

<b>Woolwich and Thamesmead Area Planning Committee 12 November 2020</b>	<b>Agenda Item: 5 Reference No: 20/0053/F</b>
---	---

**Applicant:** Mr Ali

**Agent:** Mr Ward, Studio Werc Ltd

<b>Site Address:</b> 56 St Nicholas Road, Plumstead, London, SE18 1HH	<b>Ward:</b> Plumstead <b>Application Type:</b> Full Planning Permission
---	---

## **I. Recommendation**

1.1 The Committee is requested to grant full planning permission as outlined below:

- Conversion of the existing dwelling house (Use Class C3) into a 7person HMO (sui generis) with associated external alterations at ground floor level to include replacement windows with bi-folding doors.

Subject to:

- i. To resolve to grant conditional planning permission according to the conditions in appendix 2, to be detailed in the notice of determination; and
- ii. To Authorise the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to make any minor change to the detailed working of the recommended conditions, as set out in the report and its addendums, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

## **2 Summary**

2.1 Detailed below is a summary of the application:

<b>The Site -</b>	
Site Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	147m <sup>2</sup>

Local Plan Allocation	Opposite Community Open Space
Heritage Assets	Plumstead Common Conservation Area
Tree Preservation Order	None
Flood Risk Zone	Not in a Flood Zone

<b>Existing &amp; Proposed Building (no change)</b>	
Building height (metres)	9.34m
No. of storeys	2
Floor area (m <sup>2</sup> )	104.26

<b>Transportation</b>		
Car Parking	No. existing car parking spaces	0
	No. Proposed Car Parking Spaces	0
	Proposed Parking Ratio	N/A
Cycle Parking	No. Proposed Cycle Parking	Not Detailed
	Complies with policy	Unable to Determine
Public Transport	PTAL Rating	2 (Below Average Accessibility to public transport)

<b>Public Consultation</b>	
Number in Support	None
Number of objections	One from Positive Plumstead
Main issues raised (addressed in section 6.4 of this report)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern that a residential property is not suitable for conversion to a HMO with a maximum of 7 Persons</li> <li>- Concern that details of waste and parking have not been provided as part of the submissions.</li> </ul>

- 2.2 Whilst this application has only received one objection, it has been called before committee by Councillor Cornforth, for members to decide as she has concerns with the proposal. However, has not at this time set out what the concerns are.
- 2.3 The report details all relevant national, regional and local policy implications of the scheme, including supplementary planning guidance.
- 2.4 The application is considered to be acceptable and is recommended for approval subject to that set out in section 1.1 above.
- 2.5 Officers understand following discussions with the planning agent that the physical changes relating to the proposal have been completed, making this application part-retrospective. The planning agent has made clear that at the time of the committee hearing, the premises is still in use as a C3 residential property. Photographs of the external and internal completed works have been provided.

### **Site Plan**



### **3 Site and Surroundings**

- 3.1 The application site is 56 St Nicholas Road, Plumstead, London, SE18 1HH.

- 3.2 The application site comprises a two-storey terrace dwelling, and is located on the western side of St Nicholas Road.
- 3.3 The surrounding area is residential in character and the property in question is part of a wider development erected in the late 20<sup>th</sup> Century, featuring a consistent typology throughout. Like the other properties in this area, the house was originally constructed to feature a stepped appearance, with a twostorey rear outrigger extension that exists as an original feature.
- 3.4 It is understood that the property existed as a C3 Residential Unit with three (3) bedrooms at the time of application.
- 3.5 St Nicholas Gardens, which is designated as Community Open Space in the Royal Greenwich Local Plan, exists opposite the application site to the east.
- 3.6 The property falls within the Plumstead Common Conservation Area.
- 3.7 The property is not a statutory listed or locally listed building.
- 3.8 The property does not currently include any off-street parking. The application site has a PTAL rating of 2, suggesting below average connectivity to public transport links.

#### **4. Relevant Planning History**

- 4.1 There is no relevant planning history.
- 4.2 Officers understand following discussions with the planning agent that the physical changes relating to the proposal have been completed, making this application part-retrospective. The planning agent has made clear that at the time of the committee hearing, the premises is still in use as a C3 residential property. Photographs of the external and internal completed works, as well as an ongoing single tenancy agreement (ending in May 2021), have been provided.
- 4.3 Officers acknowledge that since reception of the application, an enforcement case was opened on the 2nd June 2020 in relation to the site being in use as a 5-bedroom HMO. It is understood that enforcement action is currently paused whilst this application is under assessment.

