

| | | |
|--------------|--|--------------|
| Committee | PLANNING COMMITTEE A | |
| Report Title | HAMILTON LODGE, 36 HONOR OAK ROAD, LONDON SE23 3RZ | |
| Ward | FOREST HILL | |
| Contributors | LUKE MANNIX | |
| Class | PART 1 | 16 JULY 2015 |

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <u>Reg. Nos.</u> | DC/15/91664 |
| <u>Application dated</u> | 02.04.15 |
| <u>Applicant</u> | Private Sector Housing Agency (Lewisham Council) |
| <u>Proposal</u> | The change of use of Hamilton Lodge, 36 Honor Oak Road SE23 from a Care Home (Use Class C2) to a hostel comprising temporary accommodation for homeless households (Use Class Sui Generis) for a period of 5 years. |
| <u>Applicant's Plan Nos.</u> | E.01 Rev B, E.02 Rev A, P.51 Rev B, LSDP 11216.01 (Landscape Proposal/Tree Survey), BREEAM Pre-Assessment Estimator Report, Design and Access Statement, Education Statement, Planning Statement, Site Location and Photographs, Statement of Community Engagement, Travel Plan Framework, Travel Statement (received 2nd April 2015); Management Statement (received 17 th June 2015); P.52 Rev D (received 19 th June 2015); Parking Survey (received 30 th June 2017). |
| <u>Background Papers</u> | (1) LE/53/36/TP (2) Development Management Local Plan (2014) (3) Core Strategy (2011) (4) The London Plan (2015) |
| <u>Designation</u> | PTAL 3 Local Open Space Deficiency Locally List Building C Road |
| <u>Screening</u> | N/A |

1.0 Property/Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is located on the west side of Honor Oak Road and contains a three storey detached building with side and rear extensions, together with ancillary car parking and refuse storage to the front and open space to the rear.
- 1.2 The building is an Edwardian Villa constructed in 1898-9. The building is constructed of red brick with stone dressings around the windows and doors with

slate roofing. The front facade has two domed corner turrets with bay windows. The side and rear extensions are more modern additions dated around 1960-70's. The additions to the rear also act as separate access and egress to the rear of the building.

- 1.3 The property is currently vacant, however the most recent use was as a nursing home (Use Class C2). Other past uses include adult language schools and private home.
- 1.4 The topography is heavily sloped, sloping from the Thames Water reservoir at the rear to Honor Oak Road at the front. There is some vegetation to the rear of the site of moderate ecological value.
- 1.5 The property is not located in a Conservation Area and is not a listed building, however it is a locally listed building. The area is mainly residential, with the Forest Hill district centre and Honor Oak Park both approximately 900m from the site. The site has a PTAL rating of 3, based on a scale of 1-6 with 6 being excellent, with a bus stop to the front of the site.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 4th August 1961 – Planning permission for the erection of an extension to the existing adult language school.
- 2.2 31st July 1963 – Planning permission for alterations and the erection of an extension to the adult school of languages at 36 Honor Oak Road.
- 2.3 5th April 1995 – Planning permission was granted for the use of 36 Honor Oak Road SE23 as a nursing home (DC/95/38662).

Adjacent Property

- 2.4 DC/15/91663 – An application has been received for the change of use of 118 Canonbie Road (neighbouring Hamilton Lodge to the north) from a Care Home (Use Class C2) to a hostel comprising temporary accommodation for homeless households (Use Class Sui Generis) for a period of 5 years. The application is made by the same applicants and presented for consideration at the same committee meeting.

3.0 Current Planning Applications

The Proposals

- 3.1 Planning permission is sought for the change of use of Hamilton Lodge, 36 Honor Oak Road from a Care Home (Use Class C2) to a hostel comprising temporary accommodation for homeless households (Use Class Sui Generis) for a period of 5 years.
- 3.2 Overall there would be 80 beds provided within 21 units, which includes one emergency overnight admissions facility that is capable of accommodating 2 persons. The units would be a mix of shared facilities and self contained units. The self contained units would include kitchens and bathrooms, while the shared facilities would have kitchens but utilise shared bathroom facilities.

- 3.3 The application was originally for 80 bedrooms but spread over 22 units. The scheme was slightly amended following conversations with the Planning Officers to provide more space for a two bed unit on the second floor and increase the number of beds on the top floor unit. Further to this, other amendments were made to reduce the number of shared facility units from 7 units to 5.
- 3.4 There would be no material alterations to the external appearance of the building.
- 3.5 The development would also include a communal laundry facility, caretakers office and childrens play space to the rear. Eight existing car parking spaces would be retained to the front of the building, together with the provision of 22 cycle storage spaces to the side of the building. The existing refuse area would be retained.
- 3.6 The proposed hostel would be managed by the Private Sector Housing Agency within Lewisham Council, who currently manage 26 hostels within the Borough. The proposed hostel would employ a Temporary Accommodations Officer (TAO), Homeless Families Facilities Support Service (HFFSS) and an on-site caretaker. These members of staff would be employed during the core hours (Monday to Friday 9am-5pm), together with an emergency out of hour's repairs service to deal with any repairs through the Council's in-house repairs service, administered through Lewisham Homes.
- 3.7 The proposed hostel would be used to accommodate "Homeless Households" and would not be used for individuals with high/acute support needs. A household is defined within the Management Statement as at least one adult and at least one child under 18. It is expected that the residents would be accommodated for 26 weeks on average.

Supporting Documents

- 3.8 Together with the existing and proposed floor plans, the following documents have been submitted in support of the application:-
- Design and Access Statement;
 - Management Statement;
 - Planning Statement;
 - Transport Statement;
 - