

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

Application No : 19/00732/FULL1

Ward:
Orpington

Address : 18 Homefield Rise Orpington BR6 0RU **Objections:** Yes

OS Grid Ref: E: 546296 N: 166102

Applicant : C/O AGENT

Description of Development:

Demolition of Nos. 18-22 Homefield Rise and the construction of 9 x 3 bed houses with associated access and car parking together with the repositioning of the existing bus shelter and other street furniture.

Key designations:

Areas of Archeological Significance
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 29

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of Nos. 18-22 Homefield Rise and construction of 9 x 3 bed houses with associated access and car parking together with the repositioning of the existing bus shelter and other street furniture.

The development adopts a traditional design approach proposing two storey dwellings with accommodation in the roof space. The footprints of the buildings have been arranged as two sets of terraces, with one fronting Homefield Rise and the other fronting Gravel Pit Way.

Block A would front Homefield Rise and have a maximum width of approximately 25.4m and maximum depth of 10.2m and a maximum height of 9m. This block would provide 5 x 3bed, 6 person units with a GIA of 110sqm – 113sqm.

Block B would front Gravel Pit Way and have a maximum width of approximately 20m and maximum depth of 10.2m and a maximum height of 9m. This block would provide 4 x 3bed, 6 person units with a GIA of 110sqm – 111sqm.

At the front of Block A will be 6 car parking spaces and 8 spaces to the rear of Block B to provide parking for the residents and 4 visitor bays. Pedestrian access to the buildings is from the front door there are additional accesses to some of the units via a side entrance gate with the shared access.

At the rear, gardens are provided for each unit.

The proposed materials are indicated to reflect the local character and match neighbouring buildings with feature gables to the front elevation and stone window surround and extruded brick detailing. The development proposes a traditional palette of materials with a modern twist.

The application was called-in to Committee by the Local Ward Councillor.

The application was supported by the following documents:

- Design and Access Statement
- Tree Survey
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Ecological Report
- Air Quality Report
- Supporting Letter (dated 15/05/2019)

Location and Key Constraints

The application site lies on the south side of Homefield Rise, on the corner with Gravel Pit Way, directly opposite the former Police Station site (since redeveloped) and College premises, which in turn form the periphery of the Walnuts Shopping Centre in Orpington High Street. The site is not located within a Conservation Area nor are the existing buildings listed.

Homefield Rise is made up of a variety of architectural styles with development on the north side of Homefield Rise generally being larger in scale with multi-storey blocks, compartmented to the southern side, with the majority of nearby buildings being 2 storeys in height.

The site location also has a range of public transport options, which include bus routes directly from the site, and has a PTAL of 4.

The application site area extends to 1590sqm.

The site falls within a larger redevelopment site which is identified in the Local Plan Site 11 for 18-44 Homefield Rise which is allocated for residential development up to 100 units. The application site comprises approximately one fifth of the total area of Site 11.

Comments from Local Residents and Groups

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

Objections:

- Security to the residents to the rear in Lancing Road and the future residents of the development given the location of the parking area and pedestrian access;
- Concern over the quality of amenity for the future residents of the housing facing Gravel Pit Way as this is a very busy road;
- Impact on the character of the area;
- Change the character of Gravel Pit Way from commercial access road to a residential street;
- If houses were reversed in their aspect that it would overcome the issues regarding security and result in the new homes from Homefield Rise and therefore not changing the character of Gravel Pit Way;
- Poor design;
- Create an undesirable precedent for further developments;
- Seek a commitment from the developer that a high secure fence combined with anti-climb measures or hedging would be included in the boundary treatment along the neighbouring boundaries;
- Concern over further garden grabbing in both Homefield Rise and Gravel Pit Way;
- Development is too close to the properties in Lancing Road;
- Loss of privacy;
- The properties are Council owned and therefore they will approve the application;

Support/Comment:

- Desperately need family houses rather than flats;
- Welcome the development is for town houses which do not loom over the gardens of Lancing Road;
- Welcome that the proposal does not include balconies which overlook properties to the rear;
- Homefield Rise would benefit from regeneration
- Development is in keeping with the area;
- Gravel Pit Way is no longer a commercial road with the Thornborrows development underway;
- The proposal would improve security to the residents in Lancing Road;
- There are empty houses in the road which is an eyesore, this development will be a benefit;
- Security issues could be addressed by CCTV;
- These are not council owned properties but privately owned.

Please note the above is a summary and full text is available on the Council's website.

Comments from Consultees

Highways: Four of the properties would front Gravel Pit Way and be served by a vehicular access from Homefield Rise. The access is 5m wide where it meets

Homefield Rise and so is wide enough for 2 vehicles to pass. There is a lamppost here which will need to be relocated. The other 5 properties directly front Homefield Rise.

There are a total of 14 parking spaces proposed. Turning will be difficult from the two spaces at the end of the access road. The site has a moderate PTAL (4) and the parking standards in the Local Plan would give a range of 9 – 14 spaces so the provision is at the top of the range.

There is a refuse store shown in the access. I am not sure which properties this is supposed to serve, it does not look big enough for 9 houses. This is not the normal collection method for houses which all front highways so Waste Services should be consulted to see if they are OK with this.

The proposal includes moving the bus stop and shelter in Gravel Pit Way as it will be in front of some of the properties. The applicant will need the agreement of TfL to do this. The location shown for the repositioned stop is on private property which is unusual and I would suggest that the applicant gets the agreement in principle from TfL

If the issue with the bus stop and refuse store is agreed, please include conditions regarding parking, stopping up of accesses, hardstanding for wash down facilities, construction management plan, lighting and highway drainage with any permission.

The applicant will need to apply to the Council's Highway section for the new crossovers and reinstating the redundant ones. All the costs, including removing / reinstating street furniture, will fall to the applicant.

Trees: No objection to the proposed tree removals: they are of sufficiently small size and/or low value for their amenity value to be replaced in the medium term by the planting of replacement trees. Therefore I would recommend a condition regarding retained trees and new tree planting with any permission.

No objection to the degree of impact on retained trees provided that the TPP is adhered to. Therefore I would recommend a tree protection condition if permission is granted.

Drainage: The submitted FRA carried out by Herrington Consulting Limited Issue 2 Revision 0 dated 01/02/2019 to incorporate permeable paving as well as a soakway to retain surface water run-off are acceptable, we do also accept the alternative option of incorporating a large tank to restrict surface water run-off to 2l/s. Please impose a condition to secure this with any permission.

Thames Water: Waste comments -

As you are redeveloping a site, there may be public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you discover a sewer, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't reduce capacity, limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-nearor-diverting-our-pipes>.

A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 02035779483 or by emailing wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality.

With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewaterservices>

Thames Water would advise that with regard to waste water network and waste water process infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided

Water comments –

If you are planning on using mains water for construction purposes, it's important you let Thames Water know before you start using it, to avoid potential fines for improper usage. More information and how to apply can be found online at thameswater.co.uk/buildingwater.

On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water network and water treatment infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

Thames Water recommends the following informative be attached to this planning permission. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

TfL: With respect to the Stop and Shelter being on private property the solution would be to impose a condition on the planning permission that gives TfL the right to install / maintain / replace or dispose of a Stop and Shelter on the affected property for a period of 100 years or for the developer to give over the land on which the Stop and Shelter is to be located on. Either would be I suspect acceptable to TfL.

The issues surrounding the Advertising ability of this shelter will have to be confirmed but on the face of it the small movement of the shelter and the visibility of it should not change it's revenue charging.

Policy Context

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:

- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
- (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
- (c) any other material considerations.

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that any determination under the planning acts must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The National Planning Policy Framework was published on 24 July 2018 and updated on 19 February 2019.

