

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

Application No : 17/03272/OUT

Ward:
Petts Wood And Knoll

Address : 2 Woodland Way, Petts Wood,
Orpington BR5 1ND

OS Grid Ref: E: 544361 N: 167922

Applicant : Mr Rafael Porzycki

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Proposed outline application to consider matters of access, layout and scale for the demolition of the existing two storey dwelling house and the erection of a three storey block containing 7 residential units with associated access, parking, refuse storage and cycle storage.

Key designations:

Area of Special Residential Character
Smoke Control SCA 4

Proposal

The application proposes the demolition of a two storey family dwelling and the construction of a 3.5 storey block of 7x 2 bedroom flats. The building measures 14.5m in depth by 13.3m in width. The building is proposed with a crown pitched roof with a double two storey hipped gabled facade to the front and rear elevations. Habitable accommodation is provided over four floors, including within the basement and roof space. Private amenity space is proposed for units 1, 2 and 3 with a sunken garden to the front and rear, units 4 and 5 are proposed with first floor balconies and units 6 and 7 will make use of the communal amenity area. Parking is to be provided adjacent to the flank elevation of the property for 7 vehicles with a communal bin store also proposed to be located to the front of the property, adjacent to the highway.

The application has been submitted in 'outline' for provision of access, layout and scale of the development, while all other matters (appearance and landscaping) are reserved.

Location

2 Woodland Way is a large detached two storey property sited within a considerable plot designated as part of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character. The property has off street parking for two vehicles within the front amenity space and bounds Woodland Way to the south with a close boarded timber fence that extends approximately 21m along the frontage.

Consultations

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

- Parking issues will occur
- Increased pollution
- Highways safety problems
- Out of character with the wider area
- Out of character with the wider ASRC
- Infilling the site with a car park will mean a reduction in green garden space
- The bin store will be sited in full view of the road
- Potential overshadowing
- Overdevelopment of the plot
- The application is contrary to Policy H10 - ASRC
- The majority of properties within the ASRC are houses not flats
- The appeal decision on 6 Ladywood Avenue is relevant to this scheme
- The proposal contravenes the front and rear building lines
- The design of the development, particularly the roof, would be out of keeping with surrounding properties
- The level of activity and noise in the proposed building would be many times that of the surrounding properties
- The proportion of the plot left as garden would be substantially lower than the surrounding properties
- The development will create a precedent for basement developments
- Outlook and privacy of neighbouring properties would be damaged
- Would exacerbate existing drainage problems
- The auto tracking plans for the car park are based on a car size below that of an average car, therefore there are questions as to the usability of the spaces and the sight lines from the driveway to the road
- The TFL transport documentation contained within the application does not identify the current site as it indicates a position further down Woodland Way, past the junction with Manor Way
- All functional living space and external patio seating area is directly next to the proposed development and at the side of the building closest to the development. The shadowing of the neighbouring property, as per page 16 of Aventier's Detailed Design Review, is doubled by the proposed development
- All light drawings are before the impact of the proposed additional trees on the boundary line are taken into account which would further reduce daylight.
- The flat roof of the proposal will be taller than the neighbouring property
- Flat roofs aren't in keeping with the area
- Overlooking into neighbouring properties from unit 4 and 5 terraces

- The lack of front door provides an incongruous front elevation without context
- School places are already a struggle in this area, there should not be an increase in residents until this is resolved.
- Long term accessibility issues with wheelchair users getting to the shops due to construction work
- The windows to the basement units are NE facing and would not give sufficient light
- The accommodation would be substandard
- No provision has been made for recycling
- The proposal fails to make allowances for disabled parking or lifetime home standards
- Side space provision is not in keeping with wider area
- The flat sizes are undersized as detailed in the London Plan
- The submission of multiple applications is a deliberate abuse of the planning system by the developer to create 'objection fatigue'
- The submission contains many errors
- The extent of the stated landscaping is questioned
- Hardstanding calculation omit access paths, bin stores and hardstanding around the building
- Bin store and cycle store is too small
- The distance to the boundaries shown on some drawings has been shown in a misleading way
- Issues getting doctors places as it is without replacing single houses with multiple flats
- The development goes against the Garden Suburb principles which the area is developed to

Consultee Comments

Highways: The previous application was for an additional house, which was refused, and this is an outline application to demolish the existing house and construct a block of 7 x 2 bed flats. The site has a moderate (3) PTAL assessment.

