
Building footprint will cover 37% of the plot whereas houses on the street cover 10-20% of their plots	Noted. Suburban intensification schemes typically result in an increase in built footprint
Oakwood avenue is a quiet road and one of the few roads remaining consisting solely of detached family accommodation - flats will be detrimental to its unique character.	Flats would contribute to providing a mix of different types of housing to facilitate mixed and balanced communities.
Basement would not meet Secure by Design standards	SbD accreditation will be secured by condition.
Object to basement excavation which could cause problems for neighbouring properties	This will be controlled by building regulations or other legislation such as the Party Wall Act

<i>Parking, transport and highways impacts</i>	
There is only one bus in the area and the site is not in reasonable walking distance of public transport due to the steep hills so people will use cars which will increase traffic and pollution.	Addressed in paragraphs 8.38-8.43 of this report
People will not cycle because of the hills	Topography is noted however the Council seeks to encourage sustainable transport. Car parking is also provided.
Residents will have more than one car and there is no visitors parking - will lead to on-street parking which will be detrimental to the area.	Addressed in paragraphs 8.38-8.43 of this report
Failure to provide a car club parking bay	Noted however the development will contribute towards sustainable transport initiatives through the S106 to include attracting a car club to the area
Parking spaces will be expensive so residents will park on the street	The cost of the parking spaces is not a material planning concern
Parking arrangement could cause bottlenecks, visibility is not sufficient on the ramp, the ramp gradient is unsafe, the 'queueing point' could be dangerous, there is no entrance barrier to the car park.	The parking arrangements have been reviewed and are considered satisfactory
Transport capacity into central London is already overcrowded	Noted
Increased cars will be a danger to school children walking/living in the area	Addressed in paragraphs 8.38-8.43 of this report
Emergency service access will be restricted	A construction logistics plan will be provided by condition to ensure the highway remains clear for emergency vehicles during the construction process.
Parking survey took place in the night so no visitors or deliveries present.	The Lambeth methodology is for surveys to be undertaken in the night when the highest numbers of

	residents and cars are likely to be home
Transport Statement does not consider impacts on school run traffic.	The development would be unlikely to have a material impact on the amount of traffic on the road during the school run.
What is passive car charging provision?	Addressed in paragraph 8.1 of this report
<i>Impacts on ecology and trees</i>	
Loss of habitat, impacts on birds, badgers, bats, slow worms	The ecology appraisal has been assessed by the Council's ecology advisor and deemed acceptable subject to the mitigation measures outlined.
Loss of green space	The proposed landscaping scheme involves greenery and planting on the forecourt, sides and rear of the building
The tree in 12 Oakwood Avenue is shown to be smaller than it actually is. Discrepancies in the RPZ on drawings. How will the development minimise the impact on this tree?	Addressed in paragraphs 8.35-8.37 of this report.  The topography plan incorrectly labels the beech tree as an oak. It has been confirmed that the location of the tree is accurate in the proposed site plan and the Tree Report.
<i>Sustainability and flooding</i>	
Increase in carbon footprint. Does not fit with the Council's ambition to be carbon neutral by 2030.	S106 contributions towards air quality initiatives, carbon offsetting, sustainable transport, etc will be sought
Impacts on air quality from dust and vehicles	A S106 air quality contribution will be provided.
Environmental impacts of demolition. The existing property should be converted into flats	Environmental construction impacts will be controlled by condition.
Drainage issues including surface runoff and pressure on drains	Surface water will be captured in soakaways. Thames Water have not raised concerns regarding drainage.

Basement flooding issues have not been addressed.	The site is in flood zone 1 and an area of limited potential for groundwater flooding so a basement impact assessment is not required as part of the FRA and this has not been raised as an issue by the LLFA.
<i>Quality of accommodation</i>	
There is no provision for a sprinkler system which will be required under post Grenfell Revised Approved Document B for structures over 11 metres. Including such a system would increase overall development height. Also no plant room for necessary life safety fire suppression systems.	This will be controlled by building regulations.
No lift / lift capacity inadequate. Lift capacity study should be undertaken.	The scheme includes a lift
Exceeds London Plan density targets	Noted. Density figures are a guideline
Not sufficient provision for wheelchair users (2 x 1-bed flats) – these are no larger than standard 1-bed flats. 2 bedrooms would be more suitable for live-in support.	A condition will be included to ensure the M4(3) flats comply with M4(3) building regulations
Access to the cycle park is beside one of the disabled bays so the car there is likely to be scratched	It is considered that there is sufficient space to enter the bike store.
Insufficient garden space for 70 residents	Over 180sq of shared amenity space for residents is provided.
The 3-bed apartments have the lowest storage area of 0.9sqm.	The 3b4p units have 2.1sqm of dedicated storage space which falls slightly below the London Plan requirement of 2.5sqm.
<i>Principle of flatted accommodation</i>	
Flats not welcomed. Many flats unsold in the area, there will not be demand for these. Should be retaining family houses.	This is a residential area and good quality flats with decent amenity spaces for new residents is appropriate. It must be noted that flats are often more affordable than houses with gardens and they
Houses with gardens are more beneficial for people's mental health than flats	