The development plan for Bromley comprises the Bromley Local Plan (Jan 2019) and the London Plan (March 2016). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

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

London Plan (2016):

- 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
- 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
- 5.7 Renewable Energy
- 5.10 Urban Greening
- 5.11 Green Roofs and Development Site Environs
- 5.12 Flood Risk Management
- 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
- 5.14 Water quality and wastewater Infrastructure
- 5.15 Water use and supplies
- 5.16 Waste self-sufficiency
- 5.17 Waste capacity
- 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste
- 5.21 Contaminated land

- 6.3 Assessing Effects of Development on Transport Capacity
- 6.5 Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.1 Lifetime Neighbourhoods
- 7.2 An Inclusive Environment
- 7.3 Designing Out Crime
- 7.4 Local Character
- 7.5 Public Realm
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.14 Improving Air Quality
- 7.15 Reducing and Managing Noise, Improving and Enhancing the Acoustic Environment and Promoting Appropriate Soundscapes.
- 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy

Bromley Local Plan (2019):

- Policy 1 Housing Supply
- Policy 4 Housing Design
- Policy 37 General Design of Development
- Policy 30 Parking
- Policy 32 Road Safety

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- SPG1 – General Design Principles
- SPG2 – Residential Design Guidance

Housing: Supplementary Planning Guidance. (March 2016)

Technical housing standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015)

Planning History

16/04563/OUT - Demolition of numbers 18-44 Homefield Rise and the construction of 103 residential apartments in four separate three and four storey blocks to be served by two accesses, together with associated car parking, cycle parking, refuse storage and private communal amenity space. – Refused for the following reason:

“The proposal would constitute an overdevelopment of this suburban site that would fail to respect or complement the scale, form and layout of the surrounding area and would harm the amenities of neighbouring properties through overlooking, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan, and Policy 3.4 (including table 3.2) of the London Plan.”

The appeal was dismissed and the Inspector when considering the proposal found that the development would conflict with “Policy BE1 of the UDP in terms of the significant harm that it would cause to the character and appearance of the area and harm to living conditions, in terms of privacy and outlook”.

The Inspector acknowledged that the site was identified in the emerging local plan for the redevelopment of 'around 100 residential units' (87 net). However, as a draft allocation in an emerging plan this was afforded limited weight and, whilst found to be a material consideration it was not determinative. This was because the proposal must also result in a high standard of design as required by the relevant adopted development plan policy. Furthermore, the emerging plan policy had similar objectives and for this site in particular, proposals are required to create an effective transition between the adjacent town centre and lower rise residential area whilst respecting the amenity of adjoining properties.

Whilst the density of the scheme was found to be slightly above the relevant guidance for a suburban setting this was not determinative given the location on the edge of the town centre. Moreover, the Inspector considered that although this is linked to a site's accessibility such a design led approach requires a number of less calculated considerations and judgements. A proposal must be appropriate to the local context with regard to the principles of good design and as such, density is therefore only one measure of acceptability insofar as character and appearance is concerned.

The Inspector did acknowledge that the number of dwellings proposed would provide a substantial contribution towards housing in an area of high house prices and demand and took into account that 37 of the units would be secured as affordable in the Unilateral Undertaking. However, this was considered to be tempered by the housing land supply position which indicated to the Inspector that housing land supply is not restricted and this will also yield additional affordable housing and no substantive evidence to suggest that dismissal of the appeal would result in a less than 5 year supply.

The Inspector gave "moderate weight" to the economic benefits of construction jobs and associated spending in the local economy given their short term nature.

The Inspector was mindful of the intended allocation site in the Local Plan and the challenges in designing an appropriate scheme. He stated that, such a consideration should not result in a strict adherence to an intended figure, especially where that scheme also needs to be acceptable in terms of its overall design and impacts, which in this case he considered it would not be. He also stated that there was nothing substantive before him to suggest that this is the only viable scheme for the site.

The Inspector concluded that, although there are considerations that weigh heavily in favour of the proposal, nevertheless greater weight was given to the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and harm to living conditions that he had identified.