A new access is proposed leading to a parking area with 7 spaces. The swept paths provided in the Detailed Design Review show that manoeuvring is tight within the parking area. Woodland Way has a waiting restriction from 8am-10am Monday to Friday in the vicinity of the site and there appears to be a high demand for on-street parking outside of those times. I would prefer to see some visitor parking provided in this location as well as better manoeuvring space.

The cycle store is too small for the 14 spaces required under the London Plan standards. The refuse store also looks too small for the number of flats, Waste Services should be asked for their view.

As it stands the proposal appears cramped, and the site overdeveloped, and should be amended to take account of the above points.

Drainage: The proposed layout and scale of the development is appropriate to use SUDS to attenuate for surface water run-off. No objections subject to conditions.

Environmental Health Pollution: Before works commence, the Applicant is advised to contact the Pollution Team of Environmental Health & Trading Standards regarding compliance with the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and/or the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The Applicant should also ensure compliance with the Control of Pollution and Noise from Demolition and Construction Sites Code of Practice 2008 which is available on the Bromley web site. If during the works on site any suspected contamination is encountered, Environmental Health should be contacted immediately. The contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to the Local Authority for approval in writing.

Environmental Health Housing: The applicant is advised to have regard to the Housing Act 1985's statutory space standards contained within Part X of the Act and the Housing Act 2004's housing standards contained within the Housing Health and Safety Rating System under Part 1 of the Act.

Trees: The arboricultural submissions have addressed the implications of both developments on existing trees. No objections are made subject to conditions

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies:

Unitary Development Plan 2006:

BE1 (Design of New Development)
H8 (Residential Extensions)
BE7 (Railings, Boundary Wall and Other Means of Enclosure)
BE10 (Areas of Special Residential Character)
H1 (Housing Supply)
H7 (Housing Density and Design)
H9 (Side Space)
T1 (Transport Demand)
T3 (Parking)
T7 (Cyclists)
T18 (Road Safety)

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 General Design Principles
Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 Residential Design Guidance

According to paragraph 216 of the NPPF decision takers can also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);

The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given);
and

The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

As set out in paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework, emerging plans gain weight as they move through the plan making process.

The following emerging plans are relevant to this application.

Draft Local Plan

The Council is preparing a Local Plan. The submission of the Draft Local Plan was made to Secretary of State on 11th August 2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Emerging Local Plan Policies

Draft Policy 1 - Housing Supply
Draft Policy 4 - Housing Design
Draft Policy 8 - Side Space
Draft Policy 30 - Parking
Draft Policy 31 - Relieving Congestion
Draft Policy 32 - Highways Safety
Draft Policy 37 - General Design of Development
Draft Policy 113 - Waste Management in new Development
Draft Policy 116 - Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)
Draft Policy 119 - Noise Pollution
Draft Policy 120 - Air Quality
Draft Policy 122 - Light Pollution
Draft Policy 123 - Sustainable Design and Construction

London Plan (2015) Policies:

Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply.
Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential
Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
Policy 3.8 Housing choice
Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling
Policy 5.10 Urban greening

Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
Policy 5.14 Water quality and wastewater Infrastructure
Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies
Policy 5.16 Waste net self-sufficiency
Policy 5.17 Waste capacity
Policy 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste
Policy 6.5 Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure
Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.14 Improving Air Quality
Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and Access to Nature
Policy 8.2 Planning obligations
Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2016

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is also a consideration.

Planning History

15/03933/FULL1 - Proposed three bedroom dwelling on land adjoining 2 Woodland Way - Refused

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site on land which is not previously developed, out of character with the spatial characteristics of the locality thereby detrimental to its visual amenities and special character, contrary to Policies H7, H10 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan, the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The application site is a singular plot within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character and the proposal would deteriorate the special character of the area thereby contrary to the agreed revised Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character description and Policy H10 of the Unitary Development Plan.

