

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 24 September, 2015

Agenda Item 08

Case No. 15/3014

Location James Stewart House, Dyne Road, London
Description Erection of two-storey detached residential unit (4 x 3bed), with associated hard and soft landscaping, improvement work to existing communal amenity space and provision for 24 car parking spaces

Agenda Page Number: 95

Planning committee visited the site on 19th September.
A number of points were raised which are responded to below.

Pre-application consultation by
BHP

- Garage Verification letters sent by Tenancy 6/10/2014 to establish whether the garages were being used to park cars or as storage. (18 garages). Verifications concluded that 3 garages were being used to park cars.
- The Notice To Quit was served on 25/11/2014 to seek to clear out garages.
- 3/12/2014 – Initial letter to local councillors to advise of the proposals. Site specific meeting have been held during the planning period with both Cllr Duffy and Cllr Conneely
- Lock changes to all garages January 2015. Further discussions with 3 residents affected and agreed to extend their garage leases during the planning period rather than close down and serve immediate notice. One resident didn't use their car any more and didn't wish to rent the garage any longer.
- Letter Drop on 7/1/2015. Knocked on each residents door, the development proposal was explained in detail to those residents who were at home. Others had the information posted through their letter box.
- Consultation continued through ad hoc conversations with residents during the design and development period between January and June. As a result of this consultation, residents comments were taken on board in relation to parking and provision was increased.
- 9/6/2015 - Door knocked all residents mainly to discuss the revised parking arrangements and commitment to honour existing resident parking permits and explain our proposals for parking in the new scheme. The proposal for issuing permits was discussed with residents who were at home, otherwise drawings/information posted through their letter box. 6 formal responses were received and BHP met with a number of these who wanted follow up or one to one meetings.

Concerns of existing residents in relation to repairs/behaviour

Members heard at the site visit that a resident was concerned about the way BHP maintain their properties. In response BHP advise that in the last 12 months 31 repairs have been undertaken at James Stewart House. Across both William Dromey Court and James Stewart House there have been 7 complaints in the last 12 months, one of which relating to a roof repair was upheld. BHP say that repairs have been carried out and completed as instructed and do not accept the version of events given at the weekend.

BHP are aware of recent congregation by youths to the front of James Stewart which has resulted in calls to the Police, however they are not aware of other records of police call outs in the immediate area and it is not considered a crime 'hotspot'.

Across the 2 sites there have been 8 antisocial behaviour call outs from 1st July 2014 to 17th September 2015. Officers consider that if the proposal is likely to result in reduced opportunities for ASB given the increase in natural surveillance and private outside space.

Implications of the Housing Bill and whether the best value is being achieved from the site

This point was raised by Brondesbury Residents and Tenants Association (BRAT).

The Housing Bill is proposed introduce a requirement that council's sell their most valuable properties to reinvest in affordable housing (and fund the Right to Buy discounts). There is no clarity on the full details of this proposal at present but it is stated that it would apply only to properties which become vacant, it would be unlikely that it would apply to a new build house yet to be occupied. The proposal needs to be determined on its own merits and can't pre-empt future housing policy.

The proposed scheme has already attracted a grant from the GLA which is committed only if these houses are affordable housing and they are proposed to meet the borough's pressing need for affordable accommodation. BRAT have also suggested that a larger number of small units should be proposed instead of smaller number of family size units and these could be used to re-accommodate existing tenants living in properties which are too large for them. Officers understand that this is something that the council is proceeding with separately. BRAT have also suggested that bigger buildings could be accommodated on the sites; Members will be aware that parking for existing residents needs to be reprovided meaning that the footprints of the buildings cannot easily increase and additional height may result in conflict with light and outlook to flats above commercial properties. In any event the proposal needs to be considered on its own planning merits, the borough has a great need for affordable family accommodation and these units will help to meet that need.

Car parking

The site has very good access to parking however the possible impact of overspill parking on the street needs to be considered to ensure the proposal would be in accordance with policy TRN23. Census data for the local output area from 2011 shows 54 cars owned by residents of 152 flats in the immediate area, this gives an average car ownership rate of 0.36 cars/household which, for James Stewart House, suggests car ownership of about 16 spaces.

Parking in James Stewart House is controlled by BHP through a permit system. There are 14 permanent permits currently issued to residents and 4 on-street residents' permits issued by Brent Council's Parking Service, totalling 18 permits (or 18 vehicles). On this basis the proposed retention of 24 spaces has been considered sufficient to satisfy existing demand. The proposed units each have a parking space located between their front paths.

Parking during construction will be dealt with under a construction management plan, to ensure reasonable parking can be maintained throughout.

Additional conditions

1)

Details of lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development, for communal areas within the site.

The approved details shall be fully implemented.

Reason: In the interests of safety, amenity and convenience.

2)

Prior to commencement, detail of surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved detail. Such detail shall include:

- inclusion of SuDS where practicable*
- demonstration that water will not discharge onto the highway*
- confirmation that run-off rates into the public sewers are acceptable*

Reason: To ensure that surface water run-off is mitigated acceptably

Recommendation: Remains approval subject to additional conditions