Conclusions

The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- Principle of development;
- Density;
- Design, character and appearance;
- Impact on Adjoining Properties;
- Standard of Residential Accommodation;
- Amenity Space;
- Car parking;
- Cycle parking;
- Refuse;
- Sustainability and energy;
- Landscaping; and
- Community Infrastructure Levy

Principle of development:

Housing is a priority use for all London Boroughs. Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply, Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential and Policy 3.8 Housing choice in the London Plan (2015) generally encourage the provision of small scale infill development in previously developed residential areas 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.

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.

The document also encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) and excludes gardens from the definition of previously developed land.

Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply of the London Plan acknowledges that there is a pressing need for more homes in London, provides some context for the level of housing need and sets out suitable locations for it to be delivered and requires the Borough to make provision for at least 641 additional dwelling completions per year 2015-2025. Policy 3.3, Clause E states that Boroughs, in their LDF Preparation, should identify and seek additional development capacity having regard to other policies in the Plan, in particular the potential to realise brownfield

housing capacity. Policy 3.3 Clause E (a-e) sets out suitable locations for additional development including:

- (a) Intensification;
- (b) Town Centre Renewal;
- (c) Opportunity and Intensification areas and growth corridors;
- (d) Mixed Use Redevelopment especially of surplus commercial capacity and surplus public land;
- (e) Sensitive Renewal of existing residential areas

The London Plan Policy 3.3 The current proposal could represent a significant contribution to the Council's required Housing Land Supply in a location adjacent to Orpington Town Centre. It is allocated within the Bromley Local Plan (2019) for residential development of around 100 units of which significant weight can be afforded. The site is also included as an identified site for within the Council's current Five Year Housing Land supply.

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.

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.

In terms of the extent of the development, the land carries no formal designation and is not located nearby sensitive areas such as conservation areas or sites of specific nature importance; no statutory listed buildings are located in close proximity to the site. Furthermore, the site is situated within an accessible, residential area bounded on three sides by a mixture of residential properties and is currently in residential use.

Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential sets out relevant density ranges for settings defined as 'Central', 'Urban' and 'Suburban'. Table A2.1 classifies Orpington as a 'Major' Town Centre. The notes to Table 3.2 (Sustainable Residential Quality) is define sites within 800m walking distance of an International, Metropolitan or Major Town centre as 'Central'.

London Plan Policy 3.4 range for a PTAL 4 site in a Central is 140 - 290 units / ha for larger units, rising to a maximum of 405 units / ha for smaller units

It is noted that the Committee Report for the previous 103 unit scheme (ref: 16/04563/OUT) identified the site as being within an 'Urban' setting as defined in the London Plan Density Matrix and that in refusing permission, Members considered the site to be suburban in character. However, the proposal site is immediately adjoining Orpington Major Town Centre and is considered to meet the definition of a 'Central' setting. This is also contrary to the Design & Access

Statement para 4.2 which suggests this is an 'Urban' setting. As such the proposal falls well below the 140 minimum density for larger dwelling types. This minimum would suggest in excess of 22 larger units (increasing for a proposal of smaller units).

The Bromley Local Plan confirms, in Policy 1 'Housing Supply', that the Council will make provision for a minimum average of 641 additional homes per annum.

Policy 1 specifies that future housing supply should be sustainable and delivered on a range of sites including; allocated sites set out in Appendix 10.2 of the Local Plan, notably the 0.75ha housing site allocation (Site 11) 18 – 44 Homefield Rise. The allocation is included within the Council's Housing Trajectory.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

18-22 Homefield Rise forms the western element of Housing Site Allocation 11, indicated as coming forward in Local Plan phases 1-5 years (2015/16 – 2019/20) and 6-10 years (2020/1-2024/25). The Inspectors report into the Local Plan noted, in para 33 that Site 11 was in multiple ownership and suggests that the lack of planning permission indicates that it would be more likely to be delivered in the latter period set out in the Plan. The Inspector concluded that *'the policies for housing in the Plan are justified, deliverable, and consistent with the national policy and the London Plan'* (para 54).

