

Local Planning Committee 25 February 2025	Agenda Item: 4 Reference No: 24/3979/F Web Link: Planning Documents
--	--

Applicant: Mr Hollander, 88 Corelli Road, Kidbrooke, London, SE3 8EW
Agent: Redwoods Projects, Mr Shloime Godlewsky, Unit 4
Grosvenor Way, London, E5 9ND

Site Address: 88 Corelli Road, Kidbrooke, London, SE3 8EW	Ward: Kidbrooke Park Application Type: Full Planning Permission.
---	---

I. Recommendation

- I.1 That Full Planning Permission be granted for:
“A ground-floor rear extension, a dormer extension and the change of use from a single dwelling house (Class C3) to a 6-bed HMO (Class C4).”
- I.2 Subject to the conditions (Appendix 2) to be detailed in the notice of determination.
- I.3 To authorise the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) to make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in this report (Appendix 2), where the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

2 Summary

- 2.1 Detailed below is a summary of the application:

The Site -	
Site Area (m ²)	227m ²
Heritage Assets	None
Tree Preservation Order	None
Flood Risk Zone	Flood Zone I (No Flood Risk Assessment Required)

Proposed Building	
Existing and proposed Building height (metres)	8.25m
No. of storeys	2 (with additional loft floor proposed)

Transportation		
Car Parking	No. existing car parking spaces	0
	No. Proposed Car Parking Spaces	0 (no change)
Cycle Parking	No. Proposed Cycle Parking Spaces	6
Public Transport	PTAL Rating	1b (below average level of access to public transport links)
Within CPZ?		No

Public Consultation	
Number in Support	One (1)
Number of objections	Thirteen (13) and two petitions, one with fifteen (15) signatures and one with three (3) signatures

- 2.2 The application has received 13 objections from local residents (and two petitions) and has also been called into committee by Councillor John Fahy
- 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 acceptable with respect to the requirements of the development plan and is recommended for approval subject to that set out in Section 1 above.

Site Plan



3. Site and Surroundings (in detail)

- 3.1 The application site is 88 Corelli Road, Kidbrooke, London, SE3 8EW
- 3.2 The site is located on the western side of Corelli Road and relates to a two-storey terraced dwellinghouse, which includes a small outbuilding to rear of the property which is a non-original development on the property. The surrounding area is residential in character, comprising a mix of terraced and semi-detached dwellings.
- 3.3 The application site is not located within a conservation area and does not relate to a listed or locally listed building.
- 3.4 The application site has a PTAL rating of 1b (where 0 is the worst and 6b is the best). The site is not within a Controlled Parking Zone.
- 3.5 The site is within Flood Zone 1 (No flood risk assessment required). There are no other relevant site allocations at this site.

4. Relevant Planning History

- 4.1 25/0005/PNI- 88 CORELLI ROAD, KIDBROOKE, LONDON, SE3 8EW - Prior Approval for the construction of a single storey rear infill extension which will extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling by 6.00m, for which the maximum height will be 3.00m and the height at the eaves will be 3.00m.- Withdrawn 16th of January 2025.
- 4.2 24/3829/CP- 88 CORELLI ROAD, KIDBROOKE, LONDON, SE3 8EW - Lawful Development Certificate (proposed) for the construction for the construction of a rear dormer. - Approved on 20/01/2025.
- 4.3 24/3839/PNI- 88 CORELLI ROAD, KIDBROOKE, LONDON, SE3 8EW Prior Approval for the construction of a single storey rear extension which will extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling by 6.00m, for which the maximum height will be 3.00m and the height at the eaves will be 3.00m.- Withdrawn 7th of January 2025.

5. Proposals (in detail)

- 5.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the change of use from single dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a 6-bedroom, 6-person large HMO (Use Class C4) incorporating a rear box dormer roof extension and

construction of a single storey rear extension, cycle and refuse storage and associated external alterations.