What is the need for this development? There are 3 times as many flats for sale in the area as houses. Flats are no longer a property type desired by buyers and renters.	contribute to providing a mix of different types of housing in the area.
There will be too many residents in the area with 70+ additional people living here	
Noise from new residents	
<i>Other matters</i>	
Should be refused for lack of affordable housing / which units are affordable?	Addressed in paragraphs 8.6-8.9 of this report
Schools, GPs and local hospital already over capacity	The development will make a CIL payment to contribute towards local infrastructure and services
Construction impacts	A construction management plan will be required by condition
Sets a precedent for future development	This is an appropriate use within a residential area and each scheme is assessed on its own merits
There is no Construction Logistics Plan which is essential given the excavation required	A CLP will be required by condition.
Community consultation was inadequate	Consultation undertaken by the developer was supplementary. The Council has undertaken statutory consultation in accordance with regulations
The proposed excavation will cause archaeological harm	GLAAS has confirmed that there are not likely to be any impacts on assets of archaeological interest
The plans do not show dimensions or levels or requirements for retaining structures. National validation criteria has not been met.	The drawings are to scale and proposed levels are shown on the site plan

Drawing inaccuracies for the footprint of number 12 as part of the rear/side extension has not been constructed.	As the footprint of number 12 is further away from the boundary than shown on the location plan, there will be no additional amenity impacts in terms of the 45 degree line or daylight and sunlight impacts
Heating and hot water flues are not shown (there is no communal plant room) and a communal satellite antennae should be provided.	Plant room is on the ground floor. Heating/hot water arrangement are outlined in the energy Statement
Refuse arrangements not practical as it will be time consuming to take 7 bins from the development to the road	Refuse arrangements are appropriate. Details of the receptacles will be provided by condition.
Red line boundary is shown to include a small patch of land on the public highway in front of number 12	This area of land has been removed from the red line.

7.7 Riddlesdown Residents Association objected to the application, raising the following (summarised) concerns:

- The Transport Statement is not accurate regarding walking distance to bus stops or train stations because topography is not considered.
- All nearby schools are oversubscribed – it is unclear where children living in the flats will go to school
- Over-intensification of the site and exceeding the London Plan density matrix
- Excessive bulk, scale and massing in a suburban location and uncharacteristic built form
- The DAS does not refer to NPPF policies
- Non-compliant affordable housing offer
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Insufficient amenity and private garden space
- Soakaways should be provided for surface water disposal
- How will the infiltration tank and the basement work together?
- Foul water sewers need to be increased in size
- Concerns about parking layout
- There is no overspill parking proposed
- Basement may flood in heavy rain
- Where is the evidence that the number or refuse bins is sufficient?
- The 3-bed units are located on 1st and 2nd floor when it would be preferable for them to be on the ground floor for easier access to the amenity and play space
- Mature trees on the rear boundary could cause loss of light to 3 Coxley Rise
- Cumulative impact of the loss of family homes and strain on infrastructure

- Comments regarding requirements for improved infrastructure and public services to support development are ignored by the Council.

7.8 Purley and Woodcote Residents Association objected to the application, raising the following (summarised) concerns:

- Loss of a family home
- Overdevelopment of the site with a significant increase in the built area of the existing family home
- Overdevelopment of the site resulting in inadequate amenity space for potential occupiers
- The design is out of keeping with the locality and surrounding townscape, as a result of its massing, form (incl height), and overall appearance.
- Detrimental to the amenity of adjoining properties. Size and scale means that occupiers of neighbouring properties will suffer visual intrusion, increased noise and loss of privacy.
- Inadequate car parking resulting in additional on street parking, parking pressure on the surrounding area, and increased traffic movements endangering road safety.

7.9 Councillor Simon Brew has objected to the application and referred this application to committee on the following planning related grounds:

- Overdevelopment
- Impacts on local infrastructure
- Not compliant with density targets: 329hr/ha when London Plan specifies 150-200hr/ha (almost double)
- Cumulative impacts of other flatted schemes in the area, approx. 100 new flats within 1km and this is not compensated for by CIL payments
- Oakwood Avenue is the sole remaining road consisting of family homes with gardens and that should be considered a heritage asset
- Visual impact on streetscape, fails to respect local character, contrary to SDG 2.7
- Scale, massing, bulk, form and design visually dominating and harmful to character and detrimental to visual amenity
- Massing much larger than any in vicinity
- Paving and hardstanding would have a harmful impact on the green character of the area.
- Proximity to homes on either side
- Privacy impact on numbers 12 and 16 and number 3 behind and daylight impacts
- Breach of 45 degree lines by intrusion into back garden
- If permission is granted the solar panels must be required before occupation to reduce carbon footprint
- Access to the communal amenity space at the rear is via a flight of stairs which is not DDA compliant for wheelchairs
  - *Officer note: there are no stairs to access the amenity space but there are stairs to the play space*
- Access to garage is via a steep 1:6 gradient and risk of carpark flooding during heavy rain.