## 5. Proposals (in detail)

5.1 The current application seeks full planning permission for the following:

*“Conversion of the existing dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) into a 7 person HMO (sui generis) with associated external alterations at ground floor level to include replacement windows with bi-folding doors. Re-Consultation with Amended Description (Physical Changes Retrospective)”*

5.2 The proposed new HMO would have 5 bedrooms, with a maximum capacity of seven persons. The layout of the proposed HMO is described below:

Ground Floor:

- Communal Hallway
- Bedroom 01, 1 Persons, (11.7sqm, 14.04sqm inc ensuite)
- Bedroom 02, 1 Persons, (9.3sqm, 11.48sqm inc ensuite)
- Under Stairs Storage
- Communal Kitchen/ Dining Space (14.54sqm)

First Floor:

- Communal Hallway
- Bedroom 03, 2 Persons, (15.43sqm, 17.71sqm inc ensuite)
- Bedroom 04, 1 Persons, (10.25sqm, 12.36sqm inc ensuite)
- Bedroom 05, 2 Persons, (12.1sqm, 14.33sqm inc ensuite)

5.3 Officers acknowledge that on the submitted drawings, Bedrooms 03 and 05 are described as single occupancy bedrooms despite the rooms being large enough to be double occupancy under the limitations set out in the Royal Greenwich HMO Standards.

5.4 Officers concede that in planning terms, where proposed rooms for HMO's meet the minimum size requirements for double rooms, they should be assessed as such.

5.5 This interpretation reflects the findings of the Inspector in the relevant similar Appeal Ref: APP/H2265/W/16/3165882 (decision date 24 May 2017) where paragraphs 5 and 6 state the following:

*“The proposal includes 3 bedrooms that are shown on the plans as providing a double bed and would therefore be suitable for double occupancy, in addition to 4 bedrooms shown as providing single beds. However, I also note that all but one of the bedrooms showing single beds is comparable in size to those with a double and could be used as such. The appellant suggests that occupancy would be for between 7-10 persons but I share the Council’s concerns that this could be greater and for the above reasons there is potential for 10-13 occupants in 7 lettable rooms.”*

- 5.6 The submissions also include plans to replace the ground floor window on the rear elevation with a set of bi-folding doors that would serve the new kitchen/ dining space to be shared by occupants.
- 5.7 The proposal similarly brings forwards plans to infill the existing ground floor side door on the rear outrigger element that exists as an original feature. Officers note that these works had been undertaken at the time of a site visit on the 16<sup>th</sup> of March 2019, although they do alone fall within the limitations of the Permitted Development Order (Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A), which the site had benefit of at the time of the submission of the application.
- 5.8 No changes are proposed to the front elevation of the property, and as such front elevations are not brought forward in the submitted drawing pack.

## **6. Consultation**

- 6.1 The application since being submitted in February 2020 has been subject of public consultation, comprising of a press notice, site notice and seven (7) individual letters, sent to individual occupiers in the vicinity of the application site. This also included consultation with local amenity groups.
- 6.2 To better represent the proposal as it is assessed as a Larger HMO (Sui Generis Use Class) with a maximum capacity of 7 Persons, re-consultation took place during the assessment period with new neighbour letters, press notice and site notices.
- 6.3 No responses from any neighbours or other members of the public were received, though a response from Positive Plumstead Group was received.

#### 6.4 *Responses from Amenity Groups:*

<b>Details of Representation and date received</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Officers comments</b>
<b>Positive Plumstead:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern that a 7 Person HMO is not a suitable housing provision on a terraced street for family homes</li>   <li>- Concern that parking and rubbish collection arrangements have not</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The principle of a HMO is discussed in the “principle of development” section below (Section 9)</li>   <li>- The application form states that parking arrangements are not relevant for this</li> </ul>
	<p>been provided as part of the application</p>	<p>proposal (they remain unchanged from the original situation). Parking is addressed in section 13 of this report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Details of waste and refuse collection are proposed to be secured via a condition attached to the decision notice.</li> </ul>

#### 6.5 *Councillors*

6.5.1 As noted in section 2.2 of the report, this has been called before committee by Councillor Cornforth, for members to decide as she has concerns with the proposal.

