



LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & DAGENHAM PLANNING COMMITTEE

20 May 2024

Application for **Planning Permission**

Case Officer:	Esther Rubinsohn	Valid date:	18/12/2023
Applicant:	Invision Care	Expiry date:	15/03/2024
Application number:	23/01824/FULL	Ward:	Longbridge
Address:	33 Beccles Drive, Barking IG11 9HX		

The purpose of this report is to set out the Officer recommendations to Planning Committee regarding an application for planning permission relating to the proposal below at 33 Beccles Drive, Barking, Barking And Dagenham, IG11 9HX.

Proposal:

Change of use of existing property (Use Class C3) to children's care facility (Use Class C2).

Officer recommendation:

Agree the reasons for approval as set out in this report, and delegate authority to the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham's Director of Inclusive Growth (or authorised Officer) to grant planning permission subject to the Conditions listed at Appendix 4 of this report.

Summary of conditions and informative:

Compliance

1. Time Limit
2. Approved Plans and Documents
3. Care Home Capacity
4. Cycle Parking
5. Ancillary Outbuilding Use

Prior to Commencement

6. Care Home Management Plan

OFFICER REPORT

Site, Situation, and relevant background information:

The site and its use

The application site is a three-storey, semi-detached dwelling located on the north side of Beccles Drive. The pair are uniform in design and scale, both featuring key architectural features such as bay windows with gabled protruding roofs.

The road is characterised predominantly by two and three storey, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. The built form is separated by regular gaps which cultivate a breathing space, opening up the road and allowing light to penetrate between the buildings.

The site is 0.04 ha and comprises the existing property and associated rear garden, including a garden annexe.

Figure 1: Google Earth screenshot of aerial view of the application site (marked red) and the surrounding area



Surrounding area and background

The site, as it can be seen from Figure 1 above, is located within a residential area. The majority of the houses along Beccles Drive retain their C3 single residential use.

Transport

The application site has a Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) of 3, on a scale whereby 1 means poor and 6 means excellent access. As such, it can be considered that the site has ok access to public transport.

The site is about a 12-minute walk (0.6miles) from Upney Station. The site is a 3-minute walk (0.1miles) from Upney Lane whereby the bus route 62 runs along and is about a 5-minute walk (0.2miles) from Longbridge Road (A124) whereby the bus routes 5, 145, EL2, EL3 and N15 all run along.

Proposed Development

The proposed development seeks full planning permission for the change of use of existing property (Use Class C3) to children's care facility (Use Class C2). No physical alterations to the building are proposed.

Amended Planning Application

In response to consultation comments from the Childcare Commissioning team and Transport the following amendments were made to the application in order to resolve the concerns:

- Refining of the proposed support that would be provided to the children
- Reduction in number of off-street parking spaces
- Amending the location of long-term cycle parking

Summary of function

Childcare provision

The proposal aims to house up to 6 children, aged between 11-17 of mixed gender who require an urgent placement. The care home would be designed to support young people who require support in the following areas:

- a) Children or young people that display social, emotional, and/or behavioural difficulties;
- b) Children or young people that have low-moderate additional learning needs;
- c) Children or young people at risk or involved in contextual safeguarding risks;
- d) Children or young people who have been victims of abuse;
- e) Children or young people new to care requiring an assessment or whilst the LA complete the young person's care plan;
- f) Placement breakdowns in the family home;
- g) A bridging placement due to a placement breakdown;
- h) Children in need of urgent short-term respite placements;
- i) Young people preparing to transition into a 16 plus service requiring semi rapid independence preparation; and
- j) Unaccompanied minors

Shift patterns

There would be two members of staff providing care at one given time. 12 members of staff would be employed and would work on a shift rotation to cover the support. That being said, at handover times there would be about four staff on site. Handover times would last from 15-30 minutes maximum.

Within the Planning Statement, it refers to three different shift plans for the proposed staff.

- a) Day shift – 9:00-18:00 or 9:00-21:00
- b) Sleep-in night shift – 17:30-10:00
- c) Night shift – 17:30-9:30 or 21:00 – 9:30

In an email (dated 22/02/2024) the agent provided additional clarification to the difference between sleep-in shift patterns and waking night shifts:

- Sleep-in Shift
 - During sleep-in shifts, staff members begin their duties between 10:00am and 17:30pm and continue until 23:00pm. At 23:00, designated staff members sleep within the home premises until 07:30am the following day.
 - Their primary responsibility during this period is to settle young people into their bedrooms between 20:30pm and 22:00pm. Importantly, the sleep-in staff remains available to support waking night staff in case of any issues.
- Waking Night Shift
 - Waking night shifts commence at either 17:30pm or 21:00pm, where the assigned staff member stays awake throughout the night.
 - Their role involves continuous monitoring of the home and providing necessary support to service users whenever required. The waking night shift concludes at 09:30am, marking the end of the overnight monitoring and support period.

Visitor frequency

Within the Planning Statement, it was stated that visitors would be allowed to visit the children who are receiving care. It is proposed that visitors adhere to the typical practices expected in a family home setting when attending the site. Anticipated weekly visitor numbers are estimated to average 2-3 individuals in person from Monday to Friday, between the hours of 10:00 and 17:45. However, the majority of visits are expected to occur virtually, minimizing physical foot traffic to the site.

In a follow up email with the agent (dated 22/02/2024), the following was clarified:

"Typically, the home welcomes visitors between the hours of 09:30-18:00. We aim to keep the number of visitors limited to ensure minimal disruption to both the service users and our neighbours. To enhance efficiency, most meetings are conducted virtually through platforms like Zoom or Teams, and these arrangements are usually coordinated by the LA. In instances where physical visits are necessary, we kindly request that the number of professionals or family members present be limited to two at any given time. Our diary management system ensures that there are no conflicting appointments, preventing an influx of visitors simultaneously. The approach we adopt in managing visitors reflects the atmosphere of an ordinary family home, much like one with extended family members dropping by occasionally. While it is challenging to quantify an exact figure, as a guideline, I would estimate no more than five visitors per week to maintain a balanced environment".