- No provision of a car club bay as required by Policy DM30 Table 10.1.
- The road is very steep which impacts on access to Purley district centre, Riddlesdown station and the 407 bus stop.
- Quantum of cycle spaces is ridiculous due to topography
- 15% affordable housing is inadequate and contrary to policy.

7.10 Councillor Simon Hoar (neighbouring Ward Councillor) has objected to the application on the following planning related grounds:

- Overdevelopment of the site with 20 units replacing one
- Out of keeping with the area due to height, harmful to the character of the street
- Loss of privacy to neighbours from overlooking balconies
- Loss of daylight to neighbours
- Lack of privacy for new occupants
- Over saturation of flats within the local area
- Detrimental impact on local amenity and infrastructure
- Insufficient parking will impact on the road and traffic flow

7.11 The applicant also undertook their own community engagement prior to submission which involved a handout being provided to neighbours and they were invited to send their comments via email or telephone. A summary of some of these responses and the applicant's responses is provided in the applicants Community Engagement Statement.

## **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 (CLP) and the South London Waste Plan (2012).

7.2 Government Guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (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.

7.3 The main planning Policies relevant in the assessment of this application are:

### Consolidated London Plan (2015):

- 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
- 3.14 Existing Housing

- 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.7 Renewable energy
- 5.10 Urban greening
- 5.12 Flood risk management
- 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- 5.18 Construction, Demolition and excavation waste
- 6.3 Effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.10 Walking
- 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
- 6.12 Road Network Capacity
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.4 Local Character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 8.13 Community Infrastructure Levy

#### Croydon Local Plan (2018):

- SP2 Homes
- DM1 Housing choice for sustainable communities
- SP4 Urban Design and Local Character
- DM10 Design and character
- DM13 Refuse and recycling
- SP6 Environment and Climate Change
- DM23 Development and construction
- DM25 Sustainable drainage systems and reducing floor risk
- DM27 Protecting and Enhancing our Biodiversity
- DM28 Trees
- SP8 Transport and communications
- DM29 Promoting sustainable travel and reducing congestion
- DM30 Car and cycle parking in new development

#### Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance

- Croydon Suburban Design Guide SPD (2019)
- Section 106 Planning Obligations in Croydon and their Relationship to the Community Infrastructure Levy (2019)
- London Housing SPG (Mayor of London, 2016)
- Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment SPG (Mayor of London, 2014)
- Play and Informal Recreation SPG (Mayor of London, 2012)
- Character and Context SPG (Mayor of London, 2014)
- Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (Mayor of London, 2014)

#### Emerging New London Plan

- 7.4 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 and 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.
- 7.5 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 than the current adopted 2018 Croydon Local Plan target of 592 homes on windfall sites each year.
- 7.6 It is important to note, that whilst the Secretary of State has not supported 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.
- 7.7 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 relevant in the assessment of this application are as follows:

- Principle of development
- Residential tenure and unit mix
- Design of the proposal and the impact on the character of the area
- Quality of accommodation
- Impact on neighbouring residential amenity
- Access, parking and highways impacts
- Waste / Recycling Facilities
- Impacts on trees, biodiversity and ecology
- Sustainability and Flood Risk

### **Principle of Development**

8.2 The NPPF applies a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 68 acknowledges the contribution that small and medium size sites can make in meeting housing requirements and supports the development of windfall sites. Similarly Policy SP2.1 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) applies a presumption in favour of development of new homes and Policy SP2.2 commits to the delivery of 10,060 homes across the borough's windfall sites. London Plan policy 3.3 recognises the pressing need for more homes in London and Policy 3.8 states that Londoners should have a genuine choice of homes which meet their requirements for different sizes and types of dwellings in the highest quality environments. The proposal is for a residential scheme comprising 20 units in a 4 storey building. The site is within an established residential area and is a windfall site which could be suitable for sensitive renewal and intensification.

8.3 Policy DM1.2 seeks to prevent the net loss of small family homes by restricting the loss of three bedroom units and the loss of units that have a floor area of less than 130sqm. The existing property has 4 bedrooms and measures 272sqm. 4 x 3 bed units would be re-provided (3 x 3b5p) resulting in a net gain of family homes, in accordance with the policy.

