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AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Site visit: DC/04/00692/FUL - 184 Billet Road, Marks Gate (Pages 1 - 10)

3. Any Other Business
Plan: E
DC/04/00692/FUL Chadwell Heath Ward (R)

Address: 184 Billet Road, Marks Gate

Development: Erection of single storey front and part single/part two storey rear extensions in connection with conversion of existing dwelling into 1 one bedroom flat and 1 two bedroom flat and erection of part single storey part 2 two storey building to provide 1 one bedroom flat and 1 two bedroom flat

Applicant: Mr P Farthing

Introduction and Description of Development

The application property is a two storey end-of-terrace house on the corner of Kingston Hill Avenue fronting a service road on Billet Road. The house has an existing side garden that is some 10m. wide from the flank wall of the house to the Kingston Hill Avenue boundary. There is an existing crossover from Kingston Hill Avenue at the rear of the site.

This application is submitted as an amendment to application ref. 04/00369/FUL which was refused. A copy of the report relating to the above application is appended. Details of the differences between the two schemes are referred to in the analysis below.

The proposal is to extend the existing property to the side by constructing a new building comprising a 2 bedroom ground floor flat and a 1 bedroom first floor flat. The existing building would be converted from a single dwelling to 2 flats also comprising a 2 bedroom ground floor flat and a 1 bedroom first floor flat. The proposal also includes a single storey rear extension to the existing building with a depth of 3.1m, a single storey rear projection to the proposed building with a depth of 2.45m, in addition to a first floor rear projection to both properties with a depth of 2.1m and a combined width of 6.85m. The four flats would share an entrance via a new front porch extension projecting 1.5m from the front of the existing house.

The new building would have a frontage of 7.1m, replicating the pattern of the existing terrace, leaving a side garden 3m. wide and extending 3m. beyond the building line of houses in Kingston Hill Avenue.

The new building would have a tiled pitched roof, with brick and render walls, to match the existing terrace.

The 2-bedroom flats have habitable floor areas of 41 sq. m. and 44 sq. m., and the 1-bedroom flats provide an area of 34 sq. m. and 35 sq. m. The rear garden for the existing, converted house would be 10.5m. deep with an area of 76 sq. m., and for the new building 10m. deep with an area of 102 sq. m., giving a total area of 178 sq. m.

The submitted plans show 4 on-site parking spaces to the front of the existing house with access via 2 new crossovers one from the front service road, and the other onto Kingston Hill Avenue in order to provide an ‘in and out drive’. The existing privet hedge around the front and side garden boundary is shown to be retained, although it would be necessary to remove parts of the hedgerow in order to create the two new openings to provide vehicular access to the site.
**Background**

The previous application, ref. 04/00369/FUL, also comprised the construction of a new building and the provision of 4 flats. Planning permission was refused on the grounds that the provision of amenity space would be inadequate; the scheme did not meet the Council’s habitable floor area standards; the parking provision was inadequate; and the development would compromise the typical openness of the area adversely affecting the street scene.

**Consultations**

a) **Adjoining occupiers**

23 nearby occupiers consulted. 9 responses with the following objections
- the development will exacerbate existing parking problems
- the development would be out of keeping with the area both physically and because the area is characterised predominantly by single family houses
- Concern about the proximity of the proposed single storey rear extension to the existing single storey rear extension to the neighbouring property at 186 Billet Road and the effect on maintenance
- the scheme constitutes overdevelopment
- the construction work would cause disturbance
- concerns about the affect on local sewerage due to previous blockages in the area
- adverse effect on views of neighbours opposite
- the development would devalue properties
- concerns about the type of occupants

In addition a 38 signature petition was submitted by local residents which states the following:

“We the below signatures are strongly opposed to the proposed development on the site of 184 Billet Road, Marks Gate on the following grounds.

1. It is over development of the land.
2. It is out of character with the surrounding properties.
3. It will mar the views of immediate neighbours, especially those living opposite the property in Kingston Hill Avenue and those that back on to it, as well as those immediate neighbours.
4. It will de-value nearby properties, as at present it is all houses, NOT FLATS. Many people will not consider purchasing a property within the vicinity of Flats or Apartments.
5. We are all concerned that if the properties built are rented out, that it could lead to undesirable residents in an otherwise very quiet and peaceful part of the estate.”

b) **Traffic and Highway Safety**

No response at the time of writing. It is expected that it will be possible to provide a verbal report to the Board meeting.
Policy issues – private amenity space, character of the area, and parking and access arrangements.

Analysis

The proposed development is of the same width, and general appearance as the previous scheme which was refused planning permission. The amendments include the first floor rear projection which was not incorporated into the original scheme. The applicant has obtained No. 1 Kingston Hill Avenue and incorporated part of its wide side garden (8.8m in width) into the amenity space of the proposed flats. The proposed parking and access arrangements have also been amended. The previous scheme proposed a single access point from Billet Road to serve the two flats within the existing building, and a separate access from Kingston Hill Avenue to serve the two flats within the proposed new building.

