

Section '3' - Applications recommended for PERMISSION, APPROVAL or CONSENT

Application No : 16/02483/FULL1

Ward:
Clock House

Address : 261 Elmers End Road, Beckenham
BR3 4EJ

OS Grid Ref: E: 535738 N: 168546

Applicant : Mrs Alison Taylor Reed

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Proposed conversion of existing semi-detached dwelling house to form 1 two bedroom flat and 2 one bed flats, and roof alterations to incorporate a rear dormer

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 30

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the conversion of the existing semi-detached dwelling house to form 2 one bedroom flats and 1 two bed flat, including, alterations to the roof incorporate a rear dormer. The hip to gable roof extension was previously approved under a Lawful Development Certificate under reference: 16/01747/PLUD.

The application is accompanied by a Planning Statement and a Transport Statement.

Site and Location

The application site comprises of a two storey semi-detached residential dwelling located on the North-East side of Elmers End Road, Beckenham.

The surrounding area is predominately residential and commercial, with a PTAL rating of 5 (on a scale of 1 to 6 where 6 is the most accessible).

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and the following representations were received:

- The occupiers of the adjoining property at 259 Elmers End Road objected to the proposal stating- The proposal will have a severely detrimental effect on

the level of amenity to our property, by way of loss of privacy and noise and disturbance

- The development would lead to an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance by virtue of it being over-intensification of the occupancy in proposing 3 separate flats.
- Two of the flats appear to be below the specified nationally described space standards. We have accurately checked the submitted drawings, using CAD software.
- The first floor flat has a kitchen/living area immediately adjoining the main bedroom of our property, this would cause such harm and disturbance, particularly in the use of the kitchen appliances.
- The frontage area seems totally inadequate for its function to serve 3 flats, the refuse issues will severely affect the amenity of our property.
- Furthermore, the access to the flats appears to be across the 2 parking spaces with no allowance for pedestrians, particularly buggies, we therefore maintain that the existing house cannot accommodate these flats to the required standards and we request that planning permission be refused.

The occupiers of 191 Elmers End Road also objected to the proposal stating

- The conversion to 3 flats would be an over development of the site, we understand that two of the three flats are in reality below the minimum space standards despite claims to the contrary from the applicant.
- The parking provision is inadequate as it stands, even for just 2 of the 3 proposed flats.
- The external layout is also inadequate to accommodate even two cars plus refuse and recycling collection and storage.

The occupiers of 14 Aldersmead Road, Beckenham also objected to the proposal stating

- On behalf of local members to the proposal, this would be the loss of a reasonably sized family home, which are becoming scarce due to such conversions
- The provision of a Juliet balcony would overlook the garden of the adjacent properties. The balcony and that at second floor flat would also overlook the private garden space of the other flats in the building. We request that this application is refused

Amended plans were received on the 27/07/2016, as a result neighbours were re-notified and the following representations were received:

The neighbouring occupier at living on Ancaster Road Beckenham objected to the proposal stating:

- As a resident living in Ancaster Road opposite the railway and trams station some commuters park on Ancaster Road, so residents find it very difficult to park on their road.
- Also the plans have been submitted for three flats but there is only room for two cars to be parked in front of the house.

- Potentially if all the people living there had cars the nearest place they could park is on Ancaster Road causing more congestion for us.
- If there was parking restriction times or resident's only parking would be a lot better for residents of Ancaster Road.

The neighbouring occupier at 259 Elmers End Road objected to the proposal stating:

- The new proposals do not in any way address our objection that this re-development of a family home would have a severely detrimental effect on the level of amenity our property currently enjoys, by way of loss of privacy and by noise and disturbance.
- Our contention is that this particular house is totally unsuitable for the satisfactory division into this number of self-contained dwellings and doing so would not only severely affect our amenity but would also produce unsuitable accommodation for future occupants of the resulting flats.
- One of our principle objections was that the development was an unacceptable over-intensification of the occupancy in proposing 3 separate flats and this number had been achieved by the accommodation being below minimum acceptable standards.
- The current proposal merely re-arranges the internal accommodation to nominally improve these standards by the apparent loss of one bedroom.
- This approach is disingenuous in a number of respects and the reconfiguration of the internal spaces leads to the accommodation being deficient in slightly different ways.
- The drawings do not take into account the construction requirements that will need to be addressed in order to enable what is shown there to be built legally.
- Wall thickness as drawn does not include allowances for thermal insulation to external walls and sound insulation, both between separate flats within the proposal and the party wall with our property, which will be required to satisfy building regulations.
- The internal areas claimed on the drawing, already at or close to the requires by the national described space standards, will therefore inevitably be reduced.
- We would also reiterate our previous comments in respect of the 1st floor rear flat, flat 2. This has a kitchen/living room area immediately adjoining the main bedroom of our property. Policy BE1 seeks to ensure that development proposals respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and that their environments are not harmed. The location of the living area next to the main bedroom of our property would cause such harm and disturbance.
- The frontage area seems totally inadequate for its function to serve 3 flats. The space alongside the parking area allocated to refuse storage and collection is insufficient to accommodate Bromley's current refuse collection and recycling requirements.
- We therefore maintain that the proposal is contrary to most aspects of planning policy. The existing house cannot accommodate these flats to the required standards, and the proposed conversion would have a severely

detrimental effect on the level of amenity our property currently enjoys, by way of loss of privacy and by noise and disturbance.