8.4 With regards to density, the London Plan suggests that in a suburban setting such as this with a PTAL of 0, an appropriate density would be 150-200 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha). The proposal has a density of approximately 335hr/ha, which exceeds the guidance. However the London Plan indicates that it is not appropriate to apply these ranges mechanistically, and provides sufficient flexibility to support higher density schemes (beyond the density range) where they are acceptable in all other regards such as design, quality of proposed accommodation and impact on neighbouring amenity and traffic.

- 8.5 The proposed residential use and its density is considered acceptable in principle.

### **Residential tenure and unit mix**

- 8.6 Policy SP2.4 sets out that the Council will seek to achieve up to 50% affordable housing on sites of ten or more units, subject to viability with a 60:40 split between affordable rented homes and intermediate homes. A minimum of 30% affordable housing should be provided on site but if this is not viable then the minimum level of affordable housing permitted would comprise 15% on site plus a review mechanism with the potential to increase affordable housing provision to an equivalent of 50% upon completion based on a review of actual sales values and build costs.
- 8.7 In this case, the provision is for 15% affordable housing (by habitable room) comprising 2 x affordable rent units and 1 x shared ownership unit (all 2b4p units), to be provided and managed by Hexagon Housing Association. The applicant will also enter into a review mechanism to re-assess viability upon completion with the potential to increase the affordable housing provision. This will be secured through a S106 agreement.
- 8.8 The viability assessment submitted by the applicant concluded that it would not be viable for the applicant to provide any affordable housing on site or make any financial contribution to the council, stating that even without affordable housing the scheme would generate a deficit of £2,432,265. The Council's review of the assessment agreed that a fully market tenure scheme would generate a deficit – although a lower deficit of £715,609 - and recommends that a review mechanism is entered into. However, the Council's policy is clear that if the minimum level of affordable housing (i.e. 15% on site plus a review mechanism) is not provided then the scheme would be refused. The applicant has therefore proposed the offer outlined above and this is considered acceptable and in compliance with policy SP2.4.
- 8.9 Policies SP2.7 and DM1.1 seek to ensure adequate provision of small family sized units in order to meet the borough's need and ensure that a choice of homes is available in the borough. In suburban areas of low PTAL such as this, 70% of the homes on site should have three or more bedrooms. The policy allows a transition period until the end of February 2021 whereby 2b4p units contribute towards the proportion of family sized units. The proposal is for 3 x 3b4p, 11 x 2b4p, 6 x 1b2p units which constitutes 70% family sized units (including the 2b4p units) which complies with policy SP2.7 and DM1.1. It should be noted that the latest amendments to the drawings mean that the 3 x 3-bed units on the ground, first and second floor were previously 3b5p and are now 3b4p units, however this mix remains policy compliant.

### **Design and impact on the character of the area**

- 8.10 The existing building does not hold any significant architectural merit and there is no in principle objection to its demolition.
- 8.11 Policies SP4.1 and DM10.1 of the Local Plan state that the Council will require development of a high quality, which respects and enhances Croydon's varied local character and contributes positively to public realm, landscape and townscape to create sustainable communities. Proposals should be of high quality and, whilst seeking to achieve a minimum height of 3 storeys, should respect the development pattern, layout and siting; the scale, height, massing, and density; and the appearance, existing materials and built and natural features of the surrounding area.
- 8.12 The scheme has evolved through two rounds of pre-application discussion and minor design amendments to the elevations and layouts have been made as part of the assessment process. In the latest versions of the plans which are being assessed here, the south west corner of the building (closest to the protected beech tree in the front garden of number 12) has been pulled back by 3.5m from the front in order to reduce the encroachment into the RPA of this tree and to ensure the building is further away from the tree's canopy. This amendment is helpful not only in ensuring the protection of the tree (addressed in greater detail below) but also in reducing the perceived width of the front elevation as it now steps back on both sides.
- 8.13 In terms of height and massing, the proposed building is 3 storeys plus accommodation in the roof space, set above basement level car parking. The Suburban Design Guide SPD indicates that where surrounding buildings are predominantly detached dwellings of 2 or more storeys, new developments may be 3 storeys with an additional floor contained within the roof space. The height is considered to be appropriate.



Figure 2.10c: Where surrounding buildings are predominantly detached dwellings of two (2) or more storeys, new developments may be three (3) storeys with an additional floor contained within the roof space or set back from the building envelope below.