6.5.2 Councillor Cornforth has not at this time set out what the concerns are. However, all planning considerations are set out within the following sections of this report.

## 6.6 Responses from Council Departments

6.6.1 A summary of the consultation responses received along with the officer comments are set out in table below:

<b>Details of Representation and date received</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Officers comments</b>
<b>Transport and Highways:</b>	<i>“No Highway Objection”</i>	The transport and highways impact of the proposal is assessed in section 13 below.
<b>Waste Services:</b>	<i>“The proposal should allow space for 5 x 240L wheeled bins (2 for general waste, 2 for mixed dry recycling and 1 for organic waste).”</i>	These details are proposed to be provided via a condition attached to the decision notice.
<b>Environmental Protection:</b>	<i>“My team do not have any objections to the proposals, however, a licence is required for such a HMO and my colleagues in Environmental Health may make representations on this aspect separately”</i>	The noise and other neighbouring amenity related aspects of this proposal are assessed in section 12 below.
<b>Conservation:</b>	<p><i>“No.56 St Nicholas Road is an unlisted building within the Plumstead Common Conservation Area;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• The proposed alterations to the property comprise the bricking-up of an existing door opening and the replacement of an existing window with bifold aluminium doors;</i></li> </ul>	As the submissions do not bring forward any changes to the front elevation, it is considered that there is no impact on the character of the wider conservation area. This is further discussed in section 10 below.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>The proposed alterations are located at the rear of the property and will not be seen from the wider public domain;</i></li><li>• <i>The proposal to block the existing door from the rear outrigger will cause no harm;</i></li><li>• <i>The existing ground floor window at the end of the outrigger, given its proportions and design, appears to be a modern replacement and the proposal to form a double-door opening here will have negligible impact. However, aluminium bi-fold doors are not a traditional solution and introduce an unsympathetic element to the conservation area, and it would be preferable for traditional, side-hung timber-framed doors to be used.</i></li></ul> <p><i>Notwithstanding the proposed use of uncharacteristic aluminium bi-fold doors, the proposals will cause negligible harm to the building itself and, in this instance, will not be seen from the wider conservation area so will cause no harm to its character and appearance.</i></p>	
--	---	--

	<i>Approval of the application is therefore supported.”</i>	
<b>HMO Licensing:</b>	<p><i>“There is no HMO licence granted for this address and no application has been received in as well.”</i></p> <p><i>“The first attached doc says they want it as a 5 bedroomed HMO with 5 people - if that hasn't changed and it is one person per room then only one set of kitchen facilities would be needed. with 5 people it would be arguable they have adequate dining space, we would allow smaller room sizes with adequate dining space.</i></p> <p><i>If it is more than 5 people I would say the extra facilities needed would mean the dining space was inadequate and would want to know the floor area excluding shower of some of the smaller rooms to see if it fits our requirements of 9m2 per room for a single and 12m2 per double</i></p> <p><i>When we look at room sizes we ignore the space taken up by the shower/bathroom in the room.</i></p>	<p>The document described is the original Design and Access Statement, which was superseded following re-consultation of the application to reflect how a number of the rooms had capacity to be a two person bedroom. The application is therefore for a seven person HMO.</p> <p>Relevant room sizes have been measured and are all in accordance with the requirements set out in the Councils HMO Standards. These measurements do not include the ensuite bathrooms, and so despite how the dining space in the kitchen is considered to be inadequate, the additional space in the bedrooms is considered to provide this amenity space for dining.</p>

	<p><i>In cases when "discretionary" requirements aren't met, ie our more generous standards when compared with prescribed national minimums we can use discretion if rooms come close to meeting them or if we take into account amenities in a property as a whole. The prescribed minimum is only 6.5 1m2 for a single adult.</i></p> <p><i>This would definitely go through as a 5 unit HMO with 5 singles. Even if they swapped 2 of the bigger rooms for doubles we would possibly exercise discretion and allow it but would insist on the specified kitchen amenities being provided."</i></p>	<p>Any planning drawings showing amenities are purely indicative at this stage – it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in planning terms and any outstanding issues relating to the positioning and provision of amenities within the spaces proposed should be further considered at licencing stage.</p>
<b>Parks and Open Spaces:</b>	No response received.	As the submissions do not bring forward any changes to the front
		elevation, it is considered that there is no impact on the character of the Community Open Space Opposite. This is further discussed in section 10 below.

