

**PLANNING NEWS - AUGUST 2016**

**4 Stanford Rd - House in Multiple Occupation Refused**

There is an excellent piece of news - the planners have rejected the application for 4 Stanford Rd as a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). The owner had already converted it to become one and has let it to tenants before the Council decision was taken. The JPC submitted an objection as did Cllr Maggie Mansell.

The planners reason states: 'The development would result in sub-standard accommodation by reason of unsatisfactory layouts to rooms and unsatisfactory provision and layout of washing and kitchen facilities.....'

Given this was a retrospective application the JPC has asked the planners whether they will take action to enforce taking out the changes that have been made.

However the refusal is the opposite of the planners decision to approve the use of the first and second floors as a house in multiple occupation and the third floor as studio flat at 1420A London Road.

**46 Ederline Avenue (16/03190/GPDO) - Extension Refused**

The planners have also refused this application to build a single storey rear extension projecting out 6 metres with a maximum height of 2.9 metres. The reasons: 'The proposal fails to meet the requirements'. 'The development would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining property by reason of loss of outlook and visual intrusion.'

**34 Fairview Road (16/03916/GPDO) - Overdevelopment and proper design**

The JPC has objected to this application because

- Car parking is already a problem on this stretch of Fairview Rd. Three flats with the possibility of a minimum of three vehicles will add to the problems.
- The application does not meet the Council's policy for 60% new housing being 3 bedrooms plus.
- It involves the loss of employment space, which has been drastically reduced in Norbury with the conversion of Astral and Windsor Houses on London Rd from office to residential.
- The bathroom/toilet of the first floor flat looks like it is over a ground floor bedroom, which could result in toilet waste flowing down in the event of a leak.
- Several bedrooms are at the back close to the railway line which will create a noise problem. (6) Bedroom 1 in the right hand flat on the ground floor is up against the hall of the left hand flat, making for potential noise problems between the flats.
- There is minimal outdoor amenity space in the form of a tiny patio area for each of the two downstairs flats.
- There is a lack of provision for waste storage and disposal.
- The siting right up against the railway embankment and under two large trees will mean very limited daylight penetration to the ground floor flats in particular.

**298 Green Lane (16/02619/P) - Vehicular Access Refused**

They have refused permission to form a vehicular access. The reasons: 'The development would create a hazard to vehicular traffic using the highway by reason of inadequate space to enter and exit the site in a forward gear.' 'The development would create a hazard to pedestrians and vehicular traffic using the highway by reason of inadequate visibility and due to the close proximity of two street trees which would adversely affect visibility.'

**Lidl Store, 1 Hermitage Lane (16/02194/A) - Refused**

Illuminated freestanding sign refused because it would compromise road safety and would also be detrimental to the visual amenities of local residents by reason of size and prominent siting.

**1355-1357 London Road (16/02662/P & 16/02663/A) - Refused**

These applications from the Delight Wedlinka grocery chain for the installation of plant equipment and shopfront, and illuminated fascia sign and window signs, have been refused on the grounds that the security shutters would harm the host building's frontage and character of the street scene, and the

number, size and location of the advertisements would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene.

#### **44-46 Norbury Crescent (16/03715/P) - Overdevelopment**

The JPC has objected to this application to convert the existing two houses into 9 flats, including an enlarged rear extension, conversion of the roof space and construction of a basement. Unless the officers decide to reject the application the JPC has requested that the application be submitted to Committee.

In an area already designated as high density, this scheme would be gross overdevelopment of what were originally two fairly modest family homes, combined into a single residence for the elderly in 1989.

The proposed plans show three flats on the ground floor, three on the first floor, two in the roof space and one in the basement, all with two bedrooms each, illustrating a total of 27 potential tenants (8 x 1 double bed plus 1 single, 1 x 2 double beds. This would obviously create an excessive demand on the usual services, sewerage, water supply, waste disposal etc.

Such a large development is bound to be at risk of noise disturbance to the tenants and possibly also the neighbours.