*Extract from Suburban Design Guide SPD*



*Proposed massing / street elevation (also showing outline of existing property and the second pre-app 20/00296/PRE)*

- 8.14 The proposed footprint of the building is larger than its neighbours, with a rear projection extending up to 15m beyond the back of neighbouring properties (number 16), however the plot is large and the 45 degree lines from the closest ground floor habitable rooms of the neighbouring properties on either side are not breached, as shown on the site plan. This indicates that the proposed massing is appropriate and will not have an overbearing impact on neighbouring occupiers. The proposed footprint retains appropriate separation distances between neighbouring residences. On the north elevation there is a gap of 3.5m between the side of the building and the edge of the site (adjoining number 16). On the south elevation, the gap between the edge of the building and the edge of the site is between 4.7m and 1.3m at its closest point. These areas on either side of the building are used as private gardens for ground floor flats so would not be used as walkways or access points for residents, and new mature tree planting will also be introduced on all boundaries.
- 8.15 The front building line is in line with the existing neighbouring properties which is supported. The proposed frontage is 27.8m wide, compared to the existing building on the site which has a total width of 23.5m including the side extension and garage. The building is set back from the front on both sides to remove any sense of it being overbearing in the street scene. It is acknowledged that the increased width coupled with the increased depth of the proposed building means that the building is of a larger scale than neighbouring properties and introduces a larger suburban grain to the neighbourhood. However the suburban design guide SPD acknowledges that intensification schemes such as this will be generally larger than their neighbours, and this is acceptable provided the design is of a high quality.



*Proposed site plan*

- 8.16 The proposed design approach is a contemporary reinterpretation approach. The character appraisal included within the design and access statement identifies various features within the surrounding styles of suburban housing and draws upon these in the proposed design, including the front gable, the vertical emphasis around the entrance and the use of brick in different colours. Amendments to the elevations have been made as part of the assessment (in addition to pulling back the SW corner of the building), including changes to the materials from predominantly white render to predominantly brick. Detailing using lighter bricks has been introduced to break up the façade and detailing is included around windows. The roof form has also been simplified. The architectural expression and materiality is now considered to be of an appropriately high quality which responds well to the character of the area.
- 8.17 In terms of site layout, the proposed underground parking is supported as this maximises opportunities for landscaping at ground floor level to reflect the green and open character of the street and this is considered to enhance the streetscene. The vehicular crossover is relocated further north to provide ramped

access to the underground parking. Cycle parking is also included in the underground car park and waste storage is provided internally at ground floor level. There is a separate ramped entrance for pedestrians providing access to the main front entrance, and also a clear access route for operatives to access the bin store which is positioned at the front of the ground floor. An area of communal amenity space and play space is provided at the rear which is accessed internally through the building. The proposed site layout is supported.

8.18 Currently the site slopes upwards from the pavement with a sloped stone wall in front of the forecourt. The proposal would involve some fairly significant excavation at the front to provide the ramped access down to the underground car park. Other proposed land level alterations are minor; the front sloped wall would be removed and replaced with a gradual ramp from the pavement to the main front door and some front boundary hedging. The existing rear garden is flat and no excavation or retaining walls are proposed at the rear. The proposed changes at the front of the site are considered to represent a visual improvement to the street scene.

8.19 The proposal is considered to comply with policies SP4.1 and DM10.

### **Quality of Accommodation**

8.20 Policy 3.5 of the 2016 London Plan states that housing developments should be of the highest quality, internally, externally and in relation to their context and to the wider environment. It sets out minimum Gross Internal Area (GIA) standards for new residential developments. All proposed units exceed the minimum space standards and layouts are sensible.

8.21 Internal layouts have been well thought out and all proposed units are dual aspect. There are 3 flats (1 bed units 4, 10 and 16 which are stacked above each other on ground, first and second floors) which have their secondary side (south) facing aspect obscured to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers at number 12. Occupiers of these units would not have outlook towards the south but would still benefit from ventilation from the windows, and neighbouring amenity would be protected, so the arrangement is acceptable. An obscured window is also provided to the living room window of ground floor flat 1 because access to the communal amenity space for all residents is via a pathway outside this window. This is a secondary window to the living room and the obscure glazing will protect the privacy of prospective residents, so is acceptable.

8.22 An internal daylight and sunlight study has been submitted which assesses the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) for all ground floor habitable rooms and a sample of rooms on first second and third floor. The study demonstrates that all rooms exceed the ADF guidelines of 1.5-2% for kitchen/living rooms and 1% for bedrooms, indicating that all units will receive sufficient daylight. It is noted that the communal stairwell will not receive natural light.

