


**LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & DAGENHAM**
**PLANNING COMMITTEE**
**22<sup>nd</sup> March 2021**
**Notification for Prior Approval: New Dwelling houses on Detached Blocks of Flats.**

Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

<b>Case Officer:</b>	Kathryn McAllister	<b>Valid Date:</b>	23-12-2020
<b>Applicant:</b>	Avon Freeholds Ltd	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	22-03-2021
<b>Application Number:</b>	20/02534/PRIFLAT	<b>Ward:</b>	Abbey
<b>Address:</b>	The Sienna Building, 116-118 Victoria Road, IG11 8PZ		

The purpose of this report is to set out the Officer recommendations to Planning Committee regarding an application for prior approval: new dwelling houses on detached blocks of flats to the proposal below at The Sienna Building, 116-118 Victoria Road. This is not a planning application.

**Proposal:**

*Prior notification application for the construction of new dwelling houses on detached blocks of flats. The proposed development involves the construction of one additional storey on top of the detached block of flats to create 4 new units.*

**Officer Recommendations:**

Planning Committee is asked to resolve to:

1. agree the reasons for approval as set out in this report; and
2. delegate authority to the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham's Director of Inclusive Growth to grant prior approval based on the Conditions listed in Appendix 5 and summarised below.

**Conditions Summary:**

- Time
- Approved Drawings & Documents
- Materials
- Construction Management Plan
- Notification of completion
- Use as dwelling houses only.

## OFFICER REPORT

### Understanding the Application:

This application seeks prior approval for the construction of dwelling houses on detached block of flats. This application is not a planning application. As such the principle of development, quality of accommodation, waste management and provision of cycle storage and parking are matters which fall outside the scope of consideration.

Matters which can be assessed include impact on public transport, highway, air traffic and defence assets; consideration on contaminated land, flood risks and protected vistas; consideration of the design impact on the existing building, however, this does not include the assessment of the actual design of the additional floor; consideration of the amount of natural light received by the new dwellings and consideration of the impact on the amenity of the existing building and any adjoining premises including overlooking, privacy and the loss of light.

### Site, Situation and relevant background information:

The application site is a three-storey purpose-built block of flats located on 116-118 Victoria Road. The applicant previously sought pre-application advice for the construction of an additional storey to create 4 new units. This was received positively and in planning terms officers considered the proposal to be acceptable.

Notwithstanding, the applicant submitted a prior approval: new dwelling houses on detached blocks of flats application for the construction of 2 additional storeys to create 8 new units (20/02265/PRIFLAT). This application was refused for the following reasons:

1. Having regard to the proposed development and further to the assessment above in relation to overlooking, privacy and the loss of light, it is considered that the proposed development is un-neighbourly and would have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of the adjoining properties. As such, having regard to the policies below, Prior Approval for a 'new dwelling houses on detached blocks of flats' is required and refused.

- National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG, February 2019)
- Policies 7.1, 7.4, 7.6 and 7.15 of The London Plan (March 2016)
- Policies GG1, GG3 and D14 of the Draft London Plan Intended to Publish (December 2019)
- Policy BP8 of the Borough Wide DPD (February 2012)
- Policy DMD1 and DMS13 of the Draft Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation version (June 2020)

2. Having regard to the proposed development and further to the assessment above in relation to architectural design and features of the external appearance of the building, it is considered that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the purpose built flat and the wider streetscene. As such, having regard to the policies below, Prior Approval for an 'new dwelling houses on detached blocks of flats' is required and refused.

- National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG, February 2019)
- Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (March 2016)
- Policy D4 of the Draft London Plan Intended to Publish (December 2019)
- Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy DPD (July 2010)
- Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide DPD (March 2011)
- Policies SP2 and DMD 1 of the Draft Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation version (October 2020)

This prior notification application for the construction of new dwelling houses on detached blocks of flats seeks permission for the construction of one additional storey to create 4 new units. This application is different to application 20/02265/PRIFLAT as it seeks permission for the construction of one additional floor only.

