

Section '4' - Applications recommended for REFUSAL or DISAPPROVAL OF DETAILS

Application No : 12/00469/FULL1

Ward:
West Wickham

Address : 131 - 133 High Street West Wickham
BR4 0LU

OS Grid Ref: E: 537848 N: 166070

Applicant : Mrs M Andreade

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Roof alterations to include side dormer extensions, elevation alterations, part one/three storey rear extensions, conversion of first floor, second floor and roof space to provide 8 two bedroom self-contained units with roof terrace/garden areas, 6 car parking spaces and cycle and refuse store.

Key designations:

Secondary Shopping Frontage
Stat Routes

Proposal

- The proposal comprises the sub-division and extension of the existing building to provide 8 two bedroom residential units, 6 car parking spaces and associated amenity space.
- There are two existing residential units which will be retained, with an additional 6 units. The two existing residential units do not have access to on-site parking spaces, and this will remain the case. The additional 6 residential units will each be afforded 1 on-site car parking space.
- The residential accommodation will be split over the first floor, the second floor and the loft space. The commercial unit at ground floor is not part of the current application being considered, but is part of a separate application reference 12/00422 (Change of use of ground floor from Class A1 (retail) to class A2 (financial and professional services) and sub-division into 2 separate units).
- Access, parking, refuse and bicycle storage is all provided at ground floor to the rear of the retail unit.

Location

The application site is located on the southern side of the High Street in West Wickham, on the corner with Grosvenor Road. The site has a frontage to the High Street of about 10 metres and a frontage to Grosvenor Road of about 33 metres.

The site at present comprises a three storey commercial and residential building, with the ground floor being in commercial use and the upper floors being in residential use. The ground floor unit does not form part of the application, but has been the subject of a separate application which sought to sub-divide and convert it into two Class A2 units.

Comments from Local Residents

Nearby residents were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- excessive proposal to say the least;
- 8, 2 bedroom flats and 2 shops with only 6 parking spaces in an already congested area must be classed as an overdevelopment;
- parking in this area is already very difficult;
- a four storey building is just too big and would be out of keeping with other properties in the High Street;
- proposal to provide 6 parking spaces for 8 two bedroom flats and the ground floor commercial units is insufficient;
- Grosvenor Road is one of the narrowest roads in old West Wickham and is often congested particularly with the busy KwikFit tyre shop situated at the junction with the High Street;
- proposed building is very large and not in keeping with other residential houses;
- suggested amenity / garden is located on top of the parking area and is therefore on a level with, and directly opposite, bathroom and front bedroom of neighbouring property;
- intolerable intrusion of privacy;
- Grosvenor Road is a narrow road with a narrow pavement – the extended height and depth of proposed building will appear oppressive;
- restriction of light to neighbouring properties;
- previous applications for 5 and 6 flats were rejected, yet this is a larger scheme of 8 flats;
- current proposal is also higher and does not include parking for all flats;
- parking exit will also have limited sight of the narrow pavement and without a driveway would appear dangerous;
- inadequate parking – could easily be 16 cars looking for spaces.

Comments from Consultees

Highways Drainage – no objection, however the site is within the area in which there is a restriction on the rate of discharge of surface water from new developments into the River Ravensbourne or its tributaries. Discharge of surface water would therefore need to be controlled should permission be granted.

Transport for London (TfL) requested that the development should seek to maximise the use of public transport, walking and cycling. TfL would expect appropriate cycle parking to be provided in line with London Plan and local standards. Also in line with London Plan standards, 20% of the parking spaces must be for electric vehicles and a further 20% of spaces having passive provision for use by such vehicles. Adequate parking for disabled people should be provided, the proposals currently have no designated parking spaces for use as disabled parking.

Servicing and deliveries should take place off the TLRN both during construction and subsequently, via the rear access of Grosvenor Road, and this should be secured by appropriate condition.

Temporary obstructions to the public highway must be kept to a minimum. In addition, should this development be granted planning permission this does not discharge the requirements under the Traffic Management Act 2004.

Traffic – provision for bicycle storage consists of a cycle store with 12 racks, which meets the minimum requirement of one cycle parking space per unit. Further details should be provided as to the type of racks being provided.

Waste Services – refuse store should allow for 2 euro containers (1 x 1100 and 1 x 660), 2 paper wheelie bins (240 litre), 2 glass / plastic / cans wheelie bins (240 litres) and 1 x 140 litre wheelie bin for food.