The applicant highlights the refusal of a 2017 outline planning application for 103 residential apartments across four separate blocks (Ref DC/16/04563/OUT) covering 18-44 Homefield Rise (which was subsequently adopted as Site 11). A subsequent appeal against this decision was dismissed. With particular regard to density, the Inspector noted that whilst the development was slightly above the relevant guidance for a 'suburban' setting this was not determinative given the location on the edge of the town centre. Indeed, the Inspector found that a proposal must be appropriate to the local context with regard to the principles of good design and as such, density is therefore only one measure of acceptability insofar as character and appearance is concerned (para 12). He also concluded that the requirement for applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise (para 28), and noted that the allocation was draft at that time (paras 32 – 34).

Since the appeal decision was issued, the site allocation has now been formally adopted within the Local Plan and, whilst the Inspector did raise concerns regarding the impact of the 103 unit development on the character and appearance of the area, that was in relation to a specific development proposal and does not itself mean that the site cannot accommodate a higher density of development as envisaged by the Site 11 allocation, subject to a suitable design and layout that responds appropriately to local character.

Site 11, of which the proposal site is a part, is allocated for 'around 100 residential units'. The proposal site comprises in the region of a fifth of Site 11, however this

particular development proposal for 9 houses represents only 9% of the overall quantum of development anticipated for Site 11. Given the location of the site at the corner of Homefield Rise and Gravel Pit Way, being relatively low lying and having the greatest back to back distances to neighbouring properties, it is considered that the application site is a key component of Site 11 and its ability to make the contribution to housing delivery anticipated in the Local Plan. Officers therefore consider that the application site has the ability to accommodate a greater density of residential development than currently proposed. As it stands, the proposal would comprise an unacceptable piecemeal form of development that would fail to optimise the housing output from this site and, if accepted, would compromise the delivery of the total quantum of development anticipated for Site 11.

It is therefore recommended that the proposal be refused for failing to optimise housing output and therefore being contrary to London Plan Policy 3.4 'Optimising Housing Potential' and Local Plan Policy 1 Housing Supply.

Density:

The density of the proposal would be 226hr/ha. Table 3.2 of the London Plan sets out the appropriate density range for a site with a PTAL of 4 in a Central area as 650–1100 hr/ha.

Given, the density of the proposal is well below the guideline density criteria the amount of development on site is considered to be an underdevelopment of the site in this sustainable location.

Design, character and appearance:

Policies 3.4 and 3.5 of the Further Alterations to the London Plan (March 2015) (FALP) reflect the same principles. Policy 3.4 specifies that Boroughs should take into account local context and character, the design principles (in Chapter 7 of the Plan) and public transport capacity; development should also optimise housing output for different types of location within the relevant density range. This reflects paragraph 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires development to respond to local character and context and optimise the potential of sites.

Policy 4 and 37 of the BLP set out a number of criteria for the design of new development. With regard to local character and appearance development should be imaginative and attractive to look at, should complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas. Development should not detract from the existing street scene and/or landscape and should respect important views, skylines, landmarks or landscape features. Space about buildings should provide opportunities to create attractive settings with hard or soft landscaping and relationships with existing buildings should allow for adequate daylight and sunlight to penetrate in and between buildings.

Policy 8 requires that new residential development for a proposal of two or more storeys in height a minimum of 1m side space from the side boundary is

maintained and where higher standards of separation already exist within residential areas. Proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space.

The 9 units are split into a two terraces of 5 and 4 units which provides a break in the elevation and pedestrian access to the rear gardens and car parking area. The design of the terraces are traditional in style with pitched roofs, gable ends incorporating gable features within each row of terraces. The design has included two types of brick, to give a variety, texture and play in differing light conditions. The units have been designed as 2.5 storeys to provide accommodation within the roofspace but reduce the overall height of the buildings.