Key issues to assess:

1. Principle of the development
2. Quality of Accommodation
3. Design and Quality of Materials
4. Impact to Neighbouring Amenity
5. Sustainable Transport

Planning assessment:

1. Principle of the development

Policy

Loss of family-sized dwelling

- 1.1 Paragraph 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that 'to determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment... [and] within this context, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies'.
- 1.2 Policy H1 (Increasing housing supply) and Table 4.1 of the London Plan places a strategic expectation that the borough will need to deliver 19,440 as a 10-year housing target (annualised to 1,944 per year) between 2019 and 2029. The emerging policy in the draft Local Plan reflect this target. This policy also requires that Londoners have a genuine choice of homes that they can afford which meets their requirements for different types of high-quality accommodation. In addition, Policy H2 (Small sites) supports the use of small sites, highlighting that boroughs should support the construction of well-designed dwellings on small sites. This can take a number of forms, such as: new build, infill development, residential conversions, redevelopment or extension of existing buildings, including non-residential buildings and residential garages, where this results in net additional housing provision.
- 1.3 Policy CM1 (General principles for development) and CM2 (Managing housing growth) of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure the borough contributes to meeting its housing targets and supports the delivery of a variety of housing types.
- 1.4 Policy SPDG 1 (Delivering growth in Barking and Dagenham) of the Draft Local Plan (December 2021) seeks to ensure developments contribute to meeting the Borough's housing targets and supports the delivery of a suitable variety of housing to meet high levels of identified need within the Borough. Policy SP 3 (Delivering homes that meet peoples needs) emphasising the need to optimise suitable sites to help deliver suitable housing for the Borough's high levels of identified housing need.
- 1.5 On the 19th January 2021, the Government published the 2020 Housing Delivery Test (HDT) results. The HDT results show that the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham has delivered 57% of its housing requirement over the latest 3-year period. Consequently, the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within paragraph 11 d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) will be engaged.

New Care Facility

- 1.6 Chapter 5 of the NPPF sets out that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements should be addressed. The size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. Chapter 8 of the NPPF seeks to promote healthy and safe communities, setting out that planning decisions should enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs.

- 1.7 Policy S2 of the London Plan supports development proposals which support the provision of high-quality new and enhanced health and social care facilities to meet identified need. Policy H12 of The London Plan states that the delivery, retention and refurbishment of supported and specialised housing which meets an identified need should be supported. Whilst the form this comes in may vary it should satisfy the requirements of specific groups and uses who use it. Boroughs should undertake assessments of the need for short-term, medium-term and permanent supported and specialised accommodation within their borough. This is further supported by Policy D7 which seeks to ensure a suitable genuine choice of housing is provided to support a range of needs and allows residents to live an independent and dignified lifestyle.
- 1.8 Policy CM1 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that development meets the needs of new and existing communities.
- 1.9 Policy SPDG1 and SP3 of the Draft Local Plan Reg 19 seek to ensure developments contribute to meeting the Borough's housing targets and supports the delivery of a suitable variety of housing to meet high levels of identified need within the Borough. Likewise, Policy SP3 seeks to ensure development does not undermine the supply of family sized housing whilst simultaneously supports applications which seek to meet the needs of specific communities, including older people, disabled and vulnerable people, LGBT community, students, families and private rented sectors (PRS) and Gypsies and Travellers. Further, Policy DMH3 supports the provision of specialist housing within the borough providing it meets the identified need within the borough based on evidence.

Assessment

- 1.10 The proposal seeks for permission for the change of use from a residential dwelling house (Use Class C3) into a residential institution/residential care home for up to 6 children with 2 full time adult carers (Use Class C2).
- 1.11 The application site is a two-storey, 6-bedroom dwelling. As defined by the LBBB Draft Local Plan, a family sized dwelling is "A dwelling that by virtue of its size, layout and design is suitable for a family to live in and generally has three, four, five, or more bedrooms". Therefore, this proposal would, in essence, entail the loss of a family dwelling, which is in high demand within the borough and thus should be preserved.
- 1.12 The proposal, however, would introduce a new children's care home. The site would provide support for children between the ages of 11 to 17 who have minimal care needs. It is designed to operate comparably to a typical household, ensuring that the children adhere to a consistent schedule that includes fixed times for meals and bedtime. Meals would be a communal activity, with both caregivers and children sitting together to eat. Additionally, the children residing in the home would be expected to take on household duties, sharing responsibilities akin to those in a standard family setting. This approach would aim to emulate the daily rhythm and way of life of an average family.
- 1.13 The recent Ministerial Statement on 'planning for accommodation for looked after children' (May 2023, Statement UIN HCWS795), underscored the need for additional care homes, particularly for children and indicated that Local Authorities must work with commissioners to assess local need and closely engage to support applications, where appropriate, for accommodation for looked after children as part of the authority's statutory duties for looked after children.
- 1.14 Policies also endorse specialised accommodation when there is a demonstrated need for the type of facility proposed within the borough, as evidenced by the applicant. In this case, the applicant has provided a detailed needs assessment based within the Planning

Statement. The submission indicates that there is a significant lack of children's social care services within the borough, and OFSTED has indicated the improvement which is required here. Within the Planning Statement a 2022 report by OFSTED is also referenced, which indicates there are a lack of sufficiently sized children's homes which meet the long-term needs for stability.

- 1.15 Officers consulted LBBB Childcare Commissioning Team to better comprehend this need and whether this property would be suitable for their use. Both the disabilities team and general social care team were consulted. While the disabilities team did not believe this site would be suitable for children with moderate to high learning difficulties, the general childcare and support team did support this proposal, indicating that *"The proposed home would be considered suitable to CYP with EBD [...]. I can confirm that we have no concerns regarding the suitability of this site for accommodating children in need of care with no "care needs" but requiring support"*. It was highlighted by the children general social care team that *"often LA's need to place children out of the borough and there is a high chance that other LA's would place young people there also"*. That being said, there is also a significant chance it would be used for local children too.
- 1.16 This site is located only about a minute walk (0.4miles) from Barking Abbey School and is in close proximity to Faircross Parade (a neighbourhood centre) consisting of shops, restaurants and cafes meaning that the children would have the amenity and access to facilities which would be required. The dwelling would also provide a sizeable, long-term good quality home to house children in care, thus would help to contribute to the stock of children's homes which are of sufficient quality within the borough.
- 1.17 When considering the loss of a family-sized dwelling against the provision of a new care home, officers refer to an appeal outlined in the Planning Statement (received: 26/01/2024) whereby the applicant makes reference to a recent appeal (ref. APP/Z5060/W/19/3233360). In January 2020, an appeal in the Borough of Barking and Dagenham was allowed for a care home that, despite being significantly smaller than the current proposed care home, highlighted some key principles. The Inspector recognised that although converting a family dwelling (under C3 use) to a care home conflicted with policy BC4, the change would still provide suitable living accommodation. Additionally, there was no stipulation that the dwelling needed to be occupied by a family specifically, suggesting that the care home would still retain the characteristics of a 'family-sized' property. The care home's intended use would maintain essential residential functions such as shared meals, a structured routine, and involvement in household tasks, thus it is not considered that the proposal would adversely affect the availability of family-sized homes in the area.
- 1.18 The proposed development would therefore help to address the high demand for care homes in the borough, aligning with relevant policies and the recent ministerial statement emphasising the need for supported care homes for children. While it is acknowledged that this proposal would result in a loss a family sized dwelling for the use by a singular conventional family, it would still have a residential use and would have the functionality similar to that of a singular family. Due to the significant need of this form of care home, as displayed above, officers believe this holds considerable weight and on balance deem view the proposed change of use as acceptable in principle.