No objection raised by Environmental Health Pollution. Should permission be granted, steps should be taken to control pollution.

Thames Water – no objection raised with regard to sewerage or water infrastructure.

Highways Engineers – In regards to the layout of the parking area drawing No.SK01 indicates a typical car utilising parking space for number three. The manoeuvrability remains tight but it is considered to be practical.

A parking beat survey was undertaken to review any potential parking stress during the evening. The surveys occurred on 21 and 22 March 2012 between the hours of 19:00 and 7:00, the parking survey within the area showed that there is available parking in the surrounding roads. However the applicant is aware that parking during the day is at premium; as High Street, West Wickham is part of the Transport for London Road Network, and parking is prohibited between 7:00 and 19:00; this adds to the parking pressure on the other surrounding roads. An increase in parking demand in an area where a few spaces are available would generate considerable pressure to find spaces with a significant risk of illegal or unsuitable parking and on-street manoeuvring. This would cause inconvenience and in some locations, risk to traffic and pedestrian safety.

However, six car parking spaces would be provided for 8 units this is unsatisfactory. Based on 2001 census results, car ownership in West Wickham ward was approx. 1.35 cars per household. Considering that the available census information is approximately 11 years old, and the growth in car ownership level

since 2001, greater parking demand is likely to exist now. Therefore one for one parking space for the development (8 spaces in total) should be provided.

Planning Considerations

BE1 Design of New Development
H7 Housing Density & Design
T3 Parking
T7 Cyclists
T11 New Accesses
T17 Servicing of Premises
T18 Road Safety
S2 Secondary frontages

Recently, Planning Policy Statements and Planning Policy Guidance notes were replaced by the adopted National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This is also a material consideration for the determination of the application.

Planning History

In terms of relevant planning history, permission was granted under reference 02/01240 for elevational alterations and conversion of first and second floors into 2 one bedroom flats.

A previous application was refused under ref. 06/04553 for a block of 6 flats with a ground floor retail unit and 6 parking spaces. This was refused on the following grounds:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its height, depth, bulk, external detailing and design, would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the site, harmful to the appearance of the streetscene and the setting of the neighbouring locally listed building. The application is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan; and
2. The proposed development fails to provide a good level and quality of external amenity space and adequate cycle storage facilities. The application is therefore contrary to Policies H7 and T7 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Application reference 07/02157 was for demolition of existing buildings and erection of a three storey building comprising retail unit (Class A1) on ground floor and 6 two bedroom flats on upper floors with roof terrace/garden, 6 car parking spaces, cycle and refuse store which was refused on similar grounds:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its height, depth, bulk, external detailing and design, would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the site, harmful to the appearance of the street scene and the setting of the neighbouring locally listed building. The application is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan; and

2. The proposed development fails to provide a good level and quality of external amenity space. The application is therefore contrary to Policy H7 of the Unitary Development Plan.

A further application was submitted under reference DC/07/04049 for the demolition of existing building and erection of a three storey building comprising retail unit (Class A1) on ground floor and 1 one bedroom and 5 two bedroom flats on upper floors with roof terrace/garden 6 car parking spaces/cycle and refuse store. This application was refused by the Council but allowed at Appeal.

The most recent application, reference 11/01869, sought to extend the time limit that this application could be implemented. This application was granted permission.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area, the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties, the impact on the nearby locally listed building and the impact on highway safety.

Members will be aware that the principle of some form of residential development on this site has already been accepted at Appeal by The Planning Inspectorate, and there is an extant permission on this site from the Appeal being extended through application 11/01869. As such, it may be considered by Members that the current application should therefore be assessed in relation to the main differences in terms of the extant permission.

The supporting Design and Access Statement, on page 10, effectively states that the proposed development mirrors the profile of the redevelopment scheme that was granted permission in 2008 and renewed in 2011. In addition, access and amenity provision mirrors that previously approved, and parking provision is also identical.

The main difference however is that the number of residential units has been increased by two, to provide 8 two bedroom units, whereas the extant permission would provide 1 one bedroom unit and 5 two bedroom units. Members may therefore consider that whilst the site coverage of building would not be increased, the increase in the number of units and indeed the addition of the 6th unit being two bedrooms rather than one, would be an intensification of the site.

Whilst the supporting statement states that parking provision would be identical to that already approved, Members may consider that the provision of 6 car parking spaces for 8 two bedroom units is insufficient. Indeed the Council Highways Engineers stated in effect that the scheme would be lacking in on-site car parking provision which would exacerbate an already densely parked vicinity, in particular Grosvenor Road, as the High Street frontage is a red route and no on-street parking is available in this location.

