



**Hackbridge & Beddington Corner
Neighbourhood Development Group**
hackbridgeandbc@gmail.com
www.hackbridgendg.com

Mr Andrew Thornley
Case Officer
Planning and Transportation
London Borough of Sutton
24 Denmark Road
Carshalton
Surrey SM5 2JG

11 October 2017

Dear Mr Thornley

**PLANNING APPLICATION – C2017/77886
CADET CENTRE ACF Hackbridge Road, SM6 7AS**

We are writing to **OBJECT** to the above application. Reasons for this objection have been listed below, under headings for ease of reference.

We are however interested to know why this development has not proceeded under the approved application C2014/69942 for two detached houses.

Observations on submitted documentation

Existing mapping & proposed massing – drawing no. 006

- We wish to point out that this drawing show inaccurate massing of the flats along Hackbridge Road on the Felnex site as 6-storeys. This should be 4-storeys.

Design & Access Statement

- Paragraph 2.3 states that ‘However, there are two rows of grade II listed 18th century terraced cottages on the Green, approximately 50m from the site. However, these are not visible from the site and therefore not considered to be part of the site’s context.’
- This is rather a confusing statement and appears to dismiss properties likely to be overshadowed and subjected to loss of sunlight and daylight, while at the same time referencing practically every current new development across Hackbridge, to justify both height and massing of proposed development on this site. Given the close proximity of this proposed development to existing and currently being built residential properties, it is worry that the word ‘approximate’ is being used when it comes to stating distances from such properties.
- Paragraph 3.2 states that “*The above permission (ref: C2014/69942) remains extant and establishes the acceptability of the proposals in principle. Furthermore, the*

approved Non Material Amendment (ref 2014/70968) grants access for up to 3 dwellings to the site from the parking area of Corbet Close”.

- This is rather misleading as the planning application (C2014/70968) referred to is for changes to the parking layout in Corbet Close and allowing access to future development on the Cadet Hut site. Nowhere does it make specific reference to the acceptability of 3 dwellings on the Cadet Hut site.
- Paragraphs 3.1 – 3.4 provide a list of some of the various planning applications which have received approval over recent years in Hackbridge; for the specific purpose of justifying the developer’s desire to increase the density on this small plot. This is unacceptable and only serves to highlight the serious overdevelopment of Hackbridge currently happening.
- Paragraph 4.7 states that ‘It must be recognised that the Core Strategy, which sets the Council’s annual housing target, was developed before 2012, and under PPS3. The current Core Strategy Housing target of 5,175 homes is the 15-year Plan period (345 per year) is therefore out of date.’
- The important point here is the target is for the whole of Sutton. Hackbridge is one ward and is currently taking a disproportionate element of this target due to a recent surge in landowners suddenly taking advantage of changes to planning regulations including permitted development.
- Paragraph 5.40 states that ‘Whilst Plot 2 provides two spaces, Plots 1 and 3 have one parking space provided.
- While cycle storage and a nearby bus stop are cited as justification for not providing adequate parking, it is unacceptable for the developer of this land to base his planning application on the assumption that developments in Hackbridge ‘is likely to bring about transport improvements in the area’. Indeed, Southern and Thameslink have recently announced their intention to reduce services during peak times. The provision of electric charging points only serves to highlight the fact that residents may opt to drive greener vehicles but these still have to be parked somewhere!

Density

- The site of the development is not within the area of potential intensification, and thereby submitting an application for three houses on such a small plot of land is unjustifiable.
- Previous concerns on the original planning application for three houses were issues on amenity space and unacceptable living conditions. We do not see how this new application has solved these issues.
- Our view is that the developer is trying to squeeze too many houses onto the plot to the detriment of existing and the future residents.

Loss of privacy

- Residents from the houses in Corbet Close and The Wave Flats are concerned with loss of privacy.
- We do note that Plot 3 has been partially reduced in height and windows removed to try to alleviate this. However, with the addition of a third house, means this plot is even closer to the Corbet Close residents.
- There are no elevations to see clearly how windows of Plots 1 and 2 relate to the Wave Flats.
- Living Walls are featured significantly in the design to reduce loss of privacy. If they can’t design the building to take into account privacy without additional screening measures, then the site is being overdeveloped. There are also no specific details of construction or irrigation systems needed. What measurements are in place to ensure the maintenance of these walls are taken on by the new residents and don’t removed? Whilst we welcome living walls, these are not easy to maintain.

Loss of sunlight / daylight

- Residents in the Wave Flats are concerned about loss of daylight. Although plans may be to scale, without written dimensions on them when using Sutton Council's Planning Portal, one is unable to make calculations how close Plot 1 is to the Wave Flats.
- Residents of Corbet Close are concerned about loss of daylight / sunlight to their gardens and houses.
- Residents of 27 to 19 The Green, Grade II Listed cottages are concerned that the height of the houses with minimal spacing between will result in loss of winter sunlight. It should be noted that 27 The Green is a bungalow. It should also be taken into consideration that daylight and sunlight was lost to these houses from the construction of Wave Flats in 2010.
- There is no sunlight / daylight light study to show:-
 - No loss of sunlight / daylight to garden and houses of Corbet Close
 - No loss of sunlight / daylight to the Wave Flats
 - No loss of sunlight / daylight to The Green, especially the bungalow
 - How the living walls which are to be used as privacy screens will affect sunlight / daylight.

Excessive height

- Three sides of the site are surrounded by 2-storey houses, with the last by the Wave Flats, a part 4/5/6 block of flats.
- The site is not in an area of taller building potential and it is evident that as the plot is of limited size that the only way to get four bedrooms in each property is to go up in height.

Car Parking

- The site is in a low Public Transport Accessibility Level – rating 2. The recommended number of parking spaces for 4-bedroom houses are two per household.
- This application does not provide sufficient parking for all three houses.
- It should also be noted there are significant parking problems in Hackbridge and inadequate provision should not be acceptable as there is no room for overspill onto nearby roads.

Protection of TPO Corsican pine tree

- We cannot find any information how this tree will be protected from demolition and ultimately construction, should this application be approved.

Plot sizes of proposed dwellings / private amenity space

- Plot 1 is 170sqm for 4 bedrooms, 6 people, 73sqm amenity space
- Plot 2 is 130sqm for 4 bedrooms, 8 people, 75sqm amenity space
- Plot 3 is 120sqm for 4 bedrooms, 7 people, 71sqm amenity space
- Whilst we note that Plot 3 is part 2, part 3 storey house, it is less than the minimum GIA for a 4 bedroom 7 person 3-storey house. It is noticeably different in design, which does not benefit with a garage, no toilet facilities on the ground or third floor and what appears to be a smaller living area. Plot 3 also just meets the minimum size of private amenity space. It is clear that the future residents of this property have not been taken into consideration with its minimal sizes and more reflective of money making for the developer.

Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces	Minimum GIA (m ²)			Built-in storage (m ²)
		1 storey dwellings	2 storey dwellings	3 storey dwellings	
4b	5p	90	97	103	3.0
	6p	99	106	112	
	7p	108	115	121	
	8p	117	124	130	

Overall the site has lots of design features we welcome, however we believe that this plot is being over developed to the detriment of existing residents and small amenities for the new residents.

We hope you will take our comments into consideration when viewing this application.

Yours sincerely

LHorrox

Lysanne Horrox
Chair