- 5.2 The proposed HMO would provide two bedrooms both with ensembles at ground floor level in addition to a communal kitchen area. The first-floor level would contain two bedrooms, both with ensuite bathrooms. The loft floor level would provide two bedrooms, also with their own ensuite bathroom.
- 5.3 As part of the proposal, the proposal also includes the construction of single storey rear extension and the implementation of a rear box dormer.
- 5.4 The proposed rear extension would have a depth of 3m, with a width of 5.68 metres. This extension would be completed with a flat roof, with a height of 3m.
- 5.5 The proposal also seeks for rear box-style, full-width dormer. The dormer would have a height of 2.65m (8.12m from ground level), a width of 6.42m and a depth of 3.4m. The dormer would be positioned approximately 0.38m from the eaves of the main roof. A rear chimney within the roof is sought to be demolished so as to accommodate the rear dormer.
- 5.6 The submissions set out that the development would generally utilise materials which would match those used in the existing building.

6. Consultation

- 6.1 The application since being submitted in December 2024 has been subject of public consultation, comprising of a site notice and six (6) individual letters, sent to individual occupiers in the vicinity of the application site. This consultation also included consultation with statutory bodies and consultants.
- 6.2 Following discussions with applicants, amendments were made to the proposals to reduce the depth of the proposed rear extension from 6m as initially proposed to 3m as is currently proposed. Amendments were also made to alter the internal layout of the proposals and remove originally proposed side windows to the development. Given that these amendments pertained to a reduction in the scope of the originally submitted proposals, re-consultation did not take place in this instance.

6.3 Thirteen (13) objections, a petition with fifteen (15) signatures and a second petition with three (3) signatures has been received in objection to the proposed development. A summary of the neighbour's objections is provided below:

Summary of Comments	Officers comments
Concerns that the tenants of the potential HMO would bring forward safety concerns and would harm the community character of the surrounding area.	The character of potential future tenants is not a material planning consideration and is speculation. The principle of development is discussed within the “Principle of development” section of the report below. The impact on the physical character of the area is considered within the “Design” section of the report below.
Concerns that the tenants of the proposed HMO might be ex-prisoners	This is not included within the submission in any way.
Concerns that there are already enough HMO’s in the borough	This is discussed within the “principle of development” section of this report.
Concerns that the development would result in a strain to local services	The absolute maximum number of persons who could occupy this proposal is six (6), which is comparable to who could occupy a similarly extended C3 family unit at this site. This number is not considered to strain local services substantially beyond the existing lawful situation on site.
Concerns regarding waste storage, and specifically that bins should be provided.	Additional bins are sought to be provided on site. An assessment of the proposed waste storage provision is set out within the “Waste” section of the report below.
Concerns over loss of privacy and Loss of daylight and noise pollution as a result of the new development.	This is considered within the “impact on neighbouring amenity” section of the report.
Concerns as to localised noise disruption specifically during the construction of the proposals.	The construction of any development is temporary by its nature and so would no be so significant so as to constitute a reason for refusal. Given the scale of the works, a requirement for a

	<p>construction management plan is not considered reasonable in this instance, however any construction event would be controlled by the local authorities Environmental Health Department.</p>
<p>Concerns regarding fire and safety issues</p>	<p>This is not material planning consideration. Fire safety for minor developments are controlled and evaluated by building regulations and HMO Licensing Team.</p>
<p>Concerns that the development might house more people than is proposed.</p>	<p>This would be subject to enforcement action, the proposed number of persons who occupy the development is sought to be controlled via planning condition.</p>
<p>Concerns regarding excessive size of the build and Structural risk against attached properties</p>	<p>The scale and size of the development will be assessed in the design section of the report. However, alleged structural risk is not a material planning consideration and is considered at building control stage. Party wall matters to neighbouring properties are also civil matters and are not material planning considerations.</p>
<p>Concerns that the proposal is not acceptable in design terms</p>	<p>This is considered within the design section of the report below.</p>
<p>Concerns regarding increased traffic and parking issues</p>	<p>This is considered within the “Transport/ Highways” section of the report below</p>
<p>Overburdening of shared access</p>	<p>The proposed development would house an absolute maximum of six (6) individuals, which is comparable to the number of people who could reasonably occupy the current family home. The shared access would only exist to access the garden without accessing the property and would not exist as the main entrance to the building.</p>
<p>Concerns that any future build might not meet Building Regulations</p>	<p>This is not a material consideration in the assessment of a planning application which does not consider Building Regulations. These are assessed</p>

	separately at Building Control Stage only.
Concerns over impact on property value	This is not a material planning consideration.
Concerns that the development would result in unacceptable impacts on the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring properties, particularly in terms of the daylight/ sunlight they enjoy	This is considered within the bulk of the report below, specifically within the “quality of accommodation” section.
Concerns regarding overcrowding	This is considered within the “Quality of Accommodation” section of the report.
Concerns that the development might impact local schools	The development is a residential conversion and will not have any tangible impact on local schools.