2. Quality of Accommodation

Internal Space Standards

Policy

- 2.1 The 'Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard' (NDSS) deals with internal space within new dwellings and is suitable for application across all tenures. It sets out requirements for the gross internal area of new dwellings at a defined level of occupancy, as well as floor areas and dimensions for key parts of the home, notably bedrooms, storage and floor to ceiling height. Policy D6 (Housing quality and standards) and Table 3.1 of the London Plan is in line with the national space standards.
- 2.2 The technical housing standards - nationally described space standards, Policy D6 and Table 3.1 of the London Plan do not provide specific guidance for states that properties 6-bedroom, 3-storey dwellings which have the capacity to house 11 occupants. For a 6-bedroom, 8-person, three storey dwelling the NDSS states that a gross internal floor area of 138sqm and built in storage of 4sqm. It further states that a dwelling with two or more bed spaces must have at least one double (or twin) bedroom. In addition, double bedrooms should have a floor area of at least 11.5sqm and a width of 2.75metres; single bedrooms should have a floor area of at least 7.5sqm and a width of 2.15metres. Not only must new dwellings meet the minimum space standards in Policy D6 Part F and Table 3.1 of the London Plan, Part C2 of the Housing Design Standards London Plan Guidance (LPG) (June, 2023) further expands on the internal space standards that should be expected to be met. Importantly, it recommends that for a four-bed property, the combined floor areas for living/kitchen/dining spaces should meet or exceed 31sqm, thus for a six-bed property this is expected to be exceeded.
- 2.3 Policy BP6 (Internal Space Standards) of the Borough Wide DPD also provides quantitative and qualitative standards are achieved. The policy differs from the national housing standards and London Plan. As these three documents are up-to-date, the Council will relies on them when checking compliance.

Assessment

- 2.4 Each bedroom in the house would be used to house one child. They would all have their own separate rooms.
- 2.5 The space standards for the proposed dwellinghouse are set out below:

	NDSS requirement	Proposed Provision	Compliant
Gross Internal Area (sqm)	+138sqm	Approx. 258.8sqm	YES
Storage (sqm)	4sqm	46.75sqm	YES
Bedroom 1	7.5sqm, 2.15metres wide	14.4sqm, 3.5metres wide	YES
Bedroom 2	7.5sqm, 2.15metres wide	8.45sqm, 2.6metres wide	YES
Bedroom 3	7.5sqm, 2.15metres wide	11.8sqm, 3.2metres wide	YES
Bedroom 4	7.5sqm, 2.15metres wide	13.6sqm, 3.6metres wide	YES

Bedroom 5	7.5sqm, 2.15metres wide	15.2sqm, 5.3metres wide	YES
Bedroom 6	7.5sqm, 2.15metres wide	23.3sqm, 3.9metres wide	YES
Sleep-in Staff Room	7.5sqm, 2.15metres wide	13.8sqm, 3.6metres wide	YES

- 2.6 No internal alterations are being made to the size of the bedrooms in the dwelling as existing and they all comply with the internal space requirements for a single bedroom.
- 2.7 The site would provide internal storage within the dwelling (approx.19.85sqm) however the majority of this would be located within the outbuilding which is located at the end of the rear garden (approx. 26.9sqm). While additional storage within the dwelling would be preferable, the current provision already exceeds the requirements set by the NDSS, making it an extra benefit for the proposed development.
- 2.8 The site would provide combined living spaces for the children to socialise and relax. This would be provided within the house (about 59sqm) and within the outbuilding located at the end of the rear garden (an additional 50sqm).
- 2.9 The existing outbuilding has been designated for use as an education/games room and a gym and for storage. This is deemed to be ancillary to the main care home and would provide the care home with essential recreational and storage space. To ensure the outbuilding maintains its intended use, officers would impose an ancillary use compliance condition. This condition is designed to prevent the outbuilding from being converted into sub-standard accommodation in the future, thus preserving its designated function.

Aspect, Daylight, Sunlight, Ventilation

Policy

- 2.10 Part C in Policy D6 (Housing Quality and Standards) of the London Plan requires new development to maximise the provision of dual aspect dwellings and avoid single aspect dwellings. This is to ensure that passive ventilation is possible and to avoid the dwelling to overheat.
- 2.11 Part D of the Policy D6 (Housing Quality and Standards) of the London Plan talks about the design of the development and how it should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to new housing, whilst avoiding overheating, minimising overshadowing and maximising the usability of outside amenity space.

Assessment

- 2.12 No amendments are going to be made to the existing bedrooms within the house. All of the bedrooms proposed in the new care home are the same those already existing. They all have access to at least one openable window which would provide sufficient daylight and ventilation into the rooms.

External Amenity

Policy

- 2.13 Policy D6 of the London Plan states that where there are no higher local standards in the borough's development plan documents, a minimum of 5 sqm of private outdoor space

should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings, with a further 1 sqm per additional occupant, and it must achieve a minimum depth and width of 1.5m.

- 2.14 Policy BP5 of the DPD requires a 4+ bedroom house to provide 75 sqm of outdoor amenity space. It further states that amenity space for all new dwellings should be: private, useable, functional and safe; easily accessible from living areas; oriented to maximise sunlight; and of a sufficient size to meet the needs of the likely number of occupiers. It is noted that this policy predates the London Plan, which forms part of the development plan, and the Mayor of London's Housing SPG, which have lower requirements. It is further noted that the preceding policies relate to new dwellings, rather than Class C2 residential accommodation. However, they are considered an appropriate starting point for an assessment to be made.

Assessment

- 2.15 The proposal would provide 162.9sqm of external amenity space. No changes would be conducted on the size of the amenity space. This is deemed to be adequate regarding the proposed number of occupants and would facilitate a high quality of living for the children who live there.

Summary of Quality of Accommodation

- 2.16 The dwelling is therefore considered to provide good quality bedrooms, all with sufficient internal space and adequate daylight/ventilation. The external amenity space provided would also be vast and policy compliant both contributing towards a high quality of accommodation. As a result, this is deemed to be acceptable.

3. Design and Quality of Materials

Policy

- 3.1 Paragraph 130 of the NPPF, Policy D6 of the London Plan, Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide DPD, and Policy DMD1 of the Draft Local Plan all have reference to the importance of quality development which addresses neighbouring amenity and avoids unacceptable impacts. Those policies seek to ensure that residential amenity is protected with particular reference to daylight, sunlight, overshadowing, outlook and privacy.

Assessment

- 3.2 The proposed development would result in no further external changes to the appearance of the dwelling. As such, officers do not believe further assessment is required here.

4. Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

Daylight, sunlight, privacy

Policy

- 4.1 Paragraph 130 of the NPPF, Policy D6 of the London Plan, Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide DPD, and Policy DMD1 of the Draft Local Plan all have reference to the importance of quality development which addresses neighbouring amenity and

avoids unacceptable impacts. Those policies seek to ensure that residential amenity is protected with particular reference to daylight, sunlight, overshadowing, outlook and privacy.

