

Committee: Development	Date: 14 th September 2010	Classification: Unrestricted	Agenda Item No: 6.1
Report of: Director of Development and Renewal		Title: Town Planning Application	
Case Officer: Mary O'Shaughnessy		Ref No: PA/10/00742	
		Ward: Bow East	

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Location: 71A Fairfield Road, London

Existing Use:

Proposal: Retention and alteration of existing part 3 part 5 storey building which contains 8 residential units.

Drawing Nos/Documents: Drawings:
jw372_100, jw372_101, jw372_102, jw372_103 REVA,
jw372_104, jw372_105, jw372_106 and jw372_107.

Documents:
Design Statement, 11th September 2009, prepared by JDW architects, incorporating:
Design and Access Statement

Impact Statement REVA, 11th September 2009, prepared by JDW architects, incorporating:
Daylight/Sunlight Report, 5th February 2010 prepared by Drivers Jonas.

Applicant: Hannah O'Brien

Ownership: As above

Historic Building: Not applicable

Conservation Area: Adjacent to Fairfield Road Conservation Area.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That the Committee resolve to **REFUSE** planning permission:

For the following reasons:

2.2 The proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site and this is identified by the following:

- a) The proposed development, by virtue of its increased height and excess bulk and mass at third and fourth floor level, would appear out of character with the surrounding area and the host building. The proposed building fails to relate to the scale of the adjacent building to the east at 71 and 73 Fairfield Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policy DEV1 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (1998), SP10 of the Core Strategy Submission Version December 2009 and policy DEV2 of the Interim Planning Guidance (2007). These policies seek to ensure appropriate design of buildings within the Borough that respect local context.

- b) The proposed development, by virtue of its proximity to the adjacent properties to the east at 71 and 73 Fairfield Road, would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for existing residents. This is compounded by the height of the proposed development and its higher gradient which looks down on to and into these properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policy DEV2 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (1998), policy DEV1 of the Interim Planning Guidance (2007) and policy SP10 of the Core Strategy Submission Version December 2009. These policies seek to protect the amenity of residents of the Borough.
- c) The proposal would result in poor standard of accommodation for future occupants, by virtue of its small internal floor areas (Flat 1, 6, 7 & 8) and lack of external amenity space (Flats 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8). The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policies DEV2, HSG13 and HSG16 of the adopted UDP (1998) and Policy HSG7 of the Interim Planning Guidance (2007). These policies seek to ensure developments provide sufficient amenity, internal space standards, and high quality useable amenity space for future residential occupiers.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 This application for planning permission was reported to Development Committee on 18th August 2010 with an Officer recommendation for approval.
- 3.2 Members indicated that they were minded to refuse the planning application because of serious concerns over:
- The bulk, scale and height of the proposed building
 - The amenity impact of the proposed building in respect of privacy issues
- 3.3 Nevertheless, members resolved to defer making a decision to allow the applicant the opportunity to amend the scheme in order to address their concerns.
- 3.4 Since the deferral of the decision, the case officer has been in contact with the applicant in respect of amending the scheme in order to reduce the bulk and mass of the third and fourth storeys of the building. The applicant has advised that it would not be possible to remove elements of the building without removing the whole building. Given, the applicant is of the opinion that the building cannot be amended in order to satisfy the concerns of members, the application is being presented to members with reasons for refusal.

Implications of the Decision

- 3.5 Following the refusal of the application there would be a number of possibilities open to the Applicant. These would include (though not limited to):-
1. Resubmission of an amended scheme to overcome reasons for refusal;
 2. Lodge an appeal against the refusal of the scheme. The Council would vigorously defend any appeal against a refusal.

4. Conclusions

All other relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account. Planning permission should be REFUSED for the reasons set out in the RECOMMENDATION at the beginning of this report.

5. APPENDICIES

5.1 Appendix One – Committee Report to Members on 18th August 2010.