6.4 Councillors

6.5 Two (2) Councillors were consulted on the 16th December 2024, Councillor John Fahy requested this application be called into committee should the recommendation be for approval.

6.6 Statutory, Internal Consultees, and Amenity Groups

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

Details of Representation and date received	Summary of Comments	Officers comments
RBG Transport and highways	<i>“No highway objection is raised”</i>	This is noted.
Waste Services	<i>“I have looked at the proposed application and am satisfied with this proposal.”</i>	This is noted.
Environmental Health Officer	No objection raised with respect to the revised layout.	This is noted.

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 – 2024)**
- **National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)**
- **The London Plan (March 2021)**
- **The Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (“Core Strategy” – 2014)**
- **New Developments: Guidance Notes for the storage and collection of waste and recycling materials for the Royal Borough of Greenwich (May 2018)**
- **The Royal Borough of Greenwich Standards for Houses in Multiple Occupation (2019)**
- **Royal Borough of Greenwich Urban Design SPD (2023)**

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

8. Principle of Development

8.1 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.

8.2 Policy H9 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) sets out that boroughs should take account of the role of houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) in meeting local and strategic housing needs. Policy H9 clearly states that where HMO’s are of a reasonable standard, they should be generally protected.

8.3 Policy H2 of the Core Strategy (2014) (CS) 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.

8.4 It is important to note that the Council’s CS does not include any policies which protect the loss of family sized accommodation in relation to the conversion of a single family dwellinghouse into HMO accommodation. As

such, the loss of the existing accommodation in order to convert the property is considered acceptable.

8.5 In respect of the suitability of the proposed HMO, the Council's Urban Design SPD (adopted October 2023) 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 needs. HMOs that are of a good standard form an important part of the provision of lower cost housing. However, unmanaged conversion of family housing stock to HMOs can undermine the Royal Borough's objective to meet these varying need sand make it difficult to achieve mixed and balanced communities as set out in the Core Strategy.”

8.6 It is therefore evident that HMOs have been identified as providing suitable residential accommodation, which will be supported by Council subject to other material considerations including the quality of internal living environment. There are no applicable policies relating to the overconcentration of HMO's within a specific area.

8.7 On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered acceptable in principle, subject to the other material planning considerations such as the provision of an acceptable quality of accommodation for its occupants. This is discussed elsewhere within this report.

9. Design

9.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) states that the creation of a high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to the planning and development process should achieve (Chapter 12 – Paragraph 131). Paragraph 135 state further that the planning decision should ensure that developments:

- Will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- Are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- Are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscaping setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- Establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create an attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

- Optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
- Create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

9.2 Paragraph 139 goes on to state that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

Conversely, significant weight should be given to:

- Development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or
- Outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, as long as they fit with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.

9.3 Policy D3 of the LP states that development proposals should be of a high quality, enhancing local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

9.4 Policy DHI of the CS requires all developments to be of a high quality, enhancing local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

9.5 The proposal relates to the construction of a rear box-style dormer. Additionally, the development of the site also seeks for a rear extension from the rear wall for the property.