Assessment

- 4.2 No external extensions or alterations have been proposed as part of the development. Therefore, as a result, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any additional loss of daylight, sunlight, overshadowing, outlook or privacy.

Noise and disturbance

Policy

- 4.3 Policy D14 of the London Plan and Policy DMSI3 further expands on this noting development proposals which generate an unacceptable level of nuisance including noise, waste, comings and goings and general disturbances will be resisted. This is supported by Policy BP8 of the Borough Wide DPD.

Assessment

- 4.4 While the proposal would not alter the number of bedspaces at the site or make any external alterations, the proposed residential care home (Use Class C2) may result in a different impact on neighbouring amenity than the existing use as a single dwelling house (Use Class C3). There were 10 objections received about this application. The majority of these raised concerns over parking (see sections 5.8 and 5.9), anti-social behaviour and noise.
- 4.5 The proposed care home would house up to 6 children, with a maximum of 2 carers on site during shift times. During handover periods there would be a maximum of 4 carers on site. This would only be for about 15-30minutes twice a day at the beginning and end of shifts. It would not therefore occur at antisocial times of the day. The occupiers would benefit from visitors. It was confirmed via email (dated: 26/02/2024) with the applicant that the anticipated weekly visitor numbers are estimated to average 2-3 individuals in person from Monday to Friday, between the hours of 10:00 and 17:45. No visitors would be permitted to visit on the weekends. The majority of visits (70-80%) are expected to occur virtually, minimising physical foot traffic to the site. In instances where physical visits are necessary, it would be ensured that the number of professionals or family members present be limited to two at any given time.
- 4.6 Officers obtained more specific information regarding the anticipated arrivals and departures of both the caregivers and children. In email dated 05/04/2024, it was confirmed that generally Monday through Friday during term time, a regular routine would be followed. A maximum of 6 children leaving to go to school in the morning with a maximum of 2 staff escorting in the morning and the same in the afternoon. The children would receive support in attending school and appointments primarily through walking or utilising public transport. Typically, the younger children would be escorted to and from school by staff members. This practice would ensure their safety and promotes a sense of security during their commute. For older young people who are transitioning towards semi-independence and seek greater autonomy, they would be provided with the opportunity to travel independently (by walking or public transport), provided they undergo a positive risk assessment. However, regardless of age, all young people would receive escorting to and from the bus stop to ensure their safety and well-being. On weekends as per a normal family dynamic some young people would leave the home to attend extracurricular activities but the same applies with a maximum of 6 children and

2 staff. The comings and goings on the weekends would therefore be more irregular however not significantly different to that of a normal household.

- 4.7 The dwelling is a large 6, double bedroom dwelling with the capacity to house up to 13 residents, due to the size and scale of the dwelling. Therefore, it is not considered that this proposal which would have a maximum of 12 people on site at a maximum for short periods and the majority of the time only 8 would create significantly more noise than a large family. The carers would cook meals daily for the children and they would have regular, standardised mealtimes. The care home would function similarly to that of a singular conventional family.
- 4.8 The childcare disabilities team stated in their response to the consultation that they cater to children with moderate to severe disabilities, and that a semi-detached property situated close to other homes may be unsuitable for placing children with moderate to severe disability needs. As such, officers have devised a pre-commencement condition which would involve the submission and approval of a Care Home Management Plan which would control the manner of placements at the home, lay out what types of support would be provided in this home to set out a strategy to mitigate against and loss of amenity of neighbouring residents. This would be agreed with the Local Planning Authority and enforced thereafter to ensure that the care home would only provide support for those with limited care requirements.

Summary of Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

- 4.9 In summary, the proposed development would not result in more people on site at any particular time than the dwelling has capacity for. The care home would function in a way which is similar to that of a singular, conventional family, therefore it is not considered that the proposal would cause a significant increase in noise or disturbance. Alongside the implementation of an appropriate Care Home Management Plan, the proposed scheme would not lead to an unacceptable escalation in noise levels beyond what is typical for a conventional family home already on site. Consequently, it is assessed that the proposal would not adversely affect the quality of life for neighbouring residents.

5. Sustainable Transport

- 5.1 Chapter 9 of the NPPF recognises that sustainable transport has an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also contributing to wider health objectives. It offers encouragement to developments which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and those which reduce congestion. Paragraphs 104 and 106 outline that developments which generate significant vehicle movements should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport options can be maximised. It is also expected that new development does not give rise to the creation of conflicts between vehicular traffic and pedestrians. However, it also stated that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Public Transport

- 5.2 The application site has a Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) of 3, on a scale whereby 1 means poor and 6 means excellent access. As such, it can be considered that the site has ok access to public transport. The site is about a 12-minute walk (0.6miles) from Upney Station. The site is a 3-minute walk (0.1miles) from Upney Lane whereby the bus

route 62 runs along and is about a 5-minute walk (0.2miles) from Longbridge Road (A124) whereby the bus routes 5, 145, EL2, EL3 and N15 all run along.

Car Parking

Policy

- 5.3 Policies T6 (Car Parking), T6.1 (Residential Parking), and Table 10.3 of the London Plan seek to ensure that new developments control parking provisions to avoid dominance of vehicles on streets. This policy aims to restrict car parking in line with levels of existing and future public transport accessibility and connectivity. Car-free development should be the starting point for all development proposals, if this cannot be achieved a car lite approach should be taken.
- 5.4 Table 10.3 states that in outer London area (which Barking and Dagenham is) that have PTAL score of 3 and the proposal provided 3+ beds up to 1 car parking space should be provided. That being said, it also indicates that boroughs can consider standards that allow for higher levels of provision where there is clear evidence that this would support additional family housing.
- 5.5 This is further supported by policy BR11 (Walking and Cycling) of the Borough Wide DPD and policy DMT 2 (Car Parking) of the Draft Local Plan 2037 (Reg 19).