## 7. Planning Context

- 7.1 This application needs to be considered in the context of a range of national, regional and local planning policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents.

- **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF – 2012)**
  - Chapter 5 – Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes
  - Chapter 9 – Promoting Sustainable Transport
  - Chapter 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places
- **The London Plan (March 2016)**
- **The Intend to Publish London Plan (December 2019)** (Intend to Publish LP)– The Intend to Publish version has reached an advanced stage in the adoption process and save for those areas where the Secretary of State has directed modifications the policies in the Intend to Publish version are considered to have substantial weight as a material consideration in the determining of planning applications.
- **The Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (“Core Strategy” – 2014)**
- **Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance SPD (Dec 2018) (SPD)**
- **Royal Borough of Greenwich Standards for Houses in Multiple Occupation (Standards for HMOs)**
- **New Developments: Guidance Notes for the storage and collection of waste and recycling materials for the Royal Borough of Greenwich (May 2018)**

7.2 For full details relevant policies, SPDs and other documents, refer to Appendix 3.

## **8. Material Planning Considerations**

8.1 This section of the report provides an analysis of the specific aspects of the proposed development and the principal issues that need to be considered in the determination of the planning application (Ref: 20/0053/F):

- Principle of development;
- Design, Heritage and Conservation

- Quality of living environment provided for future residents;
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Transport and Access
- Cycle Parking
- Waste and Refuse Storage
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL);
- RBG CIL;

## 9. **Principle of Development**

- 9.1 The overriding objective of the Royal Greenwich policy framework is to deliver high quality development which improves the quality and distinctive identity of places and contributes to their success and the area's popularity as somewhere to live, work and stay.
- 9.2 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan sets out that borough's should ensure that there is a range of housing choices available for its residents, in terms of a mix of housing sizes and types, to reflect the housing requirements of different groups.
- 9.3 Policy H2 of the Core Strategy promotes a mix of housing types and sizes, varying according to the location of the development and the character of the surrounding area. Other relevant considerations include; the level of accessibility to public transport, schemes for special needs groups, or where there is a poor external environment.
- 9.4 It is important to note that the Council's Core Strategy does not include any policies which protect the loss of family sized accommodation in relation to the conversion of single family dwellinghouses into HMO accommodation. Further, the minor internal works related to the change of use would not prevent the residential accommodation being converted back into a single C3 dwelling in the future if desired. As such, the loss of the existing accommodation, in order to convert the property is considered acceptable.
- 9.5 In respect of the suitability of the proposed HMO, the Council's SPD states:

*“It is important that the Royal Borough supports a range of homes in terms of size and tenure in order to meet a variety of housing need. HMOs that are of a good standard form an important part of the provision of lower cost housing. However, the unmanaged conversion of family housing stock to HMOs can undermine the Royal*

*Borough's objective to meet these varying needs and make it difficult to achieve mixed and balanced communities as set out in the Core Strategy.”*

- 9.6 It is therefore evident that HMOs have been identified as providing suitable residential accommodation, which will be supported by the Council subject to other material considerations including the quality of the internal living environment.
- 9.7 In relation to over concentration of HMO's, no applicable planning policy restricts the amount of HMO's within a specific area.
- 9.8 On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered acceptable in principle, subject to the provision of an acceptable quality of accommodation for its occupants. This is discussed elsewhere within this report.

## **10. Design, Heritage and Conservation**

- 10.1 Section 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 states that “special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.”
- 10.2 Chapter 16 of the NPPF also makes it clear that when considering planning applications, local authorities should give great weight to a heritage assets conservation. Where a development proposal leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (in this instance, the Plumstead Common Conservation Area), this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
- 10.3 Policy 7.8 of the London Plan states that development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.
- 10.4 Policies DH3 and DH(h) of the Core Strategy set out that development should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Greenwich's Conservation Areas.
- 10.5 Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan state that development should provide a high quality design response having regard to the form, function, and structure of an area, place or street and the scale, mass and orientation of

surrounding buildings. Architecture should make a positive contribution to a coherent public realm, streetscape and wider cityscape. It should incorporate the highest quality materials and design appropriate to its context.