Rear Dormer Roof Extension

- 9.6 With relation to the rear dormer proposed, Policy DH(a) specifically states that all new roof extensions should be designed to respect the scale and character of the host building, the street scene and the surrounding area.
- 9.7 Section i.62 of the RBG Urban Design Guidance SPD sets out that:
“Roof extensions and loft conversions are a useful way to gain additional living space with potentially limited impact, however when ill-considered they can change the architectural character of the building and its relationship to the street, as well as compromising the daylight to adjacent properties and intruding on a neighbour’s privacy.”
- 9.8 Section i.66 of the RBG Urban Design Guidance SPD also sets out that:
“Dormers at the rear are generally acceptable, subject to the building typology. They should be well spaced and positioned within the existing roof slope, and should reflect the position of the existing windows below.”
- 9.9 The SPD also sets out at section i.67 that:
“A roof extension should generally follow and complement the pattern and pitch of the main roof, and should be secondary in scale to the main roof, seeking to preserve or enhance the existing appearance in terms of height, scale and visual interest.”
- 9.10 Figure i.34 of the RBG Urban Design Guidance SPD (2023) makes clear that full width, box-type dormer extensions will be discouraged on any roof face as they do not integrate well with pitched roof houses.
- 9.11 The proposed rear dormer would be very large and would not comply with the SPD guidance as set out above, given its size. With the current submissions however, the applicants have drawn attention to the fact that the site has a previous Certificate of Lawfulness application approved for a rear dormer under planning ref. 24/3829/CP which has recently been approved. The applicants have made clear that the rear dormer proposed here could be reasonably undertaken at this site through the limits of permitted development as a “fall back” position.
- 9.12 The intention to develop the roof space under the limits of permitted development have been expressly identified in the submissions. Therefore, given in this instance a certificate of lawfulness exists for the fall-back position, and in view of the legal case and decision of *Mansell v Tonbridge And Malling*

Borough Council [2017] EWCA Civ 1314, it is considered that the fallback position of the proposed loft conversion does exist in this case.

- 9.13 With this position in mind, the proposed development of the site would not be considered to be substantially more harmful to the character of the site and surrounding area than the identified “fall back” position on the site. It is therefore considered that the development would have an acceptable impact on the character of surrounding properties.

Proposed single storey rear extension

- 9.14 With regard to the rear extension element of the proposal, it is considered to generally be in accordance with the guidance for rear extensions as set out in the RBG Urban Design Guidance SPD (2023)
- 9.15 Principle I.3.3 of the RBG Urban Design Guidance SPD (2023) relates to rear extensions and sets out that all rear extensions are required to respond appropriately to the scale of the existing building and the size of the garden. This principle also sets out that a 3.6m projection from the rear is typically considered appropriate in Royal Greenwich.
- 9.16 With regard to roof forms for single storey rear extensions, section i.91 of the RBG Urban Design Guidance SPD (2023) sets out that a flat roof form is generally preferred as it helps to reduce the overall bulk and impact of the extension. The SPD does go on to state at section i.92 that other roof forms can be considered, in particular where they are a response to site specific constraints or the character of the house or wider locality.
- 9.17 Section i.91 of the RBG Urban Design Guidance SPD (2023) states that
“Careful consideration needs to be given to the relationship with the first floor window sill. Generally the roof line of the extension should be 300mm below the 1st floor window sill [...]”
- 9.18 The proposed rear extension would generally be small scale and would not have a depth which would exceed the 3.6m depth recommendation which exists in the RBG Urban Design Guidance SPD (2023), as its depth would be 3m. The rear extension element would not be overly bulky or exist as a dominant addition to the host building. The scale and form of the rear extension would also be similar to the rear extensions which exist in the wider surrounding area. This aspect of the development would therefore positively respond to the built form of the surroundings and would be in accordance with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) in this regard.

- 9.19 The submissions set out that the development would utilise materials which would match or be similar to the materials used in the existing building. A condition is recommended on any approval to ensure the materials proposed would match the existing property. This is considered to be sufficient given the nature of the proposed development sought.
- 9.20 On the basis of the above, the development would be acceptable in design terms and would comply with Chapter 12 of the NPPF (2024), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Core Strategy (2014), Policy HD2 and HD3 of the Lee Neighbourhood Plan (2024) and the Royal Borough of Greenwich Urban Design Guide (SPD) (2023).

10. Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

- 10.1 Policy D14 of the LP sets out that development proposals should seek to proactively manage noise impacts in a variety of ways where possible. Proposal should use a good design to mitigate and minimise existing potential nuisances generated by uses and activities located in the area. This is also supported by Policy D13.
- 10.2 Policy E(a) of the CS states that planning permission will not normally be granted where proposed development or change of use would generally have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers or uses, and especially where proposal would be likely to result in the unacceptable emission of noise, light, vibrations, odours, fumes, dust, water and soil pollutants or grit.
- 10.3 Policy DH(b) of the CS requires 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 unneighbourly sense of enclosure, or by unacceptably impacting the wind environment or microclimate.
- 10.4 86 Corelli Road
- 10.5 The property of No.86 Corelli Road is located to the northern side of the application site. The proposed rear dormer position and size would not result in any unacceptable sense of enclosure or loss of daylight/ sunlight impacts to neighbouring properties. Additionally, the proposed rear extension has a limited depth of just 3m, and is shown to be setback from the shared boundary of No. 86 Corelli Road and the application site, therefore, it is considered that the rear extension element of the development would not

result in any unacceptable sense of enclosure or loss of daylight/ sunlight impacts to No. 86.