**Assessment:**

<b>A.</b>	<b>Purpose-Built Detached Block of Flats</b>	
	<i>Is the application site a purpose-built, detached block of flats?</i>	<b>YES</b>
	<i>Officer comment: (if NO)</i>	
<b>B.</b>	<b>Pre-Commencement &amp; Planning Enforcement</b>	
	<i>Have works commenced on site (all or in part) in relation to that proposed?</i>	<b>NO</b>
	<i>Is the application site the subject of a related enforcement case?</i>	<b>NO</b>
	<i>Officer comment: (if YES)</i>	
<b>C.</b>	<b>Conservation Area (Article 2(3) land) (A.1(o))</b>	
	<i>Is the application site located within a Conservation Area (Article 2(3) land)?</i>	<b>NO</b>
	<i>Officer comment: (if YES)</i>	
<b>D.</b>	<b>Permitted Development Rights</b>	
	<i>Have the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) been removed from the application site?</i>	<b>NO</b>
	<i>Officer comment: (if YES)</i>	
<b>E.</b>	<b>Application Clarity</b>	
	<i>Has the developer provided sufficient information to enable the authority to establish whether the proposed development complies with the conditions, limitations or restrictions applicable to development permitted by Class A?</i>	<b>YES</b>
	<i>Officer comment: (if NO)</i>	
<b>F.</b>	<b>The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A.1 &amp; A.2 Criteria</b>	
	<i>Does the proposed development comply with the conditions, limitations or restrictions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A.1 and A.2?</i>	<b>YES</b>
	<i>Conditions, limitations or restrictions</i>	<i>Officer comment:</i>
	Class A.1(c)	The application site was granted permission on 18.05.2005 for the erection of three storey building comprising 14 one- and two-bedroom flats together with associated access road and car parking at Land Adjoining 114 Victoria Road (04/01130/FUL). The application site is a purpose- built detached block of flats constructed between the period of 1 <sup>st</sup> July 1948 and 5 <sup>th</sup> March 2018. The site therefore complies with the requirements of Class A.1 (c).
<b>G.</b>	<b>The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 2020) Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A.2 (1) Criteria</b>	
	<b>A.2 (1) (a), (b), (c), (d) and (h) Criteria</b>	
	<b>Consideration of;</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Transport and highway impact on the development;</li> <li>b. air traffic and defence asset impacts of the development; and</li> <li>c. contaminated risks in relation to the building;</li> <li>d. flooding risks in relation to the building</li> <li>h. Protected Vistas</li> </ul>	

Does the proposed development raise concerns with respect to the transport and highway impacts of the development?	NO
Does the proposed development raise any concerns with respect to air traffic and defence asset impacts of the development?	NO
Does the proposed development raise concerns with respect to contamination risks in relation to the building?	NO
Does the proposed development raise concerns with respect to the flooding risks in relation to the building?	NO
Does the proposed development raise any concerns with respect to whether, as a result of the siting of the building, the development will impact on a protected view identified in the Directions Relating to Protected Vistas dated 15th March 2012(1) issued by the Secretary of State;	NO
Officer comment:	<p>The proposal does not seek to provide any additional car parking, as such, it will be a car free development. Notwithstanding, given the sites close proximity to Barking Station (11-minute walk) and a number of bus routes along Ilford Lane and Fanshawe Avenue it is evident that the site has good access to nearby public transport links. Therefore, it would be expected that future residents and visitors to the site use these links to access the property. Further, due to the size and number of flats proposed the impact on public transport links and traffic will be negligible. The transport development manager was consulted who agreed with the points raised above noting in particular that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on highway safety. Therefore, in agreement with the transport development manager officers are confident that the proposal will not result in a material change or material increase in the character of traffic in the vicinity. The proposal is considered to comply with the criteria set by Class A.2(1)(a).</p> <p>The proposal is not considered to have an acceptable impact on air traffic and defence assets, as such, the proposal will meet the criteria of Class A.2(1)(b).</p> <p>The proposal will sit directly above the existing 3<sup>rd</sup> storey, as such, the proposal is not considered to raise concerns with regard to contaminated land. The environmental protection officer was consulted with regard to this scheme. They raised no concerns with regard to contaminated land. Officers therefore consider the proposal to meet the criteria of Class A.2(1)(c).</p> <p>As shown on the 'Flood Map for Planning' (<a href="https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/">https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/</a>) the application site is located in Flood Zone 1 which represents a &lt;0.01% chance of river or sea flooding. Officers are therefore satisfied that there would be no flooding risks associated with the proposal. The environmental agency was consulted who agreed with the points raised above by officers. As such the proposal is considered to meet the criteria of Class A.2(1)(d).</p> <p>The sitting of the proposal is not considered to impact any protected views, as such, the proposal meets the criteria of Class A.2(1)(h)</p> <p>Overall, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on transport, highway, air traffic and defence assets. Likewise, the proposal is not considered to result in contaminated land or flooding risks and will have no impact on protected vistas. The proposal is therefore considered to meet the criteria A.2(1)(a), (b), (c), (d) and (h).</p>
<p><b>A.2 (1) (e) Criteria</b></p> <p><b>Consideration of the external appearance of the building</b></p>	
Does the proposed architectural design and features to the external appearance of the building respect the character and appearance of the existing building and street scene?	YES
Officer comment:	Victoria Road is characterised by two storey terraced rows which are uniform in size, scale and design whereby each row shares a single building frontage and roof scape which gives the street a very balanced and pleasing symmetry. The application site is an existing