Internal design
All of the flats fully comply with the Council’s floor area standards. In the previous scheme the first floor 1-bedroom flats fell short by approximately 1 sq. m., however this has been addressed by the additional first floor rear projection.

Design and character
The new building is designed to match the existing terrace. However, it extends beyond the building line of the houses in Kingston Hill Avenue, partially closing off the view down this road and reducing the openness of the area. The width of the new building has not been reduced and the loss of openness on this corner was one of the reasons for refusal in respect of the previous scheme. The bulk of the proposed development has now been increased as a result of the first floor rear projection.

Parking and Access
The proposed new vehicular cross-over onto Kingston Hill Avenue is within 10m of the junction with Billet Road. The development would also result in the provision of 2 cross-overs to serve the flatted development. It is understood that both these aspects are contrary to policies set by Traffic and Highway Safety. The parking and access arrangements would also result in the hard surfacing of more than 50% of the front garden area which is contrary to policy H10 relating to conversions.

The parking layout does not provide 6m in front of the parking spaces to provide sufficient manoeuvring space in accordance with Appendix 6. It is also considered that the parking layout is awkward in that the parking spaces would not be easy to access or egress. This could lead to the parking area being under used resulting in on street parking, and could cause drivers to reverse into or out of the site which would compromise highway safety.
Private Amenity Space
The area of the rear garden space proposed is well in excess of Council’s minimum standards. However, the garden depth is only 10m not 12m which is required by the policy. This is considered adequate given the size of the garden area and its substantial width. In respect of the previous scheme the garden area was below standard both in respect of its area and due to the limited depth to the rear of the proposed new building. This has been remedied through the utilisation of the side garden of 1 Kingston Hill Avenue to serve the proposed flats. No. 1 Kingston Hill Avenue has a large rear garden, well in excess of the Council’s minimum standards, therefore the loss of part of its side garden would not cause harm to the amenity of its occupants.

Loss of light
The proposed rear extension meets the Council’s normal requirements and there is a similar extension at the next door house, so there is no loss of light due to this extension. The first floor rear extension is set behind a 45 degree angle taken from the nearest corner of the adjoining property and therefore complies with policy H22 (Appendix 7). The main rear wall of the new building would be 14m. from the flank wall of 1 Kingston Hill Avenue, and lies to the north west of this house, so there will be no significant loss of daylight or sunlight to any nearby houses.

Privacy
It is considered that there would be a marginal reduction in the level of privacy afforded to the rear gardens of 186 Billet Road and 1 Kingston Hill Avenue due to the provision of the first floor rear facing kitchen to Flat C (within the new building) and the greater intensity of the use of the first floor of the existing building which would result from its conversion to a flat. However, this matter in itself is not considered to cause harm such as to warrant refusal of planning permission.

Housing Provision
The proposed development would result in the provision of an additional 3 units of accommodation and maximise the use of the site in accordance with Policy H1 of the Unitary Development Plan and Government advice set out in PPG3: ‘Housing’. However, such provision should not be at the expense of the quality of the environment and it is therefore considered that the benefit of providing this additional housing is outweighed by other factors which indicate that planning permission should be refused.

Conclusion
The proposed building would reduce the characteristic openness of the area resulting from the loss of the majority of the side garden space to the existing dwelling. This would adversely affect the street scene and the character of the area. The scale of the proposed building has not been reduced and the affect of its bulk on the openness of the area was one of the reasons for refusal in respect of the previous scheme.

The parking layout is inadequate and would result in most of the front garden area being hard surfaced. This would adversely affect the appearance of the proposed development.
Recommendation

That permission be refused for the following reasons:

1) The proposed development compromises the typical openness of the area thereby adversely affecting the street scene and as such would be out of character with the area and contrary to Policy H13 of the Council’s Unitary Development Plan.

2) The proposal does not make adequate provision for the parking of vehicles within the curtilage of the site in accordance with the Council’s standards and is therefore contrary to Policy H13 of the Council’s Unitary Development Plan.

3) The proposed development would result in the majority of the front garden being hard surfaced, contrary to policy H10 of the Council’s Unitary Development Plan, which states that in respect of flat conversions no more than 50% of the front garden area should be hard surfaced.
Appendix

Plan: DC/04/00369/FUL Chadwell Heath Ward (R)

Address: 184 Billet Road Marks Gate

Development: Erection of single storey front and rear extensions in connection with conversion of existing dwelling into one 1 bedroom flat and one 2 bedroom flat and erection of part single storey part two storey building to provide one 1 bedroom flat and one 2 bedroom flat.