- A previous application to re-develop the house in 1984 was refused on the grounds that "the property comprises a relatively modest semi-detached house which is still capable of being occupied as a single family dwelling".
- We have enjoyed the presence of young families next door to us for the 30 years we have lived here. For all these reasons, we request that planning permission be refused.

The neighbouring occupier at 257 Elmers End Road objected to the proposal stating:

- I feel the size of the property would not allow three self-contained flats, as several of the rooms would be far too small. The revised plans now show one bedroom flat 3, the roof flat as a now having a study with an en-suite bathroom instead of a bedroom and a bathroom with another en-suite bathroom on the second floor.
- I feel this would soon revert back to the original three flats soon after planning permission had been granted, thus providing the maximum sales potential.
- Contrary to the suggestions that three flats would result in fewer cases, I feel the opposite would happen.
- Whilst I know people need places to live in, I also feel that they need places big enough to live in.

The neighbouring property at 191 Elmers End Road Beckenham also objected to the proposal stating-

- We continue to object to the proposed overdevelopment of this family house by conversion to 3 flats, we understand that although the layout has been changed.
- The flats are still below the minimum standards when the need to comply with building regulations is taken into account.
- We also find it 'odd' that a study would have an en-suite or that a one bedroom flat would need to have two bathrooms.
- The parking provision is inadequate as it stands. On street parking in this area is under great pressure from rail commuters at Elmers End station and Tramlink.

The neighbouring occupier of 14 Aldersmead Road, Beckenham also objected to the proposal stating:

- On behalf of the members of WBRA to convert 261 into flats we object. This would be the loss of a family home, at a time when larger family homes are becoming scarce due to such conversions.
- Conversions to flats would be an over development of the site.
- We understand that the reconfiguration is intended to address the objections that the original proposals were below the minimum space requirements for the proposals as they then stood.

- However, we also understand that although the areas appear to be at or near minimum space requirements, they do not take into account levels of thermal or sound insulation which are likely to bring them below minimum standards.
- Our original objections still stand in respect of the loss of amenity and disturbance from noise for the adjoining properties.
- We also maintain our objections on the wider neighbourhood amenity regarding parking provision and adequate space for refuse storage and collection.

Thames Water- No objection

Environmental Health- No objection

TFL- The applicant should provide a minimum of 5 cycle parking spaces in line with the current London Plan standards

Highways- The site is located to the north of Elmers End Road, Elmers End Road (A214) is a London Distributor Road. Also is within a high PTAL rate of 5, as a result no objections are raised.

There are waiting restrictions (no waiting at any time) around the site. Two cars can be accommodated within the front forecourt area. The development would generate similar parking demand to the existing; therefore I raise no objection the proposal.

Drainage no objection

Housing Enforcement Team- No specific issues providing the conversion meets or exceeds building regulation standards for Fire separation between units and means of escape in case of fire, sound insulation between units and improved thermal efficiency.

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan, London Plan and NPPF:

BE1 Design of New Development
 BE11 Conservation Areas
 H1 Housing Supply
 H7 Housing Density and Design
 T3 Parking
 T18 Road Safety

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
- 4.4 Managing Industrial Land and Premises
- 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
- 5.12 Flood Risk Management
- 5.13 Sustainable Drainage

The Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance March 2016

Bromley's Draft Local Plan: Policies and Designations Document has been subject to public consultation and is a material consideration (albeit it of limited weight at this stage). Of particular relevance to this application are policies:

9.4 Development Outside SIL and LSIS

The National Planning Framework (NPPF) (2012) is also relative to this case.

Section 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Section 7: Requiring good design

Section 8: Promoting healthy communities

Planning History

An application under planning reference: '84/01215/FUL-Conversion into two self-contained flats' was refused for the following reasons:

1. 'The property comprises of a comparatively modest semi-detached house which is still capable of being occupied as a single family dwelling and its conversion into two flats would therefore be contrary to Policy H.5 of the Local Plan for Bromley.'
2. 'Dwellings of this type are in considerable demand and the supply should not be depleted, whereas numerous blocks of purpose-built flats and conversions of large properties are being undertaken throughout the Borough to meet demand for this type of accommodation'.