Assessment

- 5.6 The application site is located within an area with a PTAL rating of 3 and is located within a Controlled Parking Zone, therefore there is limited on-street parking in the area.
- 5.7 In the original submitted documents 3 off-street parking spaces were proposed. This was rejected by the Be First Transport Officer due to space and capacity. The submission was therefore revised and now proposes on 2 off-street parking spaces which was supported by the Transport Officer.
- 5.8 The proportion of proposed off-street parking spaces would mean that both carers on shift at a particular time would be able to drive and park at the site. Due to the age range of the children who would be supported in this home (11-17 years old) they would not have access to their own private car, as a result, it is not considered that this would result in any additional car parking demand or adverse pressure on the highway network. As noted above, there would be visitors who would be allowed to come to the site. These would be limited and controlled allowing a maximum of 2-3 visits in person a week. The rest would be virtual. It was clarified in an email dated (04/04/2024) that the applicant is introducing a Go Green Incentive Policy. As part of this initiative, all employees and visitors will be notified that no parking facilities or permits would be available at the home, which is situated within a CPZ. While visitors would be discouraged from parking on the road, it is recognised that in certain situations a visitor may need to park. Fortunately, the CPZ restrictions apply for only one hour in the middle of the day, allowing visitors the possibility to park on the road when and where space is available outside of this restricted time. Officers believe this is a similar arrangement to any of the adjacent houses getting visitors throughout the day. As a limited number of visits would be received a week, it is not considered that it would pose significant harm on parking.
- 5.9 While it's recognised there were a number of objections from neighbours raising concerns about parking and the potential impact of the proposed development on the local traffic flow, officers deem that the arrangement outlined above would not result in adverse effects on the local highway or differ significantly from those typically associated with an average household.

Cycle Parking

Policy

- 5.10 Policy T5 (Cycling) and Tables 10.2 of the London Plan encourage development to facilitate and encourage cycling and reduce car dependency and the health problems it creates. Table 10.2 provided a minimum cycle parking standards new dwelling, and it states that a minimum of 2 long-stay and 2 short-stay cycle parking spaces for a 2+bedroom dwelling is required. This is further supported by policy BR11 (Walking and Cycling) of the Borough Wide DPD and policy DMT3 (Cycle Parking) of the Draft Local Plan 2037 (Reg 19).

Assessment

- 5.11 The proposal has undergone various amendments to the type of cycle storage provided and the location.
- 5.12 Initially, the applicant planned to locate the sole parking storage for bicycles within the outbuilding at the end of the rear garden. This arrangement was found to be unsuitable because the dwelling lacks a side passageway, requiring bikes to be transported through the home.
- 5.13 Subsequently, an alternative solution was proposed. Permanent bicycle storage would still be housed within the outbuilding, complemented by an additional smaller cycle storage unit at the front of property. This would have only been suitable for foldable bikes, which the applicant offered to provide, free of charge for staff to use. However, this storage locker was considered to be too small and would not be suitable in the case that the children had bikes to use or staff member had their own bike they wanted to commute daily on.
- 5.14 As a compromise to prevent the loss of an additional off-street parking space, it was agreed that the existing garage, initially proposed to be converted into an office, would instead be transformed into cycle storage. This is just under 40 sqm therefore would provide sufficient space for the number of bikes required, for short and long-term stay. 6 cycle spaces are indicated on the plans however there would be capacity for this to be increased if necessary.

Refuse and Recycling

Policy

- 5.15 Part 3 in Policy DMSI 8 (Demolition, construction and operational waste) of the Draft Local Plan (2021) requires all new development proposals to submit strategy for the minimisation and collection of waste and recycling and include sufficient and accessible space in their design and layout for waste storage and collection within the development. As a minimum, appropriate facilities must be provided, both within the individual units and for the building as a whole, in order to separate and store dry recyclables (card, paper, mixed plastic, metals, glass), organics and residual waste.
- 5.16 The Council's Planning Advice Note on Waste and Recycling Provisions in New and Refurbished Residential Developments (dated 20/05/2021) provides advice on how to calculate storage capacity required, where the bins should be located and other general advice on waste.

Assessment

- 5.17 The refuse and recycling arrangement would be the same as currently exists on the site. Officers do not consider the proposal would result in significantly more waste than an average large family, therefore do not have concerns with this element. The proposed development is considered to have an acceptable refuse and waste strategy.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposal aims to convert a three-story, 6-bedroom residential house into a care home for one child with a full-time adult carer. Despite the loss of a family-sized dwelling, which is in high demand, the plan aligns with the need for more children's care homes as highlighted by recent policies and the ministerial statement. The Childcare Commissioning Team's feedback was supportive subject to a condition which would address the concerns of the disabilities team regarding suitability for children with moderate to high learning difficulties.

The proposal would provide an acceptable quality of accommodation and adequate transport arrangements to facilitate a residential care home which is in high need within the borough. As such, the proposal is considered to accord with the relevant Development Plan Policies, and it is recommended that planning permission is granted. It would be subject to the proposed measures being implemented, and these would be subject to planning conditions.

Appendix 1:

Development Plan Context	
<p>The Council has carefully considered the relevant provisions of the Council's adopted development plan and of all other relevant policies and guidance. Of particular relevance to this decision were the following Framework and Development Plan policies and guidance:</p>	
<p><i>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (MHCLG, December 2023)</i></p>	
<p><i>The London Plan – March 2021</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy D4 - Delivering good design • Policy D6 - Housing quality and standards • Policy D7 – Accessible Housing • Policy D14 - Noise • Policy H1 - Increasing housing supply • Policy H2 - Small sites • Policy H12 – Supported and Specialised Accommodation • Policy T5 - Cycle Parking • Policy T6 - Car Parking • Policy T6.1 - Residential Car Parking • Policy S2 – Health and Social Care Facilities • Table 3.1 - Minimum internal space standards for new dwellings • Table 4.1 - 10 year targets for net housing completions (2019/20- 2028/29) • Table 10.2 - Minimum cycle parking standards • Table 10.3 - Maximum residential parking standards
<p><i>Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy - July 2010</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy CM1 - General Principles of Development • Policy CM2 - Managing Housing Growth • Policy CP3 - High quality-built environment
<p><i>Local Development Framework (LDF) Borough Wide Development Plan Document (DPD) – March 2011</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy BP5 - External Amenity Space • Policy BP6 - Internal Space Standards • Policy BP8 - Protecting Residential Amenity • Policy BP11 - Urban Design • Policy BR9 - Parking • Policy BR11 - Walking and Cycling
<p><i>The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 Consultation Version, Autumn 2021) was submitted for examination in public to the Planning Inspectorate in December 2021. Having regard to NPPF paragraph 216 the emerging document is now a material consideration and considerable weight will be given to the emerging document in decision-making, unless other material consideration indicate that it would not be reasonable to do so.</i></p>	
<p><i>The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) – Submission version December 2021</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy SPDG 1 - Delivering growth in Barking and Dagenham • Policy SP 2 - Delivering a high quality and resilient built environment • Policy SP 3 - Delivering homes that meet people's needs • Policy DMD 1 - Securing high-quality design • Policy DMD 6 - Householder extensions and alterations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy DMH3 – Specialist Housing • Policy DMNE 1 - Parks, open space and play space • Policy DMSI 3 - Nuisance • Policy DMSI 8 - Demolition, construction and operational waste • Policy DMT 2 - Car parking • Policy DMT 3 - Cycle parking
<p><i>Other Relevant Planning Document</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LPG: Optimising Site Capacity: A Design-led Approach (GLA, June 2023) • LPG: Small Site Design Codes (GLA, June 2023). • DCLG Technical Housing Standards (nationally described space standard) (DCLG, March 2015) (as amended) • Planning Advice Note on Waste and Recycling Provisions in New and Refurbished Residential Developments (dated 20/05/2021) • Housing Delivery Test (HDT) • The Council's Planning Advice Note on Waste and Recycling Provisions in New and Refurbished Residential Developments (dated: 20/05/2021) • London Cycling Design Standards (2016)
<p><i>Human Rights Act</i> The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report.</p> <p><i>Equalities</i> In determining this planning application, the Be First on behalf of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham has had regard to its equality's obligations including its obligations under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (as amended). For the purposes of this application there are no adverse equalities issues.</p>	