(Appeal dismissed ref: APP/G5180/W/15/3141139)

Whilst this scheme proposed the sub-division of the site for a new dwelling, the Inspector made the following comment which is pertinent to this application:

- The front boundary of the appeal site adjacent to Woodland Way is marked by a low brick wall with a solid timber fence above with the side boundary away from the existing dwelling marked by a timber fence and landscaping both within the appeal site and within neighbouring gardens. The appeal site is mainly laid to lawn and it allows views through the site to mature landscaping to the rear. It makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The appeal site is located within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC) and the immediate surrounding area mainly comprises detached and semi-detached dwellings in generous sized plots with reasonable spacing between dwellings.

Application reference 17/03267/OUT for a proposed outline application to consider matters of access, layout and scale for the demolition of the existing two storey dwelling house and the erection of a three storey block containing 6 residential units with associated access, parking, refuse storage and cycle storage, has been submitted and will be considered within this agenda.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the principle of the development and the effect in principle that a residential development would have on the character of the locality, the effect of the design layout and scale on the locality and visual amenity of the area, access arrangements and the impact the scheme would have on the living conditions and amenities of nearby properties.

The application is an outline application to consider access, layout and scale. In this respect the following criteria can be assessed:

Layout: the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces within the development are provided, situated and orientated in relation to each other and to buildings and spaces outside the development

Scale: relates to information on the size of the development, including the height, width, length and massing of the proposed building and the relationship to surrounding buildings.

Access: means the accessibility to and within the site, for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding access network.

The application site was visited by the case officer and the aims and objectives of the above policies, national and regional planning guidance, all other material planning considerations including any objections, other representations and relevant planning history on the site were taken into account in the assessment of the proposal.

Principle of Development

The NPPF Paragraph 14 identifies the presumption in favour of sustainable development and that planning permission should be granted if in accordance with the development plan. Paragraph 15 of the NPPF states that development which is sustainable should be approved without delay. There is also a clear need for additional housing to meet local demand and needs.

The London Plan seeks mixed and balanced communities in accordance with Policy 3.9, which states that communities should be mixed and balanced by tenure and household income, supported by effective design, adequate infrastructure and an enhanced environment.

UDP Policy H1 requires the Borough to make provision for at least 11,450 additional dwellings over the plan period acknowledging a requirement to make the most efficient use of sites in accordance with the density/location matrix. As existing residential land, an increased density and housing provision could make a valuable contribution to the Boroughs housing supply. However, it is necessary to demonstrate that an appropriate density can be achieved having regard to the context of the surroundings, standard of accommodation to be provided and detailed design considerations.

Policy H7 of the UDP sets out criteria to assess whether new housing developments 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 and traffic implications, community safety and refuse arrangements.

Policy H10 of the UDP states that applications for development within Areas of Special Residential Character (ASRC) will be required to respect and complement the established and individual areas. The site is located within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character which is characterised by a distinct road layout and plot sizes which have remained largely intact since the late 1920s early 1930s. The style and design of properties within the ASRC are of similar though marginally varied styles.

Applications for residential development will be expected to comply with the density matrix set out in table 4.2 of policy H7; have an adequate site layout and ensure that buildings and space around buildings are of a high quality and provide adequate private or communal amenity spaces and off-street parking at levels no more than set out in Appendix II.

In considering planning proposals the Council gives particular regard to the amenity of adjoining occupiers. Policy BE1 (v) states that the development should respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring building and those of future occupants and ensure their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by overshadowing. This is supported within Policy 7.6 of the London Plan.

Large detached and semi-detached dwellings surround the site on all sides. The site is currently developed for a less dense residential use. Therefore, in this location and given the accessibility of the site, the Council will consider a higher density residential infill development provided that it is designed to complement the character of surrounding developments, the design and layout make suitable residential accommodation, and it provides for garden and amenity space. It should be noted however that there are no flatted developments within the wider locality and therefore Officers consider that this form of development would appear out of character with the prevailing residential form.

The development is also required to be assessed in line with the requirements and character assessment of Policy H10 (ASRC) and any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity, conservation and historic issues, biodiversity or open space will need to be addressed. Therefore the provision of a higher density residential development may be acceptable in principle however as previously discussed; flats are not a commonly found residential form and not considered appropriate in this context.

Layout, Scale, Massing and Design

Design is a key consideration in the planning process. Good design is an important aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. The NPPF states that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all developments, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.