It is noted that a vehicular parking is to be located in the front garden of Block A which takes up a large part of the front curtilage. However, with suitable landscaping mitigation as indicated in the submitted plans, on balance it is considered that the visual amenity of the street scene will not be detrimentally affected.

Notwithstanding the principle of an underdevelopment of the site as set out above which results in part from the form of housing proposed, it is considered that the development complies with policy on design and therefore this would not form a reason for refusal in this instance.

Impact on Adjoining Properties:

Policy 37 of the BLP 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. This is supported by Policy 7.6 of the London Plan.

In terms of outlook, the fenestration arrangement will provide mainly front and rear outlook for each unit overlooking amenity space or overlooking the street.

Concerns have been raised from neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, increased sense of enclosure, dominance and overbearing. The proposed houses are over 50m to the north of the properties sited on Lancing Road and approximately 10m from the flank wall of No. 26 Homefield Rise. Therefore, it is considered that a suitable level of privacy at the intended distances to existing neighbouring property will be maintained generally. Given the distance and the existing boundary screening on balance it is considered that the proposed development would not result in any loss of amenity in terms of increased sense of enclosure, loss of light.

With regards to overlooking there will be a degree of mutual overlooking within the development, however the separation between block A and B is approximately 10m and on balance this would be acceptable as not to impact significantly on the amenities of the future occupiers. Block B would be oriented east to west fronting on to Gravel Pit Way with the rear elevation and garden facing the car parking area and rear gardens of the properties in Homefield Rise. Given the separation, on

balance it is considered that the development would not lead to any significant loss of privacy to warrant a reason for refusal solely on this basis.

When considering the car parking area to the rear of the building concern is raised over the introduction of a residential car parking area and access road close to the neighbouring properties. Given the location of the parking area adjacent to neighbouring gardens and the access road which would run alongside the entire length of the boundary with No. 26 Homefield Rise. It is considered that this 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. Whilst it is noted that the adjacent property also forms part of the wider Site 11 allocation, this development must be acceptable on its own merits and in this case, the likely harm which would arise to the adjacent property highlights a further concern with the proposed piecemeal approach to developing the wider site.

Concerns have been raised over security the proposal should incorporate Secured by Design principles (as required by Policy 37 (h)) to take account of crime prevention and community safety.

Details over how the development could achieve secure by design principles have been included within the Design and Access Statement and as such it is considered that given this is a new building these would be achievable subject to conditions if permission was forthcoming.

For these reasons, it is considered that the proposed development would not impact significantly on neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light, sense of enclosure or overlooking. However the development is considered to have a detrimental impact by way of noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers due to the location of the car parking area.

Standard of Residential Accommodation:

London Plan policies 3.4, 3.5 and 3.8 set out housing standards relating to density, minimum unit size standards and housing choice. These policies provide the context for the Mayor's Housing SPG May 2016 which sets out the current guidance in respect of the standards required for all new residential accommodation. The Housing SPG deals with the quality of residential accommodation, setting out baseline and good practice standards for dwelling size, room layouts and size, circulation space, storage facilities, floor to ceiling heights, outlook, daylight and sunlight, external amenity space (including cycle storage facilities) as well as core and access arrangements.

Table 3.3 of London Plan Policy 3.5 sets out the minimum unit space standards for new development. Annex 1 of the Housing SPG set out all the current standards. All of the proposed units will be required to meet the minimum standards to ensure that all baseline standards are met and units are capable of providing a good standard of accommodation throughout. Whilst the minimum standards are acceptable it is

reflective of the level of development proposed. Larger units would be welcomed and provide a better level of residential amenity as well as being more desirable.

All homes should provide for direct sunlight to enter at least one habitable room for part of the day. Living areas and kitchen dining spaces should preferably receive direct sunlight (standards 29 and 32, Housing SPG). There must be an area of unobstructed window/door glazing (natural lighting) to a habitable room (i.e. bedroom or dining room) equivalent to at least 1/10th of the room's floor area to achieve the requirement for natural light. There must also be an area of openable window equivalent to 1/20th of the floor area to the room to achieve the natural ventilation requirement.