Appendix 2:

Relevant Planning History			
Application Number:	18/01094/FUL	Status:	Refused (Decision Issued: 15/10/2018)
Description:	Erection of outbuilding and alterations to the rear garden to provide an outdoor play area in connection with change of use of dwelling (Use Class C3) to a crèche and day nursery (Use Class D1).		
Application Number:	18/02090/CLU_P	Status:	Lawful (Certificate) (Decision Issued: 01/03/2019)
Description:	Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of outbuilding in rear garden.		
Application Number:	18/00652/CLU_P	Status:	Not Lawful (Certificate) (Decision Issued: 06/06/2018)
Description:	Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of rear outbuilding.		
Application Number:	17/00503/PRE	Status:	Pre-application Advice Issued (Issued: 21/04/2017)
Description:	Erection of two storey rear extension and loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window.		
Application Number:	18/00097/FUL	Status:	Approved (Decision Issued: 26/03/2018)
Description:	Erection of rear dormer window.		
Application Number:	17/01305/FUL	Status:	Approved (Decision Issued: 06/10/2017)
Description:	Erection of first floor side and rear extensions.		
Application Number:	12/00957/FUL	Status:	Approved (Decision Issued: 25/02/2013)
Description:	Erection of first floor side/rear extension, loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and replacement rendering.		
Application Number:	16/01842/FUL	Status:	Approved (Decision Issued: 06/03/2017)
Description:	Erection of two storey side extension, first floor rear/side extension and loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window.		
Application Number:	06/00242/FUL	Status:	Approved (Decision Issued: 24/05/2006)
Description:	Erection of single/two storey rear extension and two storey side extension		
Application Number:	05/01259/FUL	Status:	Approved (Decision Issued: 23/02/2006)
Description:	Erection of single/two storey rear extension and two storey side extension		
Application Number:	70/00313/TP	Status:	Approved (Decision Issued: 12/08/1970)
Description:	Erection of conservatory		
Enforcement Case:	21/00394/ENF	Status:	Case Closed
Alleged Breach:	Renting out outerbuilding		
Enforcement Case:	06/00139/NOPERM	Status:	Case Closed
Alleged Breach:	Garage demolished possible 2 storey extension going up in its place also a s/s/r/extn may be being started.		

Appendix 3

Internal and External Consultees	Section Addressed
<p>LBBB Children Care Team</p> <p><u>Children Care Commissioning (Children’s Care and Support)</u></p> <p>The overall positioning indicates the support from the general childcare team.</p> <p>First response was received (22/01/2024) via a phone call with the case officer. The contents was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of the proposed childcare • However, concerned about the support being provided to “children or young people who have been the perpetrators of abuse”. • Must be registered with Ofsted as children are aged between 11-17. • Will conduct an assessment and spot checks to make sure that the facility is run to acceptable standards. <p>The follow up response was received (07/03/2024).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed home would be considered suitable to CYP with EBD • Although often LA's need to place children out of the borough and there is a high chance that other LA's would place young people there also. <p><u>Children Care Commissioning (Disabilities)</u></p> <p>The disabilities stream of the childcare team were less supportive of the scheme, stating the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a shortage of homes for children with complex needs. • This dwelling would not be suitable for children with moderate to severe disabilities 	<p>See section 1.14 where this is addressed.</p>
<p>Be First Transport Officer</p> <p><u>Site Access</u></p> <p>No new vehicle access points are proposed within this application. However, there are proposals for a wall at the front of the property to be removed to allow for a third car parking space. Highways would object to this as the front garden appears to have insufficient space. Three vehicles parked alongside each other would inevitably overhang onto the pavement which would be deemed unacceptable. The existing vehicle crossover is also insufficient for</p>	<p>Comments all addressed within section 5.</p>

three vehicles to be accessing the property. The existing arrangement (wall retained) would be deemed acceptable.

Car Parking

The site has a PTAL of 3, indicating moderate access to public transport. The development is located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) UP.

Staff would likely rely on private vehicles for commuting to and from the site. The London Plan guidance suggests up to 1 space per unit for development located in this PTAL area. This equates to a maximum of 1 off-street parking space.

The existing front garden can accommodate 2 off-street car parking spaces. If the 2 existing parking spaces were to be retained, there would be no objections from the Highway Authority. However, the 'Planning Statement' suggests plans for the wall at the front of the property to be removed to allow for a third car parking space. Highways objects to a third parking space as the front garden appears to have insufficient space. Three vehicles parked alongside each other would inevitably overhang onto the pavement which would be deemed unacceptable.

Cycle Parking

The proposal outlines the provision of 4 cycle parking spaces in the rear garden which is accepted in principle. The parking should be fully accessible (for all types of cycles) and sheltered, in accordance with the London Cycling Design Standards.

The implementation of this cycle parking must be conditioned so that it will be implemented before the occupation of the unit and arrangements shall be retained for the life of the development.

This should be enforced to promote alternative, sustainable forms of transport, in accordance with The Local Plan POLICY DMT 3 and The London Plan 2021 policy T5.

Appendix 4

Neighbour Notification:	
Number of neighbouring properties consulted:	5
Number of responses:	10

Address	Summary of response
16 Beccles Drive	I would like this application to be fully rejected. The street will become dangerous and unsafe. It's very dangerous to have unstable teenagers around in area. Especially for the families with the kids.
22 Beccles Drive	<p>I would like to object this application of change use to children's care facility. There are many reasons:</p> <p>1) First of all, this is a residential area and having this childcare nursery will become very busy with traffic and will have more parking issues as there are not enough parking bays at the moment. Having such faculty in a residential area is not a suitable proposal, hence it should be rejected.</p> <p>(2) Secondly, the property itself is situated at bend. It is already dangerous, even with speed humps on the road, cars come at a fast pace. I have already witnessed in past whereby a car skidded in frosty conditions causing an accident. Hence, defeats the object of safeguarding the children, therefore it is not a suitable and safe place for vulnerable children. Such place will put children at more risk.</p> <p>3) Third, there are a number of same facility/nursery on Upney lane, Sandringham road etc. Therefore, area is not short of nurseries. This will really affect residents to have a nursery in a quiet residential area considering there are many nurseries at walking distance. Clearly, this is not an appropriate proposal and should be rejected immediately as considering the safety and peace of residents on this road and to avoid serious incidents due to direct effect on traffic. Therefore, I request you to reject this application as soon as possible</p>
31 Beccles Drive	<p>The troubled children will attract criminal activity, anti-social behaviour, drug use, abuse etc. They'll be bringing unknown risks to the neighbourhood.</p> <p>There will be significant noise increase throughout the day and night. (Unlike mentioned in the report) The people living there now are all working nurses and are hardly at home. There is no noise. Whereas if there are up to six troubled children living there, which may include perpetrators of abuse, requiring emergency care 24 hours a day, it will be very noisy. There will be conflicts amongst the children, carers and emergency services being called at any time of day and night.</p> <p>In warmer conditions we will have no peace and quiet. We won't be able to sit outside with the children in the garden next door. We won't be able to open windows due to the noise. We have a member of the family who works night shifts. His bedroom is in the rear looking over the garden where the children will be playing. He will be deprived of his sleep. Impact it will have on</p>