The NPPF emphasises good design as both a key aspect of sustainable development and being indivisible from good planning. Furthermore, paragraph 64 is clear that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Policy 7.4 of the London Plan requires that buildings, streets and open spaces should provide a high quality design response that has regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces and streets in orientation, scale, proportion and mass; contributes to a positive relationship between the urban structure and natural landscape features, including the underlying landform and topography of an area; is human in scale, ensuring buildings create a positive relationship with street level activity and people feel comfortable with their surroundings; allows existing buildings and structures that make a positive contribution to the character of a place to influence the future character of the area; and is informed by the surrounding historic environment.

Policy 7.6 states that architecture should make a positive contribution to a coherent public realm, streetscape and wider cityscape and should incorporate the highest quality materials and design appropriate to its context.

Policy BE1 requires that new development is of a high standard of design and layout. It should be imaginative and attractive to look at, should complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas and should respect the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring buildings.

Policy 3.4 in the London Plan seeks to ensure that development proposals achieve the optimum housing density compatible with local context, the design principles in Policy 7.4 and with public transport capacity. Table 3.2 identifies appropriate residential density ranges related to a sites setting (assessed in terms of its location, existing building form and massing) and public transport accessibility (PTAL). The site is within PTAL zone 3 and is suburban in character where there is a maximum range of 250 habitable rooms and 95 units per hectare. With a site area of 0.09 hectares this results in a density of 77 units per hectare and 233 habitable rooms per hectare which is at the upper limit of the density identified within the density matrix. Policy 3.4 is clear that in optimising housing potential, developments should take account of local context and character, design principles and public transport capacity.

In terms of layout and scale, the development proposes a significant increase in floor space over and above the existing two storey family dwelling, providing habitable accommodation over four floors. The site is considered to contribute to the openness and undeveloped nature of the southern part of Woodland Way leading into Towncourt Crescent. The area is characterised by spacious plots with considerable distance between the dwelling and the common side boundaries and this should be replicated within future development. The new development would need to respect the prevailing architectural style of the locality which is of a partially uniformed and characterful appearance.

The proposal would extend forward of the existing front building line by a maximum of 4.5m and minimum of 1.4m, lying broadly flush with the front of the neighbouring dwelling at number 4 and approximately 1.2m in front of number 2a. A bin store is proposed to the front elevation of the property, set slightly back from the highway. The width of the proposed development is approximately 1m wider than the existing dwelling, with an increase in maximum of approximately 7m. The development is proposed to be sited between 1.2-2m from the northern common side boundary similar to the existing dwelling, and between 8.5-20.2m from the southern boundary. Whilst the building would meet the policy requirement for distances to the boundary as stated within Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan and is similar in terms of siting to the existing dwelling, this is a single, stand-alone family dwelling and not a substantial, double fronted development as proposed in this case and as such this scheme must be considered on its own merits.

The overall site coverage has been vastly increased given that the open, lawned area to the south of the dwelling is to be turned over to surface car parking for the entire width of the site frontage. The Inspector stated within his previous appeal decision that 'the site is mainly laid to lawn and it allows views through the site to mature landscaping to the rear. It makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area'. Whilst the inclusion of parking to the southern elevation would retain the openness of the site, it creates an urbanising impact

within the street scene, which when considered with the resulting vehicle movements within this space, would create an overtly prominent and over-intensive use, where currently the site makes a positive contribution to the openness and verdant qualities of the wider area. Cumulatively, the proposed building and parking area covers the entire width of the plot with minimal soft landscaping proposed, this is not considered to be adequate in terms of the prevailing residential form of the ASRC and not considered appropriate within this location.

The layout of the development submitted shows that the building is broadly square shaped and has a considerable depth and width. As a result of this and the level of accommodation proposed across four floors, the resultant scale would be substantial. The scale of the proposal would be most evident when viewed from the north given the single storey nature of the extension at number 2a, which contributes to the openness of the roadway. The size of the development is further exacerbated by the topography of the land which slopes down towards the development site. The location of the bin store, set slightly back from the highway, would also highlight the prominence of the development from wide ranging views.