The plans do not show that the land slopes up from front to back, meaning that a very large garden excavation will be needed to accommodate the larger extension and basement (and the cycle store), with considerable limitation on the natural daylight reaching the basement. And there would be very little actual garden space left for the tenants to share, with probable visual and privacy intrusion of the extension affecting the neighbours both sides and possibly those at the back in Craignish Avenue.

The accompanying Transport Statement concludes that the provision of 4 car parking spaces is sufficient, together with protected storage in the rear of the property for 18 cycles. The Committee that this would only be feasible if the tenants were to be recruited predominantly from dedicated non-car-users. Any additional cars would therefore have to be parked on the street increasing the existing competition and tensions over car parking.'

#### **150 Norbury Ave (16/03584/LE) - grounds for refusal**

This application is not one on which the public are entitled to comment. The JPC has, however, written to Peter Smith, Head of Development Management, to point out some aspects of the previous history of applications on this property.

'The Committee considers that this is a case for refusal of the current application, and one for possible enforcement action, especially as there is a rather reproachful statement in the last planning decision that "The Local Planning Authority's suggested improvements were not adopted by the applicant."

In July the Council refused planning permission on another application on this property: (16/01786/P) for the erection of single/two storey rear extension, on the grounds that the development would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining property by reason of its size and siting resulting in visual intrusion.

#### **252 Norbury Avenue (16/03649/LP, 16/03760/GPDO) - Possible HMO and Visual intrusion**

The JPC has asked that these two applications be considered together because:

- (1) the combined enlargement effect could mean that this property is being prepared to turn into a House in Multiple Occupation.
- (2) the large windows in the roof at the back might be intrusive to neighbours.

#### **124 Norbury Crescent (16/03842/P) - wrong description**

This proposed single-storey rear extension would extend the full width of the back of the house. Given it would extend 6 m from the house the JPC wonders whether it might prove a visual intrusion for the next-door neighbours.

The design and access statement says that the house in question is an end-of-terrace property and that a ground-floor side extension is being proposed. These statements are wrong, it is a mid-terrace house with no free side wall for an extension - as the photo supplied clearly shows.

### **150 Norbury Crescent (16/01786/P) - Refused**

It has refused to allow the erection of single/two storey rear extension because it would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining property by reason of its size and siting resulting in visual intrusion.

### **168 Norbury Crescent (15/02203/LP) - need to inspect**

The JPC has emailed the planners stating 'Although this application was approved on 13 July observation of the building works now being carried out show that the garage, which is supposed to be demolished as part of the application, is still at the rear of the garden, with the driveway exiting onto Ederline Avenue, and the outbuilding being constructed beside this, the full width of the garden, i.e. not in accordance with the approved plans but possibly not a material amendment as the garden is long enough to accommodate it.'

The JPC wonders whether there should be a visit to look at the progress, and to ensure that application is being complied with.

### **61 Norton Gardens (16/03599/P) - loss of family size house**

The JPC has opposed this application to turn a 3 bedroom family sized house into two 2 bedroom flats. This is contrary to the Council's policy that 60% of new housing units should be 3+bedroom, and its desire to oppose the loss of family sized houses.

The living room in the ground floor flat is under a bedroom on the first floor flat. This could result in noise problems from below to the occupants above if their early morning and late night life styles are different.

The location of the kitchen in the loft is an unusual arrangement and is presumably designed to avoid noise to the ground floor flat if the kitchen is on the first floor flat.

This suggests that trying to put two flats into this family property poses design difficulties suggesting over development.

### **32 Pollards Hill North (14/00360/C) - Breach of Planning Controls**

The Council has issued an Enforcement Notice under Section 172 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. 'It appears to the Council that the above breach of planning control has occurred within the last four years.' 'The development is detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining property by reason of its size and siting resulting in loss of light, visual intrusion and loss of outlook.'

### **62 Ryecroft Road (16/01442/P) - Refused**

The planners have refused demolition of the existing garage and erection of two storey side/rear extension with dormer extension in rear roof slope, on the grounds that it would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene by reason of its scale, design, bulk and mass and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area.

Sean Creighton

NVRA representative on JPC

29 August 2016

[sean.creighton1947@btinternet.com](mailto:sean.creighton1947@btinternet.com)