	<p>vulnerable adults with learning difficulties living in the care home directly opposite. Have they been consulted?</p> <p>Street will turn into care homes, in the residential area. The property has one real parking space and there will be up to four carers at one time. What about the when the children have visitors. There is insufficient parking on the street as it is. The property is situated on a 90 degrees bend not a slight incline as in transport report. It is already dangerous, even with speed humps on the road, cars come at a fast pace. In the past in front of my own eyes, a car skidded in frosty/snowy conditions and end up on my drive. It was inches away from my front door. There have been many accidents on the bend in the past. It defeats the object of safeguarding the children.</p> <p>We have had overflow sewage problems caused by bellied underground pipe in the back extension of the applicant. The water company were called out but the problem is still not 100 % sorted. Having a greater number of occupiers, the problem will get worse</p>
35 Beccles Drive	<p>The Planning Statement, November 2023 at 2.6 refers to Beccles Drive - site is located in a predominately residential area in north Barking and is bounded by residential development on all sides. On the opposite side of the road to 33 there is a residential care home which accommodates extremely vulnerable adults who may be impacted by proposed facility.</p> <p>Of major concern is having a children's care facility in a built up residential area and the social challenges that mat arise (11 - 17). The Planning Statement at 4.6 refers to young people concerns may have. Living next door could dramatically impact daily living of occupants. Life has already 'dealt' these young people unimaginable hardships before coming to proposed children's care facility for short term emergency care.</p> <p>Within the Planning Statement of November 2023 on page 2, the aerial view of the site at 1.2 gives the impression that 33 is a detached property with no label stating 35; no reference to 35 Beccles Drive (to be referred to as 35 in this response). 33 is a semi-detached house adjoining 35. There is no 'firewall' between properties. Only a thin abutting party wall. Noise can be heard through this party wall which is likely to increase when activities indoors are undertaken by up to six young people and/or the accompanying staff. Voice level beyond normal speaking is transmitted through the wall. Activities in 33 might easily become an issue at 35 where a peaceful environment is essential for the resident's relaxation. Given the age of the young people they will spend time in the garden. There is only a fence between properties which could be scaled if someone wished to access into another garden. Noise will be carried into neighbouring garden at 35 and is likely to restrict the use of the garden as a quiet sitting area. A disturbance that is not acceptable. Specific to 35 will be lack of privacy which is paramount. This will dramatically change the well-being of those living in 35.</p>

	<p>Regarding parking, the Planning Statement, November 2023 and Transport Statement of 28 November 2023 are at variance. The Planning Statement states at 4.18....the wall to the front of the property will be removed to allow for a third car parking space. Within the Transport Statement of 28 November 2023 at 3.4.1 states the proposed development will continue to use the existing two parking spaces within the existing private drive. The drive itself can take only one vehicle. Another vehicle would have to park sideways between the house and front wall. This area is very tight. As such. the owner mainly uses the driveway and parks his second vehicle outside on the kerb. Beccles Drive is a narrow residential street which suffers from too many cars, particularly during the 'school run' periods. The traffic problem is exaggerated in Beccles Drive at a dangerous blind right-angled corner/ bend outside 33 which leads on occasions to two way traffic having to quickly stop to avoid collision. There is restricted visibility by drivers from both directions. Additionally, Beccles Drive is also used by a number of cars whose drivers want to avoid the traffic lights at Faircross or since Cavendish Road was changed to 'one way' road at Beccles Drive end.</p> <p>Parking within Beccles Drive is a major problem. The Transport Statement states at 2.6.1 that the majority of properties benefitting from on-plot parking. These areas are not designated parking slots for each house. Indeed, there is no plot parking outside 33 due to the dangerous bend in the road. During the period of Controlled Parking Zone, vehicle owners have to find a parking slot along the road. The care home opposite 33 also has parking needs on the road for additional parking due to suppliers' vehicles and visitors. if staff and visitors need car parking space around 33 which is highly likely this will exacerbate the issues of car parking in Beccles Drive increasing concerns of highway safety. The proposal within the Planning Statement to have off street parking for three cars within front of property is a traffic hazard. Further pressures on parking which is already in short supply in the area may be compounded by staff and visitors seeking to park in Beccles Drive as well as everyday supply and contractor vehicles. To be able to neatly park three cars abreast, indeed dependant on size of vehicles this may be an issue and also car(s) may overlap onto pavement; pedestrian walkway. It will be necessary to either reverse into or out from the frontage at the blind corner, further increasing the possibility of a collision on this blind bend. It is not agreed that car parking will not result in a material impact of the operation of the local highway network.</p> <p>Additional concerns were raised about noise from the garden.</p>
43 Beccles Drive	<p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed planning permission for a care facility for children in our residential area. While I understand the importance of providing care for children in need, I believe that our neighbourhood is not the suitable location for such a facility. Our area is primarily residential, and the introduction of a care facility may lead to a disruption of the peaceful and quiet environment that we have come to cherish. One of my main concerns is the potential for increased noise levels and traffic in the area. A care facility</p>