	<p>3 storey purpose-built block of flats which sits at the western end of Victoria Road. At present the maximum height of the application site sits approximately 0.68 metres above the maximum height of the terrace rows adjacent. Whilst it sits slightly above that of the terraces adjacent officers consider the height to remain sympathetic and in keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene.</p> <p>The proposal seeks permission for the construction of 1 additional storey directly above the existing 3<sup>rd</sup> storey. The additional storey will be 2.69 metres in height; as such the height of the overall building will increase to 12.0 metres. This will result in the maximum height of the application property extending 3.37 metres above the terraces adjoining. Notwithstanding, as the proposal will be set back on the northern and eastern elevations by 1.50 metres officers therefore consider the visual impact of the increase in height and massing at this level to be mitigated.</p> <p>Further, the rhythm and fenestration of the additional floor has been designed to match that of the property below whereby the external walls will be treated with zinc cladding and the projecting elements will be treated with timber cladding reflect the design and appearance of the existing property below.</p> <p>Officers therefore consider the proposal to respect and reflect the character and appearance of the host property whereby the additional storey will appear subservient to the existing building. Likewise, given its size, sitting and design the proposal is not considered to add visual mass and bulk to the character and appearance of the street scene.</p> <p>The urban design officer was consulted with regard to this application and they agreed with the points raised above by officers. In particular they note that this proposal is considered acceptable given the additional storey will be set back at roof level and the proposed materials respect and reflect the character and design of the existing building.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the external appearance of the building and respect the character and appearance of the existing building and street scene.</p>
--	--

**A.2 (1) (f) Criteria**

**Consideration of the quality of accommodation the new flats will provide.**

*Does the proposal provide adequate natural light in all habitable rooms of the new dwellinghouses?*

**YES**

*Officer comment:*

All flats will be dual aspect and all habitable rooms will have access to windows. Officers therefore consider the proposal to acceptable quality of accommodation as a habitable room will have access to adequate natural light.

**A.2 (1) (g) Criteria**

**Consideration of the impact on the amenity of the existing building and any adjoining premises including overlooking, privacy and the loss of light:**

*Is the proposed development neighbourly with respect to overlooking and privacy issues?*

**NO**

*Is the proposed development neighbourly with respect to maintaining adequate levels of light?*

**NO**

\_\_\_\_\_ address    address    address

\_\_\_\_\_ address    address    address

	119-139 Victoria Road	Existing Flats, The Sienna Building	94-114 Victoria Road
<b>Overlooking and Privacy:</b>			
Harm to habitable rooms?	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
<i>Is it unacceptable?</i>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
Harm to private amenity (gardens)?	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
<i>Is it unacceptable?</i>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>