- 10.6 Policy DHI of the Core Strategy requires all developments to be of a high quality of design and demonstrate that they positively contribute to the improvement of both the built and natural environments.
- 10.7 No changes are proposed to be implemented to the front of the application property, and so the impact on the character and appearance of the wider conservation area and community open space opposite is considered to be acceptable in this instance.
- 10.8 The only proposed external alterations to the proposal is the replacement of the ground floor rear outrigger window with a set of bi-folding doors and the infilling of the existing side door of the outrigger element on the ground floor.
- 10.9 Given these changes extremely small scale, and positioning at the rear of the property away from the public realm and wider conservation area, it is considered that these aspects of the proposal would not result in a significantly detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the application property, wider surrounding area, and conservation area.
- 10.10 The proposed development is therefore considered to be generally in accordance with Policies 3.5, 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), as well as Policy DHI, DH(a), DH3, DH(h), of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies.

## **11. Quality of Living Environment provided for future residents**

- 11.1 The Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements, and Conversions Guidance SPD (2018), and includes new standards for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs). The SPD seeks to secure a quality internal living environment for new HMOs. It states:

*“The quality of accommodation provided by HMOs can be poor and can give rise to concern. To be considered good quality, proposals for the conversion to an HMO will need to:*

- *provide sufficient internal space*
- *provide occupants with a reasonable standard of amenity*

- *not give rise to significant adverse amenity impacts to the surrounding properties/residential neighbourhood”*

11.2 Policy H5 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan seeks that new residential development, redevelopment, refurbishment or conversions will be expected to achieve a high quality of housing design and an integrated environment.

11.3 This is supported by London Plan Policy 3.5 which states that housing developments should be of the highest quality internally, externally, and in relation to their context and to the wider environment.

11.4 The proposed new HMO would have 5 bedrooms, with a maximum capacity of seven persons. The layout of the proposed HMO is described below:

Ground Floor:

- Communal Hallway
- Bedroom 01, 1 Persons, (11.7sqm, 14.04sqm inc ensuite)
- Bedroom 02, 1 Persons, (9.3sqm, 11.48sqm inc ensuite)
- Under Stairs Storage
- Communal Kitchen/ Dining Space (14.54sqm) First Floor:
- Communal Hallway
- Bedroom 03, 2 Persons, (15.43sqm, 17.71sqm inc ensuite)
- Bedroom 04, 1 Persons, (10.25sqm, 12.36sqm inc ensuite) -  
Bedroom 05, 2 Persons, (12.1sqm, 14.33sqm inc ensuite)

Bedroom Sizes

11.5 Bedroom sizes are assessed against Table 1 – Minimum room sizes, where kitchen facilities are in a separate room within the Royal Borough of Greenwich Standards for HMOs. Whilst it is noted that Table 3 within this document provides minimum bedroom standards for where there is separate kitchen facilities and a lounge/dining room, given that in this proposal the lounge room is not separate, but takes up a large proportion of the kitchen area, it is considered that the bedroom standards within Table 1 are applicable.

Bedrooms				
Bedroom	Proposed Occupancy	Size (sqm)	Standard (sqm)	Complies?
1	1	11.71	9	Yes
2	1	9.3	9	Yes
3	2	15.43	12	Yes
4	1	10.25	9	Yes
5	2	12.1	12	Yes

11.6 All of the proposed bedrooms brought forward comply with the relevant floor space requirements. This aspect of the proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Kitchen Provision

11.7 The Royal Borough of Greenwich Standards for HMOs also gives recommendations on the size of provided kitchen facilities:

*“Where exclusive kitchen facilities cannot be provided, one set of kitchen facilities shall be provided for every 5 occupants. [...] The kitchen size and layout must enable the practical, safe & hygienic use of the kitchen for storage, preparation and cooking of food.”*

11.8 The HMO Standards also state that:

*“It is preferable for a kitchen to contain only one set of facilities, however, if a kitchen is large enough, 2 sets of facilities may installed in the same kitchen for up to a maximum of 10 users. A kitchen for 10 users shall be a minimum of 14.5 square metres in area.”*

11.9 As a proposed seven (7) person HMO, two (2) sets of kitchen facilities are required to be provided.

11.10 With a size of 14.54sqm, the kitchen would comfortably meet the required minimum kitchen requirement for seven persons as per Table 5 of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Standards for HMO’s (the minimum requirement set out in Table 5 is 11.5sqm).