	<p>catering to children could result in a significant increase in activity, leading to disturbances for the residents, particularly during evenings and weekends. This could disrupt the tranquillity of our neighbourhood and negatively impact our quality of life.</p> <p>Additionally, the presence of a care facility may raise concerns about anti-social behaviour. While I understand that not all children in care exhibit such behaviour, there is a possibility that the facility could attract individuals who engage in activities that are not conducive to a safe and secure environment for the community. I strongly believe that it is crucial to maintain the residential character of our area. Our neighbourhood has always been a peaceful haven for families, and introducing a care facility may compromise the sense of security and serenity that we currently enjoy. I kindly request that you carefully consider the concerns raised by the residents of this community and reconsider the proposed planning permission for the care facility. I am confident that there are more suitable locations within our city that can cater to the needs of these children while also preserving the residential nature of our area. Thank</p>
45 Beccles Drive	<p>I firmly object to this Children's Emergency Residential Care facility ages 11-17 years as I have an elderly mother who suffers from anxiety and depression. I believe this will impact her health as having as these type of individuals around a stone throw from my property will only further aggravate her condition. I have lived here for 30 years and I believe this will have a direct impact on property prices and I do not want these kind of people around my property. There is also a residential care home opposite already and this will grid lock with traffic and parking is already a constraint on this road.</p>
47 Beccles Drive	<p>Fully object to this proposal. This is a residential and well regarded and maintained street in Barking which attracts many buyers from outside of Barking due to the quiet and pleasant nature of the street. This business is not in line with the residential quiet nature of this street. In recent years the parking congestion and traffic jams have increased, resulting in permit holder spaces being enforced and difficulty in finding parking for the residents here - a business of this nature will only making the parking situation much worse. The property is situated on a 90 degree bend which is a dangerous blind spot, cars speed regularly on this corner and I have nearly crashed several times with oncoming cars even when reducing my speed to very slow. We as pensioners and the young kids on the street will not feel safe anymore with the introduction of this business on our homely street. This business will drive out residents and reduce residential interest from buyers and investors in this street and will negatively impact the local economy. We will have no more peace and quiet. I have spoken to all the residents on the street and NO ONE is in favour of this. It will disturb the social fabric of the area. The property values will go down on the street and impact the young kids living on the street in terms of bad influences. The people are not comfortable on their own street and are not safe anymore</p>
Anonymous 1	<p>I appreciate there is an acute need for child residential care placements but request that due regard is given to the potential impact on existing residents. Constraints on existing limited on</p>

	<p>street parking, noise and risk of anti-social behaviour are not confined to neighbouring properties – noise in the street and gardens travels and impacts greatly on peoples wellbeing. Overlooking genuine risks would not benefit the proposed service users / local residents or the existing care home residents. Road safety and parking The property is close to a sharp blind bend which has resulted in past accidents and near misses. There will be up to 4 staff on site and there are only two parking spaces at most (second space is not used 99.9% of the time due to limited space). Additionally contrary to hgh report visitors would not be like a family home as each of the 6 placements would have differing networks. This would increase pressure on limited on street parking. Noise/ Disturbance I would dispute the comment 'levels of noise similar to that of existing use'. Adults currently residing there are often at work. This will be a 24-hour facility with 6 teenagers many of whom will have behavioural/emotional needs. It is normal for young people to be lively but not many family units would have so many adolescent children with existing problems. There are many multi-generational family units on the estate but not with this structure. The noise would not be comparable to a domestic setting. Limited noise mitigations may be attempted internally but not in gardens or outdoor spaces. Emergency placements can occur at any time of the day or night causing disturbance. The B&D local plan states the amenity standards of existing residents should be preserved; the right to enjoy their homes and gardens is fundamental. Sadly, there is evidence that vulnerable young people can be targeted by undesirable elements impacting on the peace and security of the neighbourhood and various risks are acknowledged in the HGH report. The local plan states that a specialist facility should be supported by a relevant operator and must not be speculative. We do not know Invision's track record or if the company has been created solely for this purpose? It could be argued that as the nursery application was unsuccessful this facility would be accepted and extremely beneficial financially. We have no proof that the suggested remedies to counter behavioural issues in the HGH report would work. Existing Care Home There is already a specialist care home for vulnerable adults opposite the proposed facility. Apart from the needs of the two conflicting it would not be balanced for the local authority to permit two facilities so close together. There is a limit to the amount of extra parking required that can be absorbed. Moreover, the existing home benefits from a proper sized car park and does not have out of hours noise etc.</p>
Anonymous 2	<p>Suffice it to say ' neighbour who lives within a quarter of a mile if 33 Beccles Drive'.</p> <p>To expand on my objection to this change of use, I wish to further mention:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School children daily use this road to either go to school in Sandringham Road or Longbridge Road 2. Last summer roads were closed because of gun shots and assault near to these premises 3. The service road off Beccles Drive (serving the rear of shops in Longbridge Road) Is continually used for drug dealing

by certain tenants that live in in the flats in the service road between Beccles Drive.

4. The Co-Op shop was 'robbed' las Saturday evening at about 10pm

I can not emphasis too strongly the proposed change of use is definitely not in the best interest of existing residents and, also and perhaps most importantly, definitely not in the interest or wellbeing of young people required 'emergency' level of care and often unaccompanied minors.

This is a very important issue and requires a great deal of more consideration in finding and establishing a location best suited to their needs and future stability. Not where there are already social issues that will be detrimental to their safety and have no chance of improving outcomes

Appendix 5

Planning conditions:

COMPLIANCE

1. Time Limit

The development hereby permitted shall commence before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. Approved Plans and Documents

The development hereby approved shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved drawing and documents.

Drawings:

Name	Drawing number	Dated
Amended Proposed Floor Plans	A_PL_E001, Revision B	23/02/2024
Proposed Elevations	P-103	21/07/2017

Documents:

Document title	Author	Date	Document number	Revision
Planning Statement	HGH consulting	26/01/2024	N/A	B
Transport Statement	Markides Associates	25/01/2024	TS01	B

Reason: To ensure that the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and documents.

3. Care Home Capacity

The care home hereby approved shall be occupied by no more than 6 children and 2 carers at any one time without prior permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring and adjoining dwellings.

4. Cycling Parking

The cycle parking spaces shown on the submitted plan (drawing number: A_PL_E001, Revision B, Dated: 23/02/2024) shall be made available for the development prior to first occupation and thereafter the approved facilities shall be maintained as approved, and be reserved for the benefit of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development support sustainable modes of transport.

5. **Ancillary Outbuilding**

The existing outbuilding shall not be occupied or used at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the use of the care home hereby approved, and shall not be used as additional residential accommodation .

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the surrounding area, to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and to ensure that the building is not used as self-contained accommodation, which may give rise to substandard living conditions.

PRE-COMMENCEMENT

6. **Care Home Management Plan (details)**

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a Care Home Management Plan (CHMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in consultation with LBBDCare Team. The CHMP shall include a full list of the profile of children that are to be placed within the development which, for the avoidance of doubt, shall not include children placed via disabilities services from any borough. The CHMP shall also include details as to how the facility shall be managed and the measures in place to mitigate the amenity impacts of the development.

The approved CHMP shall be implemented as approved and maintained thereafter and no change shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Care Team.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

INFORMATIVE

1. **Discharge of planning conditions**

All relevant planning conditions must be discharged in accordance with the triggers given. Requests to discharge conditions must be made by formal application. Fees are £116 per request.

2. **Building Control**

The approved development is required to comply with the Building Regulations. Please contact Be First Building Control at BuildingControl@befirst.london will be happy to advise you on building control matters and will protect your interests throughout your build project by leading the compliance process.