	119-139 Victoria Road	Existing Flats, The Sienna Building	94-114 Victoria Road
<b>Loss of Light and Overshadowing:</b>			
Harmful loss of light or overshadowing to habitable rooms?	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
<i>Is it unacceptable?</i>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
Harmful loss of light or overshadowing to private amenity (gardens)?	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
<i>Is it unacceptable?</i>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>

<b>Officer comment:</b>	<p>The proposal seeks permission for the construction of an additional storey to create 4 new flats to accommodate 12 additional people. The existing building contains 14 one and two bedroom flats as such given the size and number of proposed flats officers do not consider the proposal to result in the generation of noise, waste, comings and goings or general disturbances than currently produced on site.</p> <p>In addition, a daylight and sunlight assessment was submitted alongside this application which assessed the impact the proposal will have on the amount of light received by neighbouring properties. In line with BRE guidance this study contains two tests which measure diffuse daylight.</p> <p><u>Test 1: Vertical Sky Component (VSC)</u> VSC is defined by BRE as the measure of available skylight. This is a measure of the amount of diffuse daylight reaching a window. Diffuse daylight will be adversely affected if the after a development the VSC is both less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value.</p> <p><u>Test 2: Daylight Distribution</u> This is defined by BRE as the distribution of daylight within a room. Daylight may be adversely affected if after the development the amount of working plane in a room which can received direct daylight is reduces to less than 0.8 times its former value.</p> <p>Additional assessments were carried out to assess the following matters:</p> <p><u>Sunlight availability to Windows</u> This is defined by BRE as the sunlight availability to windows. All main windows facing 90 degrees due south have been tested. Sunlight availability may be adversely affected if the window receives less than 25% of the total annual sunlight hours or less than 5% of sunlight hours in the winter months.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing to Gardens and Open Spaces</u></p> <p>The proposals impact on neighbouring amenity is assessed below:</p> <p><b>Existing Flats, 116-118 Victoria Road</b></p> <p>The proposal seeks to construct an additional storey to create 4 new units. This will sit directly above the existing 3<sup>rd</sup> storey, as such, officers are confident that the proposal will</p>
-----------------------------	---



not result in the material loss of daylight, outlook, or privacy to the existing residents of the Sienna Building, 116-118 Victoria Road.

### 94-114 Victoria Road

These properties form the residential terrace row which sit east of the application site. This daylight and sunlight assessment concludes that the “proposed development will have a low impact on the light receivable by its neighbouring properties”.

Notwithstanding, officers have looked at the study and found the VSC after the development will be greater than 27% and greater than 0.8 times its former value as such the proposal will have an acceptable impact on daylight diffuse. Likewise, the amount of direct daylight received after the proposal will be greater than 0.8 times its former and sunlight availability to windows will not be reduced after the proposal by 25% of total annual sunlight hour or 5% of sunlight hours in winter months. Officers are therefore confident that these neighbouring properties will continue receiving acceptable levels of direct daylight and sunlight to windows.

In addition, this study shows the proposal will result in minimal levels of overshadowing across the rear gardens of these properties whereby with the addition of the additional storey the majority of the rear gardens at no’s 114, 112 and 110 will continue to receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on the 21 March. Further, the proposal will offset the eastern elevation by 1.50 metres. This external area will not be accessible by resident and be for maintenance use only, hence, the proposal is not considered to result in overlooking. Overall, officers are confident the proposal will not result in the material loss of daylight, outlook or privacy.

### 119- 139 Victoria Road

These properties form the terrace row which sit directly opposite the application site on Victoria Road. These properties sit 12.0 metres north of the application property. The daylight and sunlight assessment concludes that the “proposed development will have a low impact on the light receivable by its neighbouring properties”.

Notwithstanding, officers have looked at the study and found the VSC after the development will be greater than 27% and greater than 0.8 times its former value as such the proposal will have an acceptable impact on daylight diffuse. Likewise, the amount of direct daylight received after the proposal will be greater than 0.8 times its former and sunlight availability to windows will not be reduced after the proposal by 25% of total annual sunlight hour or 5% of sunlight hours in winter months.