Whilst matters of design are a reserved matter in the determination of the application, Officers can provide indicative comments based on the level of information submitted with the application. In terms of design, the proposed indicative elevations do not replicate any design features commonly found within the surrounding street scene and wider ASRC including single steep gable frontages, tile hung bay windows and mock Tudor beams and instead proposes a monolithic red brick and white rendered double fronted development, out of character with the prevailing residential form. Double fronted developments are not a feature of the wider area and it is clear to see from visiting the site just how incongruent the proposal would be within the street scene of characterful and similarly designed properties.

Officers acknowledge that there are various errors made throughout the submission siting policies and area specific observations which do not pertain to this site or the London Borough of Bromley. Whilst these are noted, given that the principle of the development was found to be unacceptable, amendments were not requested to rectify this matter.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

Policy BE1 of the UDP seeks to protect existing residential occupiers from inappropriate development. Issues to consider are the impact of a development proposal upon neighbouring properties by way of overshadowing, loss of light, overbearing impact, overlooking, loss of privacy and general noise and disturbance.

The proposed development is sited 400mm forwards of the front elevation of number 4 and 1.2m to the rear elevation and is proposed to be set away from the property at number 2a. As a result, the development is not considered to result in any material loss of light or oppressive outlook when viewed from within the neighbouring properties. Nevertheless, number 4 has a large amount of private amenity space along the southern flank boundary and Members may consider that

the proposed unrelieved, stark flank elevation will appear unduly oppressive when viewed from the neighbouring property which is only exacerbated as a result of the proposed crown roof and proximity to the boundary and ultimately harmful to the amenity of the neighbouring property.

In terms of the properties to the north of the development site, it is noted that the car parking area runs along the side/rear boundaries of number 2a Woodland Way and 3 Towncourt Road. Whilst the parking area is sited over 40m from the rear of number 3 which may be considered acceptable, given the constrained nature of the amenity space of number 2A, the parking area would cause undue impacts in terms of noise and nuisance given the amount of transient vehicular movements within close proximity to the common side boundary. No acoustic assessment has been provided to assess the impact of this area on the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

It is noted that an external terrace area is proposed to units 5 and 4 which face into the rear of the site. The terrace areas are slightly recessed into the building however given that they also project slightly out from the rear elevation Members may consider that this would give rise to actual and perceived overlooking specifically from Unit 5 which is located only 2m from the common side boundary at the closest point. The terrace areas would result in a detrimental loss of privacy to the neighbouring owner/occupiers.

Standard of Residential Accommodation

Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2011) Quality and Design of Housing Developments states the minimum internal floorspace required for residential units on the basis of the level of occupancy that could be reasonably expected within each unit.

Policy BE1 in the Adopted UDP states that the development should respect the amenity of occupiers of future occupants.

A two bedroom, three person single storey property should provide a minimum of 61sqm of habitable floor space with those units split over two floors required to provide 70sqm. The development is considered to meet these standards.

Adequate private amenity space also needs to be provided with a minimum of 5 sqm of private outdoor space for a 1-2 person dwelling and an extra 1 sqm should be provided for each additional occupant in line with the London Plan housing standards. It is noted that there is sufficient amenity space to the rear of the property with a private garden for the use of unit 3 to the front. Private amenity areas are proposed to units 1 and 2 on the lower ground floor, however the extent to which these are truly private is questioned given that they face into the rear communal amenity space of the flats where there is a potential for direct overlooking into the rear facing lower ground windows. Furthermore, the private garden space allocated to Unit 3 is neither considered private nor sufficient in terms of private outdoor space. The garden is located adjacent to the car parking area, behind the bin store where there are direct views from the highway. The impact in terms of noise, overlooking and outlook from this area makes it inappropriate for recreational use. As previously stated, within units 5 and 4,

outdoor projecting terrace areas are proposed to the rear at first floor level. Concern is raised over the potential to overlook neighbouring properties from this height and projection.

The London Plan states that for new residential development, the minimum floor to ceiling height is 2.3m for at least 75% of the Gross Internal Area where it also states that to address the unique heat island effect of London and the distinct density and flatted nature of most of its residential development, a minimum ceiling height of 2.5m for at least 75% of the gross internal area is strongly encouraged so that new housing is of adequate quality, especially in terms of light, ventilation and sense of space. When assessing the cross section drawing that has been submitted it is considered that over 75% of the head height of the loft accommodation measures 2.4m, over the minimum requirement 2.3m. Concern is however raised as to the level of outlook and natural light provision to the habitable rooms within this level given that all bedrooms do not benefit from any windows within the elevations and will be served solely by roof lights, some of which are located solely within the northern elevation of the property, which Members may find to allow for a poor quality of residential accommodation.