Nearby residents have raised a number of issues in terms of the proposed development, the main and recurring issues being overdevelopment of the site, insufficient parking for the proposed development, and loss of privacy due to the second floor balcony area. When comparing the extant permission with the current scheme, the height of the building does appear to have been increased. The previously approved scheme appears to have a maximum height of approximately 10.7 metres, whereas the current application has been increased to a maximum height of approximately 11.35 metres. The height from ground level to eaves has not been altered, still measuring approximately 7.9 metres, however the roof of the current scheme has been increased in terms of height and bulk, now providing additional residential units within the roofspace and the addition of dormer window extensions to the flank elevations.

The supporting documentation states in effect that the overall bulk, height and scale of the current proposal does not differ from the extant permission, however Members may determine that the increase in height of the roof, the provision of dormer window extensions and the design of the roof is in fact bulkier than the scheme previously allowed at Appeal and subsequently extended in time, so much so that direct comparisons between the schemes cannot be drawn. Members may therefore consider that the design of the roof would appear incongruous in terms of the host building and would be out of character with other buildings in the area, and that the additional bulk would therefore be excessively bulky, with a top-heavy and cramped appearance that would detract from the streetscene in general.

The current scheme has also provided an amenity area for units 7 and 8 which would be located to the rear of the building above the second floor extension. This would have a privacy screen to be agreed by way of condition should permission be granted, however Members may consider that whilst the principle of some form of balcony area has been agreed above ground floor level to the rear of the site, providing amenity space at second floor level in the form of a balcony / terrace area would be detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. Notwithstanding any form of privacy screening, Members may consider that this balcony area would still lead to loss of privacy for the residents of a number of properties along Grosvenor Road by way of overlooking which would not be acceptable.

In terms of the layout of the parking area, drawing No.SK01 indicates a typical car utilising parking space for number three and whilst the Highways Engineer stated that the manoeuvrability remains tight, it was considered to be practical.

A parking stress survey was carried out, this was done so during the evenings of 21 and 22 March 2012 between the hours of 19:00 and 7:00, and showed that there is available parking in the surrounding roads. However Members should already be aware that parking during the day is at premium; as the High Street, West Wickham is part of the Transport for London Road Network, and parking is prohibited between 7:00 and 19:00. The parking stress survey did not account for daytime parking availability.

Members should be aware that the parking restrictions between 07:00 and 19:00 adds to the parking pressure on the surrounding roads and it is considered that an

increase in parking demand in an area where a few spaces are available would generate considerable pressure to find spaces with a significant risk of illegal or unsuitable parking and on-street manoeuvring. This would cause inconvenience and in some locations, could result in a risk to traffic and pedestrian safety.

In addition, six car parking spaces would be provided for 8 units which is considered to be unsatisfactory. The growth in car ownership level since 2001, when the most recent Census information is available from, is likely to have risen which indicates that a much greater parking demand is likely to exist now. Therefore Members may consider that one for one parking space for the development (8 spaces in total) should be provided and the current provision is unacceptable.

As such, Members may consider that the proposal as a whole is unacceptable in that it would result in a cramped over intensive redevelopment of the site, lacking in sufficient parking provision for future occupiers, the roof design would be excessive in terms of its bulk and scale and the proposed second floor roof terrace, which is to provide amenity space for future occupiers of the building in units 7 and 8, would be detrimental to the residential amenity and privacy that occupiers of neighbouring properties should be able to continue to enjoy by reason of overlooking and loss of privacy.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 02/01240, 06/04553, 07/02157, 07/04049, 11/01869, 12/00422, and 12/00469, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 02.02.2012 29.02.2012 07.03.2012
13.03.2012 27.03.2012

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of the number of units and additional bulk and design of the roof, would result in a cramped over-intensive redevelopment of the site, harmful to the appearance of the street scene and contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan.
- 2 The proposed second floor roof terrace would be detrimental to the residential amenity and privacy that occupiers of neighbouring properties should be able to continue to enjoy by reason of overlooking and loss of privacy, contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan.
- 3 The limited number of proposed on-site parking spaces would be likely to increase parking demand in an area where few spaces are available which would, as a result, generate a significant risk of illegal or unsuitable parking and on-street manoeuvring which would be prejudicial to the free flow of traffic and conditions of general safety within the development, contrary to Policies T11 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