Nevertheless, officers want to draw attention to the daylight distribution received by nos. 121 and nos. 119 after the development. Nos. 121 will experience a 18% loss in daylight distribution to their lounge and 119 will experience a 12% loss in daylight distribution to a non-habitable ground floor room and 15% loss in daylight distribution to a ground floor bedroom. Whilst officers acknowledge that the percentage lost to the daylight distribution to nos. 119 and 121 are higher than the properties which sit adjacent to them. They note that the loss of daylight distribution after the proposal for these properties will be no less than 0.8 times its former value.

The table shows the daylight distribution calculations for these properties:

Refence	Daylight Distribution		
	Before Development	0.8 times former value	After Development
<b>119 Victoria Road</b>			
(GF) Windows 45 to 49	59.0%	47%	47%

(GF) Windows 50 to 52	78%	62%	63%
<b>121 Victoria Road</b>			
(GF) Window 60	88%	70%	70%

Therefore, it the evident shows that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the amount of direct daylight received by these rooms. Overall, officers consider the proposal to have an acceptable impact on the level of overshadowing and acceptable impact on the daylight and sunlight received by neighbouring properties.

Further, the additional storey will offset the northern elevation by 1.50 metres. This will not be accessible by resident, as such, officers are confident the proposal will not result in overlooking or the material loss of privacy.

Officers are confident that nos. 119-139 will continue receiving acceptable levels of direct daylight and sunlight to windows. Likewise, the proposal is not considered to result in any unacceptable loss of privacy or outlook.

### **Railway**

The site is bounded by railway lines to the north and west. TFL Spatial Planning and TFL Railway Infrastructure Management were consulted and were satisfied that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on nearby infrastructure. Officers therefore consider the proposal to be acceptable.

### **Neighbour Objections**

A number of neighbour objections have been received which officers will address below.

Concerns were raised with regard to the proposal appearing out of place and out of character with the existing building and the rest of the street. This matter is addressed above where officers have assessed the Class A.2 (1) (e) Criteria.

Concerns were raised regarding the impact on neighbouring amenity and the proposal resulting in the loss of daylight, outlook and privacy to neighbouring residents. This matter has been addressed above.

Concerns were raised with regard to transport, traffic, and parking. This matter is addressed above where officers have assessed the Class A.2 (1) (a) Criteria.

Further concerns were raised regarding the devaluing of the property, maintenance, the presence of Japanese knotweed, cycle storage and waste storage. Officers note that the proposal includes extending the existing cycle storage and waste storage provision to accommodate the new flats. Notwithstanding, whilst officers welcome these matters, their provision does not form part of the assessment for prior approval: new dwelling houses on detached blocks of flats. Therefore, these matter cannot warrant a reason for refusal. Likewise, whilst officer appreciate concerns raised regarding the devaluing of the property, maintenance, and Japanese Knotweed these are not material planning considerations, as such, they hold no material weight.

Finally, concerns were raised with regard to fire safety and disruption during construction. Officers note that the proposed works must comply with building regulations, as such, they are satisfied that the proposal will not pose a greater fire risk. Equally, whilst officers accept that the construction of the proposal will result in more noise and general disruptions these will only be short term disturbances, as such, they are considered to be acceptable.

Overall, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of the existing building and the adjoining premises.



**Conclusions:**

Having regard to the proposed development and further to the assessment above, Prior Approval for an 'new dwelling houses on detached blocks of flats' is required and granted subject to the imposition of conditions.

**Appendix 1****Additional Reference:***Human Rights Act*

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.

*Equalities*

In determining this planning application, the BeFirst on behalf of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham has regard to its equalities 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.