Policy 3.5 of the London Plan sets out the Mayor's aspirations for the quality and design of housing developments. Part 2 of the Mayor's Housing SPG sets out guidance in respect of the standards required for all new residential accommodation to supplement London Plan policies setting out baseline and good practice standards for dwelling size, room layouts and circulation space, storage facilities, floor to ceiling heights, outlook, daylight and sunlight, external amenity space (including cycle storage facilities) as well as core and access arrangements. The 2016 Minor Alterations to the London Plan adopted the DCLG Technical Housing Standards - nationally described space standard (March 2015) which standard 24 of the SPG says that all new dwellings should meet.

The Housing SPG also says that developments should minimise the number of single aspect dwellings. Single aspect dwellings that are north facing, or exposed to noise levels above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur, or which contain three or more bedrooms should be avoided. Policy 7.15 of the London Plan states that development proposals should seek to manage noise by mitigating and minimising potential adverse impacts of noise on, from, within, as a result of, or in the vicinity of new development without placing unreasonable restrictions on development. At the same time development proposals should improve and enhance the acoustic environment and promote appropriate soundscapes (including quiet areas); separate noise sensitive development from major sources (such as road, rail, etc) through the use of distance, screening or internal layout - in preference to sole reliance on sound insulation; and where it is not possible to achieve separation of noise sensitive development and undue noise sources, without impacting other sustainability objectives, then any potential impact should be mitigated through the application of good acoustic design principles.

The floor space size of each of the 9 units ranges between 110m² - 113m² respectively. The nationally described space standard requires 108m² for a 3-storey six person 3 bedroomed unit. On this basis, the floorspace provision for all of the units is considered compliant with the required standards and is considered acceptable.

The shape and room sizes in the proposed building are considered satisfactory. None of the rooms would have a particularly convoluted shape which would limit their specific use.

Amenity Space:

Policy 3.5 also requires design of new housing development to consider elements that enable the home to become a comfortable place of retreat. All units must benefit from private amenity space which must comply with the requirements set out in the SPG. A minimum of 5sqm of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1sqm should be provided for each additional occupant.

In terms of amenity space private rear garden areas are to be provided which exceed the minimum standard and as such no objection in this regard is raised.

Car parking:

The NPPF recognises that transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people. It should be demonstrated that improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. The NPPF clearly states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts are severe (Para.32).

Plans and decisions should also ensure that developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised while at the same time taking into account policies set out elsewhere in the Framework. Therefore developments should be located and designed to, among other things: accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies; give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities; create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians; incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles; and consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport (Paras.34-35, NPPF).

London Plan and BLP Policies also encourage sustainable transport modes whilst recognising the need for appropriate parking provision. In accordance with paragraph 39 of the NPPF, if setting local parking standards for residential development, local planning authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, its accessibility in relation to public transport, the type, mix and use of development, local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles. Car parking standards within the BLP and the London Plan should therefore be used as a basis for assessment.

Four of the properties would front Gravel Pit Way and be served by a vehicular access from Homefield Rise. The access is 5m wide where it meets Homefield Rise and so is wide enough for 2 vehicles to pass. There is a lamppost which will need to

be relocated if planning permission is granted. The other 5 properties directly front Homefield Rise.

There are a total of 14 parking spaces proposed; however turning will be difficult from the two spaces at the end of the access road. The site has a moderate PTAL (4) and the parking standards in the Local Plan would give a range of 9 – 14 spaces, as such the provision is at the top of the range.

With respect to the Bus Stop and Shelter being on private property the solution would be to impose a condition on the planning permission that gives TfL the right to install / maintain / replace or dispose of a Bus Stop and Shelter on the affected property for a period of 100 years or for the developer to give over the land on which the Stop and Shelter is to be located on to TfL. This could be secured by way of condition or legal agreement if planning permission was granted.