11.11 Examining how comfortably the proposal meets the relevant kitchen requirements, it is considered that the proposed HMO could provide the two sets of kitchen facilities required by the HMO standards as well as the small communal dining region that it brings forward in the submissions.

11.12 With reference to the above, it is considered that the proposal would be acceptable in relation to the relevant kitchen provision.

#### Bathroom Provision

11.13 The RBG Standard for Houses in Multiple Occupation (2017) provide guidance as to the required bathroom provision for HMO's:

*“Where exclusive bathroom/shower room and toilet facilities cannot be provided, bath or shower rooms, and toilets with a wash hand basin shall be provided for every 5 persons, one bathroom or shower room, and the WC and wash hand basin, one toilet with a wash hand basin shall be provided in a room separate to the bath/shower room”*

11.14 All proposed rooms would have access would have their own ensuite bathrooms.

11.15 This aspect of the proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable.

#### Outdoor Amenity Space

11.16 The proposed HMO would reuse the existing garden space to provide a total of 77.63sqm of external amenity space in the rear garden.

11.17 This space is considered to be appropriate for the number of users, although there is not a standard. Officers also note the easy accessibility of the community open space directly opposite the application site as a further provision of outdoor amenity space to residents.

11.18 Given the above, the provisions set out in the submissions are considered to be acceptable.

### Other Internal Amenity Factors

- 11.19 The RBG HMO Standards state that it is expected that all rooms will have a minimum ceiling height of 2.1m over at least half the floor area.
- 11.20 The section drawings provided as part of the submissions suggest that the proposed HMO would be in accordance with this requirement, providing an average of 2.8m floorspace heights over the entirety of the development.
- 11.21 The proposed HMO as a whole would be dual aspect. Habitable windows would serve every bedroom and living space, with all of these spaces having a reasonable outlook and receiving direct sunlight for part of the day.
- 11.22 Given the positioning of neighbouring habitable opening and amenity spaces, none of the proposed bedrooms brought forward in this application would be subject to any significant privacy or overlooking related impacts from neighbouring properties. These aspects of the proposal are therefore considered to be acceptable.

### Conclusion

- 11.23 The proposed development would provide an acceptable level of internal amenity and would therefore provide an adequate quality of accommodation for future residents.
- 11.24 As such, these aspects of the proposal are considered to be compliant with Policy 3.5 of The London Plan (2016), Policy H5 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan (2014), the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions SPD (December 2018), and the Royal Borough of Greenwich Standards for Houses in Multiple Occupation (April 2017).

## **12 Impact on neighbouring amenity**

- 12.1 Policy 7.6 of the London Plan and Policy DH(b) of the Core Strategy require new development to demonstrate that there would be no significant loss of amenity to adjacent or nearby properties, by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight, privacy or outlook they enjoy, by creating an unneighbourly sense of enclosure, or by unacceptably impacting the wind environment or microclimate.

- 12.2 Policy E(a) states that planning permission will not normally be granted where a proposed development or change of use would generally have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers or uses, and especially where proposals would be likely to result in the unacceptable emission of noise, light, vibrations, odours, fumes, dust, water and Soil pollutants or grit.
- 12.3 Examining how the proposal brings forward only minor external changes to the exterior of the application building, it is considered that the proposed development would not bring any significantly detrimental amenity impacts to any of the nearby properties with regard to loss of daylight/ sunlight, creation of an unneighbourly sense of enclosure, loss of outlook or loss of privacy beyond the existing lawful situation.
- 12.4 It is acknowledged that the submissions do bring forward an increased in the proposed number of occupants at the application property. With reference to this, an increase to the number of persons residing in the dwelling to a maximum of seven (7) is not considered to present a significantly detrimental impact on the amenity enjoyed by the immediately neighbouring properties
- 12.5 This assessment is supported by the Council's Environmental Protection department, who did not raise any objection in relation to the proposed development.
- 12.6 It is considered that the proposed development is therefore in accordance with Policy 7.6 of The London Plan (2016), Policies DH(b) and E(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance SPD (December 2018).