**Appendix 2:****Relevant Planning History:**

<i>Application Number:</i>	20/02265/PRIFLAT	<i>Status:</i>	Prior Approval Refused
<i>Description:</i>	Prior notification application for the construction of new dwelling houses on detached blocks of flats. The proposed development involves the construction of two additional storeys on top of the detached block of flats to create 8 new units.		
<i>Application Number:</i>	04/01130/FUL	<i>Status:</i>	Application Permitted
<i>Description:</i>	Erection of three storey building comprising 14 one and two bedroom flats together with associated access road and car parking		

### Appendix 3:

The following consultations have been undertaken:

- Environmental Protection Officer
- Urban Design Officer
- Transport Development Officer
- Access Officer
- Environmental Agency
- TFL Spatial Planning
- TFL Railway Infrastructure Manager

Summary of Consultation responses:		
Consultee and date received	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments
Environmental Protection Officer dated 26.01.2021	If the LPA is minded to grant this application permission it is advised that a condition relating to the scheme of acoustic protection and construction environmental management and site waste management are submitted to the LPA.	The environmental protection officer has recommended standard planning conditions to be used in planning application. Given this application is a prior approval application standard planning conditions are not required, therefore these recommended conditions have not been included.
Urban Design Dated 19.01.2021	<p>In terms of scale and massing the proposals are similar to what has previously been presented at pre-app (20/01011/PRE) and we should be consistent with the response letter. One additional storey is on balance considered acceptable given that the additional storey will be set back at roof level.</p> <p>The proposals are an improvement on the previous application (20/02265/PRIFLAT) which was not acceptable. In terms of appearance the proposed materials comply with previous guidance provided.</p> <p>The extent of any additional overshadowing/loss of light for neighbouring properties should be considered.</p> <p>In terms of the internal plans/dwelling mix I would question the suitability of rooftop accommodation for 2 family sized units particularly where no amenity space is provided.</p>	These matters are assessed in Paragraph G.
Transport Development Manager dated 14.01.2021	<p><b>Highway Planning Observations</b> The current Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating has been determined at 2.</p> <p><b>Site Access</b> Access is to remain as existing. We have no objections to this.</p> <p><b>Car Parking:</b></p>	These matters are addressed in Paragraph G.

	<p>The applicant has proposed that this proposal is car free. As Victoria Road is within a Controlled Parking Zone, a condition should be attached to any permission granted that ensures this development is car free with new residents being restricted from applying for car parking permits.</p> <p><b>Cycle Parking:</b> No cycle parking has been proposed. As there is limited space with this application, we understand that adding in cycle parking is difficult. On this occasion, we have no objections.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b> Based on the information provided it is our considered view that there is no apparent adverse highway safety issue or any substantial reason to object.</p>	
Access Officer dated 08.01.2021	I am happy with these plans.	This matter does not require assessment as such this has not been addressed above.
Environmental Agency dated 07.01.2021	Low environmental risk as such no comments have been provided.	This matter has been addressed in Paragraph G.
TFL Spatial Planning Dated 13.01.2021	No strategic comments to make on this planning application	This matter has been addressed in Paragraph G.
TFL Railway Infrastructure Manager dated 11.01.2021	<p>Though we have no objection in principle to the above planning application there are a number of potential constraints on the redevelopment of a site situated close to London Underground infrastructure.</p> <p>Therefore we request that the grant of planning permission be subject to conditions to secure the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide details on the use of tall plant, cranes and scaffolding</li> <li>• demonstrate that there will at no time be any potential security risk to our railway, property or structures</li> </ul> <p>This site is also adjacent to Network Rail assets. Please contact them directly to query what affect, if any, the proposals will have on their railway.</p> <p>This response is made as TfL Railway Infrastructure Manager under the "Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015". It therefore relates only to railway engineering and safety matters. Other parts of TfL may have other comments in line with their own statutory responsibilities.</p>	Standard planning conditions have been recommended. Given this application is a prior approval application standard planning conditions are not required, therefore these recommended conditions have not been included. Notwithstanding, matters relating to the impact on the railway are addressed in Paragraph G.