Date issued-27.12.1984

16/01747/PLUD-Hip to gable loft conversion and rear dormer with rooflights to front roof slope. Lawful Development Certificate (Proposed).-Proposed development is Lawful- Date issued- 07.06.2016

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

The primary issues in the assessment of this planning application are:

- Principle of development
- The design and appearance of the proposed residential development and its impact on the character and appearance of the local area
- The quality of living conditions for future occupiers
- Highways
- Refuse storage

Principle of development

Housing is a priority use for all London boroughs and the Development Plan welcomes the provision of small scale infill development in the areas of stability and managed change provided that it is designed to complement the character of surrounding developments, providing that the design and layout make suitable residential accommodation, and it provides garden and amenity space. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states in Paragraph 49 that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The NPPF sets out in paragraph 14 a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In terms of decision-making, the document states that where a development accords with a local plan, applications should be approved without delay. Where a plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

Policy H7 of the UDP sets out criteria to assess whether new housing development is appropriate subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the appearance/character of the surrounding area, the residential amenity of adjoining and future residential occupiers of the scheme, car parking, traffic implications, community safety and refuse arrangements.

Policy H11 requires proposals for the conversion of a single dwelling into two or more self-contained residential units will be permitted provided that, the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings will not be harmed by the loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight or by noise. In addition, the resulting accommodation will provide a satisfactory living environment for intended occupiers.

It is considered that the proposed conversion is in principle acceptable. It is not anticipated that the proposed conversion would have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area. In addition, the proposal provides garden and amenity space for future occupiers. Moreover, it is not expected that the proposed conversion would lead to any undue harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties.

The design and appearance of the proposed residential development and its impact on the character of the local area

Policy BE1 highlights the need for proposals to be of a high standard of design and layout complementing the scale, form and materials of adjacent buildings. Policy H7 sets out that developments should provide a mix of housing types and sizes.

Section 7 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment, good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. It is indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making better places for people. As stated within the NPPF, development should optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of the developments) and support local facilities and transport networks; respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation.

As stated in the planning statement and also the planning history above a Lawful Development Certificate was issued for a hip to gable and rear dormer, with roof lights to the front roof slope under reference: 16/01747/PLUD. As such, it is considered that the proposed roof alterations in principle are acceptable given that a Lawful Development Certificate has already been issued.

Apart from the hip to gable roof extension the majority of external changes to the property will be to the rear and internally. Objections have been raised in regards to the proposed Juliet balconies to flats 2 and 3, which are considered to lead to a loss of privacy and a high degree of overlooking to neighbouring properties. However, given the density of the built environment it is considered that a high degree of overlooking has already been established by the existing windows at first floor level.

The quality of living conditions for future occupiers

Policy 3.5 of the London Plan and the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) technical housing standards outlines the minimum internal floorspace required for residential units on the basis of the occupancy that could be reasonably expected within each unit. Based on the room sizes calculated from the submitted plans flats 1, 2 and 3 are considered to comply with London Plan space standards and the DCLG's technical housing standards.

Flat 1: 64.1m²

Flat 2: 40 m²

Flat 3: 58 m²

No specific issues were raised from a Housing and Enforcement team.

In addition, the Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) (March 2016) provides guidance on the implementation of housing policies in the 2015 London Plan and the 2016 Minor Alterations to the Plan (MALP), replacing the 2012 Housing SPG.

The SPG provides guidance on Private Open Space stating a minimum of 5 sqm of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1

sqm should be provided for each additional occupant. The submitted plans show amenity space is provided for each of the flats, which is considered to be adequate.

It is noted that a previous application for two flats without any roof alterations was refused in 1984, which was contrary to the Local Plan at the time.

Highways

Objections were raised stating that the proposed parking arrangements were inadequate. However, the Highways officer stated that the development would generate similar parking demand to the existing. In addition, the site is located within a high PTAL rating 5. As a result, no objections were raised.

Refuse storage

A bin collection point has been outlined on the submitted plans, also there is space within the sites curtilage, which could be utilised for refuse and recycling bins.

Summary

Overall it is considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in a loss of amenity to local residents nor impact detrimentally on the character of the area. Furthermore, the proposed accommodation complies with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan and the DCLG's Technical Guidance Housing Standards.

as amended by documents received on 27.07.2016

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

Reason: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the plans approved under this planning permission unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

- 3 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the**

development hereby permitted shall as far as is practicable match those of the existing building.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.

- 4 Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, bicycle parking (including covered storage facilities where appropriate) shall be provided at the site in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the bicycle parking/storage facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 6.9 of the London Plan and in order to provide adequate bicycle parking facilities at the site in the interest of reducing reliance on private car transport.