- 10.6 New windows are proposed to the rear dormer of the application site, however, given their positioning and the location of the neighbouring site of No.86, it is considered that the proposed windows would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy beyond the existing situation on site. Whilst there would be a level of overlooking into the rear garden from the rear dormer, this would be no different to the overlooking which already exists from the upper-level rear windows at the application site. No side openings exist on the new rear extension and this extension would be single storey only, and so it is considered that the development would not result in any unacceptable loss of privacy to No. 86 beyond the existing lawful situation on site.
- 10.7 90 Corelli Road
- 10.8 The property of No.90 Corelli Road is located to the southern side of the application site. Given the rhythm of built form of Corelli Road, the proposed roof alterations and proposed dormers' position and size, as well as the location of the single storey rear extension, it is not anticipated that the development would create any unacceptable feeling of enclosure on any habitable windows at No. 90, nor any daylight/ sunlight impact on these windows. The proposed rear extension has a limited depth of just 3m and modest scale, therefore, it is considered that the rear extension element of the development would not result in any unacceptable sense of enclosure or loss of daylight/ sunlight impacts to No. 90.
- 10.9 New windows are proposed to the rear dormer of the application site, however, given their positioning and the location of the neighbouring site of No.90, it is considered that the proposed windows would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy beyond the existing situation on site (any overlooking to neighbouring gardens would be similar to overlooking which already exists from the first floor rear windows at the site). No new side level windows at ground floor level are proposed to be facing No. 90 and so the rear extension element would not result in any loss of privacy impacts to this property.

10.10 Leigh Academy Halley

10.11 The Leigh Academy Halley is located to the rear boundary of the application site, built fronting the Corelli Road. The rear boundary of the site is abutting the parking area of the Academy. Given the separation distance of the development from the application site, while these are adjacent to the application site, it is considered that the proposed works would not result in any unacceptable impacts on the amenity enjoyed by these properties.

10.12 Use

10.13 It is acknowledged that the submissions do bring forward a subtle increase in the proposed number of occupants at the application property, to an absolute maximum of 6. With reference to this, an increase to the number of occupants residing at the property to an absolute maximum of 6 is not considered to present a significant detrimental impact to the amenity enjoyed by the nearby properties in terms of noise pollution beyond the existing use of the building as a family dwelling house.

10.14 In summary, the proposed change of use and associated development would preserve the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with Policy D13 and D14 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies E(a) and DH(b) of the adopted Core Strategy and Detailed Policies (2014) and the Councils Urban Design Guidance SPD (2023).

11. Quality of Living Environment provided for future residents

11.1 The application seeks permission for the change of use from a residential dwelling (Use Class C3) to a House of Multiple Occupation (Class C4), with six bedrooms, allowing occupancy for six persons.

11.2 The Urban Design SPD (Adopted October 2023) includes Chapter 1, Section 1.3.9, guidance for Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs). Paragraph i.166 states that:

“The quality of accommodation provided by HMOs can be poor and 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.”*

- 11.3 The Royal Borough's Standards for HMOs were adopted in 2019. These set out detailed amenity standards as well as additional further requirements relating to the management of the HMOs.
- 11.4 In Table i.1, it sets out minimum internal space standards. However, further standards depending on the kitchen and lounge/dining facilities are identified in the HMOs Standards (2019).
- 11.5 Policy H5 of the CS seeks that new residential development, redevelopment, refurbishment or conversions will be expected to achieve a high quality of housing design and an integrated environment.
- 11.6 This is supported by the London Plan, Policy D6 which states that housing developments should be of high-quality design and provide adequately sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts which are fit for purpose and meet the needs of Londoners without differentiating between tenures. The policy goes on to state that the design of development should maximise the provision of dual aspect dwellings and provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to new and surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context.
- 11.7 Bedroom Sizes
- 11.8 Bedroom sizes are assessed against Table I of the Royal Greenwich HMO Standards (2019) – Minimum room sizes, where there the kitchen is in a separate room.