With regards to construction, a condition regarding a Construction Management Plan could be requested if planning permission was granted to ensure that disruption and conflict during the construction phasing can be controlled.

Therefore given all of the above there are no technical highway objections to the proposal and on this basis does not form a reason for a refusal.

Cycle parking:

Cycle parking is required to be 2 spaces for per dwellings. The applicant has stated that secure shed are to be provided to each of the private dwelling rear garden. This is considered satisfactory and would not form a reason for refusal.

Refuse:

All new developments should provide adequate facilities for refuse and recycling, from the information provided on Drawing No. 400 REV. P3 the refuse area is not large enough and will need to accommodate additional bins and is not the normal method of collection for single family dwelling houses, however, given the extent of space surrounding the proposed buildings, there is sufficient space for alternative means of refuse storage to be agreed post decision which could be managed through a planning condition.

Sustainability and Energy:

Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction of the London Plan states that the highest standards of sustainable design and construction should be achieved in London to improve the environmental performance of new developments and to adapt to the effects of climate change over their lifetime. Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions of the London Plan states that development should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the hierarchy; Be Lean: use less energy; Be clean: supply energy efficiently and Be green: use renewable energy.

The Design and Access Statement has indicated appropriate sustainability measures to ensure that the development strives to achieve these objectives.

Landscaping:

An indicative landscaping layout has been submitted as shown on the proposed ground floor site plan drawing that details the areas given over to garden for external amenity for future occupiers. No objections are raised in this regard. Notwithstanding this full detail of hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatment could be sought by condition.

With regards to the retention and welfare of the existing trees, the tree officer is satisfied with the information provided in the Tree Protection Plan (TPP) and provided that these are not compromised, the proposal will not negatively impact retained trees and could be secured by way of condition if planning permission was granted.

Community Infrastructure Levy:

The Mayor of London's CIL is a material consideration. CIL is payable on this application and the applicant will be required to completed the relevant form.

Conclusion

The assessment above considers the qualitative as well as the quantitative merits of the design of the proposal in the context of surrounding development and in relation to adjacent residential properties.

The site is allocated for around 100 residential units in the Local Plan and is therefore an appropriate, identified site, suitable for higher density residential development. The proposal would result in a piecemeal approach to developing the wider site that would fail to optimise housing output and result in an under provision of housing units impacting on the Borough's housing supply.

Matters concerning the impact on neighbouring amenity with regards to loss of privacy, loss of light and increased sense of enclosure have been taken into account and it is considered that as a result of the separation distances between the neighbouring dwellings and the proposed development, no adverse impacts upon neighbouring properties will occur. The siting of the dwellings are considered appropriate in that they are set at a distance which mitigates any potential overlooking or loss of privacy and as such no reason for refusal relating to these amenity issues are recommended.

Concerns however are raised over the possible impact on neighbouring occupiers with regards to noise and disturbance from the access road and car parking area to the rear of the site. No acoustic assessment has been provided to assess the impact of this area on the amenity of the neighbouring properties, and given the location of the parking area and access road which is in close proximity to the amenity space to the neighbouring properties, it is considered that this would

cause undue impacts in terms of noise and nuisance given the amount of transient vehicular movements.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the files set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 15.05.2019
RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1. The application site forms part of allocated Site 11 within the Bromley Local Plan which allocates the site as a whole for 'around 100 residential units'. The proposed development, by reason of the form and limited number of new dwellings proposed, comprise a piecemeal development that would fail to optimise housing output and prejudice the delivery of the wider site allocation, being contrary to Policy 3.4 of the London Plan (2016) and Policy 1 of the Bromley Local Plan. (2019).**

- 2. The proposed development would have a detrimental impact by way of noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers due to the location of the car parking area whereby no noise assessment has been submitted to disprove this, contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies 4 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019).**