- 8.23 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan, the London Housing SPG (2015) and emerging London Plan policy D7 state that 10% of new build housing should meet Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'Wheelchair User Dwellings'. 2 x 1b2p wheelchair user dwellings are shown on the plans (unit 4 on ground floor and unit 10 on first floor). The remaining 90% should meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings'. Land level alterations are proposed to enable step free access from the street to the main entrance via a sloping path and a lift is provided internally to provide step free access from the entrance to all units. Part M4(2) also requires that step free access is provided to all facilities of the site, including communal amenity space and play space. Step-free access to the amenity space is provided via the communal core and a path which leads outside from the north east corner of the site with benches positioned around the external path. As currently proposed the access to the play space at the end of the garden is via a set of steps. A condition will be included to require step free access to the play space, either by reconfiguring this space within the garden or by providing a stair climber or platform lift
- 8.24 Policy DM10.4 of the Local Plan requires provision of high quality private amenity space at a minimum of 5sqm per 1-2 person unit and an extra 1sqm per extra occupant thereafter. Each upper floor unit is provided with a balcony which complies with the space requirements and each ground floor unit has a terrace and private garden, which is welcomed.
- 8.25 Policy DM10.4 also requires provision of children's play space calculated using the Mayor of London's population yield calculator. Play space of around 50sqm is provided in the north eastern corner of the garden. According to table 6.2 of policy 10.4, with 17 market units, 1 shared ownership (2-bed) and 2 affordable rent units (2-bed), a requirement for 42.6sqm of children's play space would be generated, and this is exceeded.
- 8.26 Communal amenity space of approximately 180sqm is also provided (not including the perimeter space which is generally occupied by trees). This space comprises lawn, planting, seating and a pergola or similar such structure. The proposed land level alterations means that some retaining walls will be required at the north and south boundary and within the amenity space and details of this will be provided by condition.
- 8.27 In summary, the proposal would provide good quality accommodation for future occupiers internally and externally in accordance with Local Plan Policies SP2 and DM10 and the London Housing SPG (2015).

### **Impacts on Neighbouring Residential Amenity**

- 8.28 Policy DM10.6 of the Local Plan states that the Council will ensure proposals protect the amenity of occupiers of adjoining buildings and will not result in direct

overlooking into their habitable rooms or private outdoor space and not result in significant loss of existing sunlight or daylight levels. The nearest residential properties are number 12 to the south and number 16 to the north. As mentioned above, the depth of the projection does not exceed the 45 degree line from the closest ground floor windows on either side. The proposal also does not breach the 45 degree line on either side in elevation, and the lowering of the ground floor land level levels in comparison with neighbouring properties assists in reducing the potential dominance of a 4 storey building. The building is not considered to have an overbearing impact on properties on either side.



*Proposed site plan showing relationship with neighbouring properties*

8.29 Number 16 to the north has 5 windows facing the site at a distance of approximately 5.9m from the proposed building at its closest point. The proposed development includes a number of north facing windows however all windows at first and second floor level which would enable direct overlooking towards the property and the first 10m of the rear garden would be obscure glazed. Careful consideration has been given to internal layouts to ensure that each of these rooms have alternative windows to allow adequate light for prospective

occupiers. Number 12 to the south has a number of windows facing the site at a distance of between 8 and 9.5m to the proposed building. The proposed development includes south facing windows which similarly would be obscure glazed at ground, first and second floor level to prevent overlooking towards the property and the garden. On both boundaries, semi-mature trees are proposed to be planted to further assist with screening between the properties.

- 8.30 A daylight and sunlight study has been undertaken to assess the impacts of the proposed development on numbers 12 and 16. The vertical sky component (VSC) analysis, which measures the amount of sky visible from a centre point of a window, indicates that all windows of number 12 retain at least 80% of their existing VSC, and all retain above the BRE guideline of 27%, which suggests that the development would not have a noticeable impact on the amount of light received to each window and each room will still receive good levels of natural daylight. The VSC analysis for number 16 shows that one window (the ground floor side facing window) would fall short of the BRE guidelines, receiving 72% of its current VSC, and falling to 26.37%, which is only marginally below the 27% BRE guideline. This room is also likely served by another larger window on the rear elevation so this minor transgression is considered acceptable. In terms of sunlight, the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) test indicates that all relevant windows of numbers 12 and 16 would continue to receive the recommended amount of daylight annually and in the winter months.
- 8.31 Balconies are proposed on the front and rear elevations. The front balconies do not raise any amenity concerns as these are looking over the public highway. The rear balconies are inset with hit and miss bricks on the side to prevent overlooking towards neighbours on either side. The outlook is proposed over the rear amenity space.
- 8.32 The property to the rear at 3 Coxley Rise has its back garden positioned directly beyond the application site at a distance of 14.5m, and the property itself is at the rear of number 12 Oakwood Avenue. It is noted that the proposed rear facing balconies would be orientated towards the rear garden of 3 Coxley Rise but the separation distance is considered to be adequate. The existing mature tree is to be retained and additional semi-mature trees are to be planted on the boundary, which will assist with screening the rear garden from overlooking. The proposed development would be visible from the windows of 3 Coxley Rise however there would be no conflict with the 45 degree line and the separation distance means that the proposal is not considered to have an overbearing impact.
- 8.33 Representations have also raised concerns around overlooking impacts towards 124/126/126a Riddlesdown Road. These properties are located over 26m from the rear of the site boundary and around 40m from the rear of the proposed buildings so any overlooking towards these properties would be from a distance and would not raise concerns regarding undue amenity impacts.

8.34 Overall the amenity impacts on neighbouring occupiers are considered to have been adequately mitigated and on balance are considered acceptable.