#### Appendix 4:

Neighbour Notification:	
Date neighbours consulted:	06.01.2021
Number of neighbouring properties consulted:	109
Number of responses:	7+ <i>Petition</i>
Address:	Summary of response:
<i>Flat 6, 116 Victoria Road</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional storey will add visual bulk, appear overbearing and will destroy the current balanced symmetry with the rest of the road.</li> <li>• Result in overshadowing and create a visual eye sore.</li> <li>• Proposal has a stacked and unneighbourly look.</li> <li>• Reduction in light for residents</li> <li>• Unsafe reduction in parking space</li> <li>• Noise pollution</li> </ul>
121 Victoria Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of privacy and overlooking.</li> <li>• Lose direct light.</li> <li>• Parking and traffic</li> </ul>
123 Victoria Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of privacy and overlooking.</li> <li>• Loss of light</li> <li>• Parking and traffic</li> </ul>
Flat 3, 116 Victoria Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out of character with the street scene</li> <li>• Loss of privacy</li> <li>• Loss of light</li> <li>• Parking and traffic</li> <li>• Waste Storage</li> <li>• Materials</li> <li>• Disruption caused by 4 new flats and up to 12 new residents.</li> </ul>
127 Victoria Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of privacy and overlooking.</li> <li>• Loss of light and increase levels of overshadowing.</li> <li>• Parking</li> <li>• Noise from construction</li> </ul>
Flat 8, 116 Victoria Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Devaluing the property</li> <li>• Cracks on the existing building</li> <li>• Japanese Knotweed</li> <li>• Maintenance and fire risk of wooden cladding</li> <li>• Parking</li> <li>• Noise</li> <li>• Loss of light</li> </ul>
108 Victoria Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of privacy</li> <li>• Security and privacy</li> <li>• Parking, waste collection and other services</li> <li>• Out of character</li> </ul>
129 Victoria Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of privacy</li> <li>• Loss of light</li> <li>• Parking</li> <li>• Fly-tipping and vermin</li> </ul>

Petition Signed by 29 residents

- Parking
- Light
- Privacy
- Overlooking
- Waste and cycle storage
- Fire Safety
- Out of character
- Disruption during construction

**Officer Summary:**

Officers note receipt of the objections listed above. The material planning considerations are addressed within the planning assessment.

**Appendix 5:**

**Conditions**

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

*Reason: To comply with the requirements of Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A Condition A.2 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended by The Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development and Miscellaneous Amendments)(England)(Coronavirus) Regulations 2020 and The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 2020)*

2. The development hereby approved shall only be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

- 1244.16.001 Site Plan Dated November 2020
- 1244.16.002 Block Plan [Issue AA] Dated November 2020
- 1244.16-211 Proposed Elevations Dated December 2020
- 1244.160-101 Proposed Ground Floor Plan [Revision 2] Dated November 2020
- 1244.160-105 Proposed Third Floor Plan [Revision 1] Dated December 2020

No other drawings or documents apply.

*Reason: To ensure that the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved drawing(s) and document(s), to ensure that the finished appearance of the development will enhance the character and visual amenities of the area and to satisfactorily protect the residential amenities of nearby occupiers.*

3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

*Reason: To ensure that the finished appearance of the development will respect the character and visual amenities of the local area.*

4. Before beginning the development, the developer must provide the local planning authority with a report for the management of the construction of the development, which sets out the proposed development hours of operation and how any adverse impact of noise, dust, vibration and traffic on adjoining owners or occupiers will be mitigated.

*Reason: To comply with the requirements of Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A Condition A.2 (3) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended by The*

*Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development and Miscellaneous Amendments)(England)(Coronavirus) Regulations 2020 and The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 2020).*

5. On the completion of the development or as soon as reasonably practicable after completion, the developer must provide notification to the local planning authority confirming:

- (i) the name of the developer,
- (ii) the address of the dwelling house, and
- (iii) the date of completion.

*Reason: To comply with the requirements of Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A Condition A.2 (4) and (5) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended by The Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development and Miscellaneous Amendments)(England)(Coronavirus) Regulations 2020 and The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 2020).*

6. Any new dwelling house created under Class A is to remain in use as a dwelling house within the meaning of Class C3 of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order and for no other purpose, except to the extent that the other purpose is ancillary to the primary use as a dwelling house.

*Reason: To comply with the requirements of Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A Condition A.2 (6) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended by The Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development and Miscellaneous Amendments)(England)(Coronavirus) Regulations 2020 and The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 2020).*