### **13 Transport and Highways Impacts**

- 13.1 Policy 6.13 of the London Plan sets out maximum standards in Table 6.2 in terms of the provision of car parking. This table states that for 5 bedroom dwellings up to 2 parking spaces are the maximum that should be provided. This is supported by Policy IM(c) of the Core Strategy.
- 13.2 The site has an access level (PTAL) of 2, which indicates a below average level of public transport accessibility.
- 13.3 The site is not located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

- 13.4 No parking spaces are to be provided as part of the proposal.
- 13.5 The lack of provision of car parking at the site is considered to be generally in accordance with London Plan provisions, which places focus on limiting the reliance on personal vehicle use in the borough.
- 13.6 Notwithstanding this, the proposed increase in occupants beyond that of a C3 family dwelling as is existing is not considered to be significant.
- 13.7 The Council's Transport and Highways officer did not raise any objections or concerns to the proposed development.
- 13.8 As such, officers are satisfied that the proposal would be in accordance with Policy 6.13 of the London Plan (2016) and Policy IM(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).

#### **14 Cycle Parking**

- 14.1 Policy 6.9 of the London Plan states that the Mayor is committed to cycling in London and to improve the experience of cycling by providing safe and attractive routes that encouraged people to cycle more.
- 14.2 Table 6.3 of the London Plan provides cycle parking standards including for residential developments that should provide one cycle space per 1-bedroom unit and two spaces per all other dwellings. This is supported by Policy IM(b) and IM(c) of the Core Strategy.
- 14.3 No details have been submitted in relation to the cycle parking provided on site.
- 14.4 It is acknowledged that the existing residential unit does not provide any designated cycle parking provision
- 14.5 Ideally, cycle parking would be provided at the front of any application building (in this case, in front of the bay window), however officers acknowledge that the relevant waste and refuse storage provision should be prioritised for this space.

14.6 It is considered that there is capacity to provide the relevant cycle parking provision within the rear garden. These details will be sought via a condition attached to the decision notice.

## **15 Waste and refuse storage**

15.1 Policy H5 of the Core Strategy identifies that development needs to minimise the production of waste, to promote the reuse and recycling of waste materials and to ensure that waste disposal is environmentally responsible. As such residential schemes should incorporate measures for community recycling that minimises waste disposal and should provide refuse bins and recycling boxes. This is supported by London Plan Policy 5.16.

15.2 No details have been provided as to the proposed refuse storage that would be required for the proposed number of occupants.

15.3 In accordance with the “New Developments: Guidance Notes for the Storage and Collection of Waste and Recycling Materials for the Royal Borough of Greenwich (May 2018)” recommendations and correspondence with the Local Authority’s Waste and Refuse Department, the proposal should allow space for 5 x 240L wheeled bins (2 for general waste, 2 for mixed dry recycling and 1 for organic waste).

15.4 Details of the proposed waste and refuse situation are to be secured via a condition attached to the decision notice.

## **16 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

16.1 The Mayor has introduced a London-wide Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to help implement the London Plan, particularly policies 6.5 and 8.3. The Mayoral CIL formally came into effect on 1st April, and it will be paid on commencement of most new development in Greater London that was granted planning permission on or after that date. The Mayor's CIL will contribute towards the funding of Crossrail. The Mayor has arranged boroughs into three charging bands. The rate for Greenwich is £35 per square metre.

16.2 The current application is not liable to this requirement.

## **17 RBG CIL**

- 17.1 The Royal Borough adopted its Local Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule, infrastructure (Regulation 123) list, instalments policy and exceptional circumstances relief policy on the 25<sup>th</sup> March 2015 and came into effect in Royal Greenwich on the 6th April 2015.
- 17.2 The current application is not liable to this requirement.

## **18 Implications for disadvantaged groups**

- 18.1 There are no specific implications identified.

## **19 Conclusion**

- 19.1 The proposed development would not result in a significantly detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the application building, public realm, and wider conservation area.
- 19.2 The proposed development would provide an acceptable quality of accommodation for residents.
- 19.3 The proposed development would not result in any unacceptable impacts to the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers.
- 19.4 Accordingly, it is recommended that permission be granted for application reference 20/0053/F, in line with Section 1.1 of this report.

Report Author: Luke Sapiano (Planning Officer)  
Email.: [luke.sapiano@royalgreenwich.gov.uk](mailto:luke.sapiano@royalgreenwich.gov.uk)

Reporting to: Victoria Geoghegan, Assistant Director, Planning & Building Control  
Email.: [victoria.geoghegan@royalgreenwich.gov.uk](mailto:victoria.geoghegan@royalgreenwich.gov.uk)