### **Trees, Biodiversity and Ecology**

8.35 Policy DM10.8 and DM28 seek to retain existing trees and vegetation. There are mature trees along the rear and side boundaries, many of which are located just outside the site boundary. These include one TPO Beech tree in the front garden of number 12 (category B – T1) and other large trees which do not have TPOs including a sycamore in the rear garden of number 12 (category B – T6), a silver birch in the rear garden of number 16 (category B – T4), and a sycamore just beyond the rear boundary (category B – T5). All of these mature boundary trees would be retained and protected. The size of the proposed basement has been informed by the location of the RPAs of these boundary trees. The wall of the proposed basement is in proximity to (but not encroaching upon) the RPAs of T5 and T6 (sycamores) but minor encroachment is expected on the RPAs of these 2 trees as a result of the basement dig process. A Tree Protection Plan has been provided and will be conditioned to ensure that any encroachment is kept to a minimum, and the detail of the Tree Protection Plan has been agreed by specialist officers. The two street trees (one to the north and one to the south) would also be retained and their root protection areas would not be impacted by the relocation of the vehicle crossover.

8.36 It is proposed to remove one false acacia tree (category C – T3) in the rear garden of the application site, one pittosporum (category B – T7), and one group of yew trees (category C – T2) near to the boundary with number 12 in order to facilitate the development. With regards to the Category B pittosporum, the arboricultural impact assessment states that 'this may be retained and protected with Tree protective fencing, or may be removed and replaced as part of a wider landscape scheme', however it has been assumed as part of the assessment that this tree will need to be removed to facilitate the development. There are no other tree removals proposed and these removals would be mitigated by planting of 13 new trees and additional shrubs and hedges as part of the landscaping scheme. 11 of the 13 new trees would be semi-mature specimens located on the eastern (adjoining 3 Coxley Lane), southern (adjoining number 12) and northern (adjoining number 16) boundaries. 2 further trees would be planted in the front garden.

- 8.37 Representations have raised concerns about impacts on the protected beech tree (T1) in the front garden of number 12. The Tree Report outlines that this tree has a RPA radius of around 14.4m and is likely to experience a root incursion of approximately 13% as the south western corner of the building would encroach the RPA. Discussion has taken place between specialists and as a result the SW corner of the building has been pulled back from the front by 3.5m to allow a further 11sqm rooting area for T1 (reducing the encroachment to below 13%). A pre-commencement tree protection condition will be included to ensure a trial trench is dug by hand in the line of the proposed foundation of the building under supervision by the project arboriculturalist to establish the presence of roots in this location. The RPAs of trees will be pegged out by the arboriculturalist prior to commencement. The Arboricultural Method Statement outlines in detail how the protected Beech tree and other retained boundary trees will be safeguarded during the construction process. This has been discussed in detail and agreed between the Council and the project team. A condition will be attached to ensure that works are undertaken in accordance with the Statement and with the appropriate supervision.
- 8.38 Policy DM27 seeks to protect and enhance the borough's biodiversity. An Ecological Appraisal has been submitted which assesses the impacts of the proposed development on designated sites, protected species and Priority species & habitats. This also includes biodiversity enhancements such as bird nesting boxes on retained trees and incorporating a range of native and non-native plant species within the landscaping scheme to provide habitats for wildlife. The council is satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination and that the mitigation measures identified are appropriate to conserve and enhance protected and Priority Species. Biodiversity enhancements are also outlined in the report, which are supported. Conditions will be attached to ensure compliance with the recommendations of the ecological appraisal and the submission of a biodiversity enhancement strategy.

### **Landscaping**

- 8.39 Local Plan policy 10.8 requires proposals to incorporate hard and soft landscaping. A landscaping scheme is proposed which involves paving of the front and rear paths using various high quality materials, lawn at the front and back with boundary hedging to delineate private and communal amenity spaces. Seating is provided in the rear garden as well as timber play equipment in the play space. The proposed landscaping is considered to be simple but high quality. Further details along with details of the retaining structures are to be provided by condition.

