

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 12/01569/FULL1

Ward:
Copers Cope

Address : 66 - 68 Park Road Beckenham BR3 1QH

OS Grid Ref: E: 536957 N: 170369

Applicant : Croudace Portland Ltd

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Erection of 6 three storey four bedroom terraced houses with 12 car parking spaces, refuse storage and associated landscaping at 66 and 68 Park Road.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for:

- 6 three storey four bedroom terraced houses
- 12 car parking spaces at the front (2 spaces per house)
- refuse storage to be sited on the front boundary
- paved patios at rear
- soft and hard landscaping at the front of the site
- the site plan shows a side space of 1.8m would be retained to the boundary with No. 64 and 1.9m to the boundary with No. 70

This application seeks full planning permission. The site plan drawing shows one continuous block of 6 terraced houses. The proposed dwelling to Plot 1 is adjacent to No.70 Park Road and measures approximately 16.5m in depth, projecting beyond the rear building line of No.70 by 5m in total (although 2.4m at two storey level). The proposed dwelling to Plot 6 is adjacent to No.64 Park Road and would measure approximately 17.2m.

This application is to be determined by Committee as it falls outside the Chief Planner's delegated power.

Location

The application site is currently vacant, with the residential properties previous at 66 and 68 Park Road previously on the site having now been demolished.

The site is located on the northern side of Park Road, relatively close to the junction with Lawn Road. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of terraced and detached houses, mostly with long rear gardens. St Paul's church and its Vicarage are situated to the rear of the application site.

Comments from Local Residents

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

- support proposal for one block
- improved appearance of scheme
- need to ensure bin storage is adequately protected/enclosed to prevent smells etc..
- most acceptable plans to date
- design very good
- slight reduction in rearward projection
- development is out of scale
- over-development
- replacing 2 detached houses with 6 terraced house
- limited landscaping
- no front gardens
- 200% increase in accommodation
- frontage too great
- solid and uninviting
- no attempt made to break up massing

A full copy of these letters are available on file ref. 12/01569. Any further comments that are received will be reported verbally at the meeting.

Comments from Consultees

The comments from Consultees are:

- Thames Water: no objections are raised
- Waste: the proposed refuse storage is not big enough- no allowance for recycling
- Environmental Health (Pollution): no objections raised in principle
- Highways- No objections raised in principle subject to conditions
- Metropolitan Police – no objections subject to secure by design condition

At the time of writing the report, Drainage advice had not been received. Any comments will be reported verbally at the meeting.

Planning Considerations

In considering the application the main policies are H1, H7, H9, BE1, T3 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan. These concern the housing supply density and design of new housing/new development, the provision of adequate car parking and new accesses and road safety.

Policy H1 (v) seeks to make most effective use of land in accordance with the density/location matrix in Table 4.2. Policy H7 aims to ensure that new residential development respects the existing built and natural environment, is of appropriate density and respects the spatial standards of the area as well as amenities adjacent occupiers, and allows adequate light penetration into and between buildings.

Policy BE1 requires a high standard of design in new development generally, and seeks to protect the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties.

Policy T3 seeks to ensure that off street parking provisions for new development are to approved standards. Policy T18 requires that issues of road safety are considered in determining planning applications.

Members will note that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which was adopted in March 2012 is also relative in this case.

There are also a number of tree on the site that will need to be taken into account whilst assessing the application.

Planning History

There is a long planning history at both 66 and 68 Park Road. The most recent planning history can be summarised as follows:

- 11/00213- outline permission was granted for the erection of 6 three storey four bedroom dwellings (plus basements) with 12 parking spaces, refuse storage and associated landscaping at 66 and 68 Park Road.
- 11/00047- planning permission was granted for the erection of 6 three storey four bedroom dwellings with 12 parking spaces, refuse storage and associated landscaping at 66 and 68 Park Road

The current application seeks to amend the scheme granted under ref. 11/00047

- 10/01916 – Planning permission refused for the erection of a three storey block comprising 6 flats at 66 Park Road
- 10/01573- Planning permission was refused for the erection of a three storey block comprising 6 flats at 68 Park Road

The above applications were both reported to Plans-Sub Committee 2 on 9th September 2009 on the grounds of excessive mass and bulk resulting in an overdevelopment of the site. The combined total of units over the two sites was 12. Both applications were also refused for the impact of the buildings of the amenities of the neighbours.

- 09/03453- Planning permission refused for the erection of a three storey block comprising 9 flats at 66 Park Road
- 09/01432- Planning permission was refused (and dismissed) for the erection of a three storey block comprising 9 flats at 68 Park Road

These applications were both refused on the basis of the number of units (a combined total of 18 over the two sites) proposed at both sites and the excessive bulk and mass. The applicant appealed against the decision at No. 68 but the application was later dismissed by the Planning Inspector.

- 07/02520- planning permission was granted for the demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of 6 three storey terraced houses with 12 car parking spaces at 66 and 68 Park. This application included basements to the proposed houses
- 06/00186- Outline permission was granted for 6 three storey terraced houses at 66 and 68 Park Road
- 05/03103- Outline permission was refused for 6 three storey terraced houses

Conclusions

The main issues in this case are whether this type of development is acceptable in principle in this location, the likely impact of the proposed scheme on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, having particular regard to layout and design of the proposed scheme.

It is considered that the redevelopment of the site would be acceptable in principle as planning permission has already been granted at the site for the erection of 6 three storey terraced houses (refs. 11/00047 and 11/00213). The site also previously housed two detached dwellings and the surrounding area is characterised by residential developments.