Applicant: Mr. P. Farthing

Introduction and Description of Development

The application property is a two storey end-of-terrace house on the corner of Kingston Hill Avenue fronting a service road on Billet Road, with an existing storage shed at the front projecting 2.2m. The house has an existing side garden that is some 10m. wide from the flank wall of the house to the Kingston Hill Avenue boundary. There is an existing crossover from Kingston Hill Avenue at the rear of the site.

The proposal is to build a single storey rear extension to the existing house and to convert the house into one 2-bedroom ground floor flat and one 1-bedroom first floor flat, and to erect a new two storey building, with a single storey rear extension 2.1m. deep, as an extension to the terrace on the land at the side of the house to provide a further 2-bedroom flat on the ground floor and a 1-bedroom flat at first floor. The four flats would share an entrance via a new front porch extension projecting 1.5m. from the front of the existing house.

The rear extension to the house would be 3.05m. deep and full width. The new building would have a frontage of 7.1m. leaving a side garden 3m. deep and extending 3m. beyond the building line of houses in Kingston Hill Avenue.

The new building would have a tiled pitched roof, with brick and render walls, to match the existing terrace.

The 2-bedroom flats have habitable floor areas of 45 sq. m. and 42.7 sq. m., and the 1-bedroom flats each provide just over 27 sq. m. The garden for the existing, converted house would be 10.5m. deep with an area of 76 sq. m., and for the new building only 3.5m. deep with an area of 35.7 sq. m., giving a total area of 111.8 sq. m.

The submitted plans show 4 on-site parking spaces, 2 in front of the existing house with access via a new crossover from the front service road, and 2 in front of the new building accessed via a new crossover from Kingston Hill Avenue.

Background

No planning history

Consultations

a) Adjoining occupiers

23 nearby occupiers consulted. 8 responses with the following objections
- the development will exacerbate existing parking problems
- the development would be out of keeping with the area both physically and because the area is characterised predominantly by single family houses
- there would be loss of light to the adjoining properties
- the scheme constitutes overdevelopment

**U.D.P. Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.D.P. Policy H1</th>
<th>Housing supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Housing for people with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13</td>
<td>New residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14</td>
<td>Environmental requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15</td>
<td>Residential amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16</td>
<td>Internal design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 6 and Interim parking standards adopted January 2002

Policy issues – private amenity space, internal design, character of the area, and parking arrangements.

**Analysis**

**Internal design**
The two 2-bedroom flats fully comply with the Council’s floor area standards, but the 1-bedroom flats fall short by approximately 1 sq. m.

**Design and character**
The new building is designed to match the existing terrace. However, it extends beyond the building line of the houses in Kingston Hill Avenue, partially closing off the view down this road and compromising the openness of the area.

**Parking**
The layout of the spaces accessed from Billet Road (in front of the existing house) is not acceptable, with the spaces only 3.5m. deep and inadequate manoeuvring space being provided.

**Private Amenity Space**
The Council’s policy requires a total garden area of 120 sq. m. for all the new flats, and the scheme falls short by just over 8 sq. m. The garden serving the existing house would have an area of 76 sq. m. which meets the standard for the 2 flats in this conversion, but the garden serving the new building would be only 35.7 sq. m. when the standard for these 2 flats is 60 sq. m. Garden depth should be a minimum of 12m., but is only 3.5m. behind the new building, and is reduced to 10.5m. behind the existing house by the proposed extension.

**Loss of light**
The proposed rear extension meets the Council’s normal requirements and there is a similar extension at the next door house, so there is no loss of light due to this extension. The main rear wall of the new building would be 14m. from the flank wall of 1 Kingston Hill Avenue, and lies to the north west of this house, so there will be no significant loss of daylight or sunlight to any nearby houses.

**Conclusion**
As submitted the proposal does not meet the Council’s standards in regard to on-site parking provision or amenity space. In addition the new building would reduce the characteristic openness of the area and is therefore out of character.
Recommendation

That permission be refused for the following reasons:

1) The proposal does not make adequate provision for private amenity space in accordance with Policy H15 of the Council’s Unitary Development Plan and would therefore be detrimental to future occupiers.

2) The proposed development compromises the typical openness of the area thereby adversely affecting the street scene and as such would be out of character with the area and contrary to Policy H13 of the Council’s Unitary Development Plan.

3) The proposal does not make adequate provision for the parking of vehicles within the curtilage of the site in accordance with the Council’s standards and is therefore contrary to Policy H13 of the Council’s Unitary Development Plan.

4) The scheme does not meet the Council’s standards for habitable floor area as set out in Policy H16 of the Council’s Unitary Development Plan and therefore fails to provide adequately sized rooms in the 1-bedroom flats.