## **Access, Parking and Highway Safety**

### Car parking

- 8.40 The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 0 which is the worst access to public transport. Car parking on a 1:1 basis is proposed within an underground car park, including 2 disabled parking bays. The quantum of car parking is in accordance with the London Plan standards. The underground car park would be accessed via a modified vehicle access point on Oakwood Avenue, further north than the existing vehicle crossover. The vehicle crossover would be a dropped kerb with a flat section of 4.5m and 0.5m ramps either side, in accordance with Council guidance. Pedestrian sight lines at the crossover are shown in the Transport Statement and are acceptable. Vehicle sightlines will be required by condition.
- 8.41 The main ramp down to the basement car parking is on a 1:6 slope, with 1:12 transitions at either end, which is acceptable. The proposed ramp is 5m wide which is appropriate to enable 2 cars to pass each other. Swept paths for each of the parking spaces are provided, demonstrating that the spaces are accessible. The relocated crossover will require the relocation of a lamppost, which will be agreed as part of a S278 Agreement. The S278 will also require the reinstatement of the existing crossover and improvements to the footway in front of the site.
- 8.42 Representations have raised concerns about on-street car parking by visitors or if occupiers have more than one car. A parking stress survey has been undertaken which shows very low parking stress in the street (13%) and concludes that the proposed development would have limited impact on parking stress on the street given the quantum of on-site parking spaces. This is accepted.
- 8.43 4 active electric vehicle charging points (20%) will be provided in the basement car park, and the remainder of the spaces will be passive spaces (spaces with the necessary underlying connections and cabling to enable installation of charging points in the future), in line with policy DM30.
- 8.44 A contribution of £30,000 will be secured via S106 agreement to contribute towards sustainable transport initiatives including on street car clubs with electric vehicle charging points (ECVPs) as well as general expansion of the EVCP network in the area in line with Local Plan policies SP8.12 and SP8.13. The funding will go towards traffic orders at around £2500, signing, lining of car club bay, EVCP provision including electrics and set up costs for the car club. Funding will also be used for extension and improvements to walking and cycling routes in the area to support and encourage sustainable methods of transport.

### Cycle parking

8.45 Policy DM30 and London Plan policy 6.9 and Table 6.3 would require provision of a total of 34 cycle spaces. Cycle parking facilities must be secure, integrated, convenient and accessible. The cycle store is located in the basement with space for 38 cycles, which is acceptable. Semi vertical racks and Sheffield stands will be provided, including space for 5% wider and adapted bikes. A sliding door to the bike store will be installed to avoid any conflict with the adjacent car parking space. Details will be secured by condition.

### **Waste / Recycling Facilities**

8.46 Policy DM13 requires the design of refuse and recycling facilities to be treated as an integral element of the overall design and should be within the main building envelope. The bin store is proposed at ground floor level, with access for residents from the entrance core and access for operatives externally from the front. The drag distance for operatives is around 20m which complies with guidance in the Council's New Build and Conversion waste management guidance. Details of the receptacles will be provided by condition to ensure capacity is adequate.

### **Sustainability and Flood Risk**

#### Energy efficiency

8.47 Local Plan Policies SP6.2 and SP6.3 require development to minimise CO2 emissions in line with the energy hierarchy and all new major developments must be zero carbon. This is to be achieved by a minimum 35% reduction in regulated carbon emissions over the 2013 Building Regulations on site, with any remaining CO2 emissions to be offset through a financial contribution. The Energy Statement shows that on site CO2 reductions of 36% will be achieved through the use of solar PVS, advanced heating controls and thermal insulation within the building fabric. A condition will be included to ensure the solar panels and other energy efficiency measures are implemented prior to occupation. The remaining carbon would be offset via a contribution at a cost of £60 per tonne of carbon, equating to approximately £27,972. This would be secured through the S106 agreement.

8.48 The S106 will also require an air quality contribution of £2,000 to fund initiatives in the Council's Air Quality Action Plan in accordance with Local Plan policy DM23 and the Council's Air Quality interim policy guidance.

#### Flood risk

8.49 The site is located within an area at very low risk of surface water flooding. The proposed surface water drainage strategy will include the incorporation of infiltration SUDS (soakaways) and this will ensure no discharge to public sewers. Two soakaways will be included, one within the front landscaped area and one in the rear landscaped area, and a SUDS maintenance strategy is included. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has been consulted and has advised that the submission is robust and the SUDS strategy is sound but that the applicant should consult the Environment Agency as a formality as the site is located within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone. A condition will be included to ensure SUDS are incorporated within the development as proposed and that the EA is consulted.

### **Conclusion and Planning Balance**

8.50 The provision of 20 flats in this location is acceptable in principle. The provision of 15% affordable housing and a review mechanism is supported and the proposed mix of units is acceptable to provide a range of accommodation sizes. The design, massing and site layout has evolved over time through pre-app discussions and is now considered acceptable. The proposed quality of accommodation is acceptable and the amenity space, play space and accessibility arrangements and landscaping are supported. Amenity impacts on neighbouring occupiers will be adequately mitigated. Existing mature trees in neighbouring gardens will be retained and protected. The parking arrangements and highways impacts are acceptable, and the proposed development is also acceptable on sustainability grounds.

8.51 All material considerations have been taken into account, including responses to the public consultation. The conditions recommended and obligations secured by Section 106 would ensure that any impacts of the scheme are mitigated and it is not considered that there are any material planning considerations in this case that would warrant a refusal of this application. Taking into account the consistency of the scheme with the Development Plan and weighing this against all other material planning considerations, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in planning policy terms.

### Other matters

8.52 The development would be liable for a charge under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

8.53 All other planning considerations including equalities have been taken into account.