In accordance with Standard 11 of Housing: Supplementary Planning Guidance. (March 2016) of the London Plan 90% of all new dwellings should meet building regulation M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'. Whilst no details have been provided to support compliance with this standard, this information can be conditioned for submission at a later date.

Car Parking and Access:

London Plan Policy 6.13 requires the maximum standards for car parking, which is supported by Policy T3 of the UDP. The site is located within a PTAL 2 area (where 1a is the lowest) therefore off street parking will be required to be provided in line with the standards.

Highways comments have been received in which the Officer states:

'The previous application was for an additional house, which was refused, and this is an outline application to demolish the existing house and construct a block of 7 x 2 bed flats. The site has a moderate (3) PTAL assessment.'

A new access is proposed leading to a parking area with 7 spaces. The swept paths provided in the Detailed Design Review show that manoeuvring is tight within the parking area. Woodland Way has a waiting restriction from 8am-10am Monday to Friday in the vicinity of the site and there appears to be a high demand for on-street parking outside of those times. I would prefer to see some visitor parking provided in this location as well as better manoeuvring space.'

The cycle store is too small for the 14 spaces required under the London Plan standards. The refuse store also looks too small for the number of flats, Waste Services should be asked for their view.'

As it stands the proposal appears cramped, and the site overdeveloped, and should be amended to take account of the above points'.

Whilst the Highways Officer considers that amended plans are necessary to overcome highways concerns, given the issues raised in terms of principle of development, impact on neighbouring properties and future residents amenity, Officers did not consider that amended plans were necessary or reasonable to request. As per the submission, Members may consider that the development does not allow for adequate parking or cycling provision with poor manoeuvring capabilities for vehicles which would ultimately lead to an increase in parking demand in an area where few spaces are available, generating 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, contrary to Policy T3 and T18 of the UDP.

Conclusion

The proposed scheme is considered an overdevelopment of the site and of a size and scale not complimentary or indicative of surrounding land development or characteristics of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character. The scheme would not provide suitable accommodation for future owner/occupiers and would appear over dominant and result in a loss of privacy for the neighbouring owner occupiers of number 4 and amenity issues as a result of transient vehicular movements to the adjoining property at number 2A.

RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1. The proposed development, by reason of its size, bulk and layout would appear incongruous and out of character with the surrounding area and would be ultimately harmful to the character of locality, contrary to Policies BE1, BE10 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Supplementary Planning Guidance No 1 and 2, London Plan Policies 3.4, 3.5 7.4 and 7.6 (2015) and the objectives of the NPPF (2012).**
- 2. The proposed development by reason of its siting and layout would be detrimental to the visual amenities of occupiers of surrounding properties and would lead to a significant loss of privacy by way of overlooking from the rear balconies. The development would also have a detrimental impact by way of noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers whereby no noise assessment has been submitted to disprove this, contrary to Policy BE1, BE10 and H7 Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Supplementary Planning Guidance No 1 General Design Principles and No 2 Residential Design Guidance.**

- 3. The proposed development by reason of its size, siting and layout would be detrimental to the amenities of future owner/occupiers of the proposed development as a result of inadequate outlook from the habitable accommodation within the roof space and the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy to the basement units/private amenity area from the communal garden. The development would also have a detrimental impact by way of noise and disturbance to future owner/occupiers as a result of the proximity of unit 3 to the car parking area contrary to Policy BE1, BE10 and H7 Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Supplementary Planning Guidance No 1 General Design Principles and No 2 Residential Design Guidance.**

- 4. The proposal has the potential to lead to an increase in local residents parking on surrounding streets, thus generating considerable on-street car parking pressure, leading to a significant risk to traffic and pedestrian safety by reasons of illegal or unsuitable parking and on-street manoeuvring, which would be prejudicial to the free flow of traffic conditions and general safety in the highway, contrary to Policy T3 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.**