The main changes which are included in the most recent application are that one block of 6 houses is now proposed (compared to two blocks of three houses), the design of the building and the increase in the size of the footprint of the building. In term of form and scale, the proposed height of the houses would be comparable with a number of properties along Park Road, in particular the three storey terraced properties adjacent to the site, Nos. 70 – 78. The proposed buildings are set back from the front boundary and rear gardens varying from approximately 17m to 20m are proposed. Some soft landscaping is proposed to the front of the site (although this is fairly limited) and adequate amenity spaces are proposed, Members may consider that the site will be redeveloped in satisfactorily to reflect the character of the area.

With regard to the proposed design of the buildings, the houses are proposed in one continuous block of Georgian style. The buildings have a slight staggered frontage which Members may consider to go some way to add visual interest to the design and break up the massing of the buildings. The previously granted schemes (refs. 11/00047 and 11/00213) had two blocks of 3 houses with pitched roofs,

whilst the current application maintains a hipped roof line, the overall massing of the roof is greater than previously granted. Members will need to carefully consider whether the increase in roof bulk (not height) is detrimental to the streetscene.

The proposed the three storey block maintain a minimum separation of 1.9m to the western boundary (adj. No.70), a minimum separation of 1.4m to the eastern boundary (adjacent to No. 64), when scaled from the submitted drawings, which is comparable to the most recent applications at the site. The application in this respect would accord with Policy H9 in that a minimum 1m separation is retained to the adjoining boundaries.

With regard to the impact of the proposed building on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties, the proposed buildings are set at reasonable distances away from the adjoining properties. However, Members will note that the overall footprint of the proposed buildings at single storey level has increased when compared to the most recently permitted applications at 66 and 68 (refs. 11/00047 and 11/00213), and consideration should be given as to whether this increase in bulk along the boundary would impact detrimentally on the amenities of the adjacent neighbours. The windows proposed on the upper western and eastern flanks are indicated hallways and a condition may be added to ensure these windows are obscure glazed.

With regards to the trees on the site, it is advised that the findings of the arboricultural report are agreed. It is considered that no significant trees would be lost as a result of this proposal and appropriate conditions are suggested for Members to take into account should permission be granted.

In terms of proposed parking, a total of 12 car parking spaces were previously considered acceptable by the Council's Highways engineer.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 12/01569, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- | | | |
|---|--------|--|
| 1 | ACA01 | Commencement of development within 3 yrs |
| | ACA01R | A01 Reason 3 years |
| 2 | ACA04 | Landscaping Scheme - full app no details |
| | ACA04R | Reason A04 |
| 3 | ACA07 | Boundary enclosure - no detail submitted |
| | ACA07R | Reason A07 |
| 4 | ACB01 | Trees to be retained during building op. |
| | ACB01R | Reason B01 |
| 5 | ACB02 | Trees - protective fencing |
| | ACB02R | Reason B02 |
| 6 | ACB03 | Trees - no bonfires |
| | ACB03R | Reason B03 |
| 7 | ACC01 | Satisfactory materials (ext'nl surfaces) |

	ACC01R	Reason C01
8	ACC03	Details of windows
	ACC03R	Reason C03
9	ACD02	Surface water drainage - no det. submitt
	ADD02R	Reason D02
10	ACH03	Satisfactory parking - full application
	ACH03R	Reason H03
11	ACH18	Refuse storage - no details submitted
	ACH18R	Reason H18
12	ACH22	Bicycle Parking
	ACH22R	Reason H22
13	ACH32	Highway Drainage
	ADH32R	Reason H32
14	Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the proposed window(s) n the first and second floor of the western flank (Plot 1) and eastern flank (Plot 6) shall be obscure glazed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall subsequently be permanently retained as such.	
	ACI12R	I12 reason (1 insert) BE1

Reasons for granting permission:

In granting permission the Local Planning Authority had regard to the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan:

H1	Housing Supply
H7	Housing Density and Design
H9	Side Space
BE1	Design of New Development
T3	Parking
T18	Road Safety

The development is considered to be satisfactory in relation to the following:

- (a) the appearance of the development in the street scene
- (b) the relationship of the development to the adjacent properties
- (c) the character of the development in the surrounding area
- (d) the impact on the amenities of the occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties
- (e) the light and outlook of occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties
- (f) the privacy of occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties
- (g) the safety of pedestrians and motorists on the adjacent highway
- (h) the safety and security of building and the spaces around them
- (i) accessibility to the building
- (j) the housing policies of the development plan
- (k) the urban design policies of the development plan
- (l) the transport policies of the development plan
- (m) the neighbour concerns raised during the consultation process

INFORMATIVE(S)

- 1 RDI10 Consult Land Charges/Street Numbering
- 2 With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.
- 3 You are advised that this application is considered to be liable for the payment of the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) and the Planning Act 2008. The London Borough of Bromley is the Collecting Authority for the Mayor and this Levy is payable on the commencement of development (defined in Part 2, para 7 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)). It is the responsibility of the owner and /or person(s) who have a material interest in the relevant land to pay the Levy (defined under Part 2, para 4(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)). The Levy will appear as a Land Charge on the relevant land with immediate effect.

If you fail to follow the payment procedure, the collecting authority may impose surcharges on this liability, take enforcement action, serve a stop notice to prohibit further development on the site and/or take action to recover the debt.