Bedroom No.	Occupancy	Size (sqm)	Standard (sqm)	Complies
Bedroom 1	1 persons	11.09sqm	9sqm	Yes
Bedroom 2	1 persons	11.4sqm	9sqm	Yes
Bedroom 3	1 persons	15.72sqm	9sqm	Yes
Bedroom 4	1 persons	15.81sqm	9sqm	Yes
Bedroom 5	1 persons	9.04sqm	9sqm	Yes
Bedroom 6	1 persons	14.19sqm	9sqm	Yes

11.9 As can be seen from the above table, the development would comply with the minimum standards provided by the HMO licencing standards. The HMO would have a maximum capacity of six persons, with each bedroom being single occupancy.

11.10 Overall, it is considered that the bedroom sizes provided would be acceptable and comply with the above referenced standards.

11.11 Kitchen Facilities

11.12 The Standards for Houses in Multiple Occupation (2019) states:

“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 for the practical, safe & hygienic use of the kitchen for storage, preparation and cooking of food.”

11.13 As a kitchen serving 6 persons, two sets of kitchen facilities need to be provided within the proposed kitchen area. The minimum requirement for a kitchen serving 6 people, according to the Council’s HMO standards (2019, Table 5) is 10.5m².

11.14 The proposed kitchen has an area of 17.78m². This is compliant.

11.15 Bathroom Facilities

11.16 The RBG Standard for Houses in Multiple Occupation (2019) provide guidance as to the required bathroom provision for HMO’s.

11.17 Table 8 of the Royal Greenwich HMO Standards (2019) outlines minimum levels for shared bathrooms/WCs for 6 persons as:

“Two bathrooms or shower rooms, and two toilets with a wash hand basin [...] One of the required WC and wash hand basins shall be provided in a room separate to the bath/shower room

11.18 With respect to the above requirements, the proposed development is compliant. Every bedroom would have access to its own ensuite.

11.19 Floor to Ceiling Heights

11.20 With The RBG HMO Standards (2019) state that it is expected that all rooms will have a minimum ceiling height of 2.1m over at least half of the floor area.

11.21 The development would be acceptable in this regard.

11.22 Outdoor Amenity Space

11.23 The HMO standards (2019) do not set out required provisions for outdoor space. It is noted however that the proposed development would reuse the existing rear garden space at the application site. As such, and with reference to the size of the proposed rear garden, this aspect of the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

11.24 Other Internal Amenity Factors

11.25 The proposed HMO as a whole would be dual aspect. Given the positioning of neighbouring habitable openings 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 should the proposed development go ahead.

11.26 It is considered that all of the proposed habitable spaces are expected to receive an acceptable level of daylight/sunlight and have access to a reasonable outlook should the proposed development go ahead.

11.27 Conclusion

11.28 The proposed development would provide an acceptable quality of accommodation for prospective residents. As such, the proposed development is in accordance with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DHI and H5 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan (2014), the Royal Borough of Greenwich Standards for Houses in Multiple Occupation (2019) and the Royal Borough of Greenwich Urban Design SPD (2023).

12. Transport and Highways Impacts

12.1 Policy T2 of the London Plan states development proposals should deliver patterns of land use that facilitate residents making shorter, regular trips by walking or cycling. This policy also states that development proposals should

reduce the dominance of vehicles on London's streets whether stationary or moving.

- 12.2 Policy T6 of the LP states that car-free development should be the starting point for all development proposals in places that area (or area planned to be) well-connected by public transport, with developments elsewhere designed to provide the minimum necessary parking.
- 12.3 Policy T4 of the LP sets out that developments should not increase road danger.
- 12.4 Policy IM4 of the CS supports the development of an integrated and sustainable transport system that is extensive in coverage and meets the needs of residents, businesses, workers and visitors in Royal Greenwich. It requires all development in Royal Greenwich to contribute to improved accessibility and safety and to reduce the use of the private car and the need to travel.
- 12.5 The application site has a PTAL rating of 1b (where 0 is the worst and 6b is the best). The London Plan (2021) sets out that for a development of this type, the proposal should bring forward an absolute maximum of 0.75 car parking spaces. The site is not within a Controlled Parking Zone.
- 12.6 The site does not benefit from existing on-site and off-street parking. No additional parking spaces have been proposed in the development. This has been indicated in the associated Planning Statement. The development does not intend to alter the existing arrangements in any way. This is consistent with the requirements of the London Plan (2021), which seek to minimise private car ownership.
- 12.7 Given the similarity in the existing use with the proposed uses and considering the only minimal uplift of the number of persons existing within the site compared to the existing lawful situation on site, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in any significantly detrimental impacts to the highway network should the proposed development go ahead. It is also emphasised that the councils Transport and Highways Department have raised no objections with respect to the proposed development.
- 12.8 As such, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with Policies T4, T6, T6.1 and D3 of the London Plan (2021), and Policies IM4, IM(c) and DH1 of the Core Strategy (2014).

13. Cycle Parkin

- 13.1 Policy T5 of the LP states that development proposals should help remove barriers to cycling and create a healthy environment in which people choose to cycle. The policy is clear that proposals should do this by providing cycle parking at least in accordance with the minimum standards as set out in Table 10.2 and Figure 10.3. The cycle parking should be fit for purpose, secure and well-located. This is supported by Policy IM(b) of the CS.
- 13.2 A cycle store has been shown within the rear garden. The siting of this would be acceptable, given that the proposed development has an existing side access that would be retained should the proposed development go ahead. The number of cycle parking spaces proposed (6) would be above and beyond with the requirements of the London Plan (2021).
- 13.3 The proposal, following the above, complies with Policy T5 of the LP and IM(c) of the Core Strategy (2014).

14. Waste and Refuse Storage

- 14.1 Policy H5 of the CS 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 appropriately incorporate measures for community recycling that minimises waste disposal and should provide refuse bins and recycling boxes. This is supported by LP Policy S18.
- 14.2 Six bins have been shown to be positioned within the front forecourt area of the application site. Officers consider that this space would be large enough to accommodate this waste provision. Additionally, the Councils' Waste Services Department have indicated they are satisfied with the provisions of the submission. The provision for recycling bins, as well as food waste bins, are also required by condition.
- 14.3 The proposed development would comply with LP policies S18, and Policy H5 of the CS.

15. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

- 15.1 The current application not liable to this requirement.

16. RBG CIL

16.1 The current application not liable to this requirement.

17. Public Sector Equality Deputy (PSED) and Human Rights

17.1 Under the Equalities Act 2010, the Council must have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation of persons by reason of age, disability, pregnancy, race, religion, sex and sexual orientation. This planning application has been processed and assessed with due regard to the PSED. The application proposals are not considered to conflict with the Duty.

17.2 The application has also been considered in the light of the Human Rights Act (1998) and is considered that the analysis of the issues in this case, as set out in this report and recommendation, is compatible with the Act.

18. Implications for Disadvantaged Groups

18.1 There are no specific implications identified. Applications for HMO's are not required to be compliant with the accessible design requirements as set out in Policy D5 and D7 of the London Plan (2021).

19. Conclusion

19.1 The proposed development would provide an HMO which would contribute to meeting the local and strategic housing needs of the Borough and London as a whole.

19.2 The proposed change of use and associated external works would not result in a significantly detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the application building or the wider public realm.

19.3 The proposed development would provide an acceptable quality of accommodation for residents.

19.4 The proposed development would not result in any unacceptable impacts to the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers.

19.5 Accordingly, it is recommended that permission be granted for application reference 24/3979/F, in line with Section I of this report.

Background Papers:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF – 2024)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

The London Plan (March 2021)

The Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (“Core Strategy” – 2014)

New Developments: Guidance Notes for the storage and collection of waste and recycling materials for the Royal Borough of Greenwich (May 2018)

The Royal Borough of Greenwich Standards for Houses in Multiple Occupation (2019)

Royal Borough of Greenwich Urban Design SPD (2023)

Responses from consultations

Report Author: Manisha Udatewar (Planning Officer)
Tel No.: 020 8921 5766
Email: manisha.udewar@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to: Victoria Geoghegan, Assistant Director Planning & Building
Control
Tel No.: 0208 921 4303
Email: victoria.geoghegan@royalgreenwich.gov.uk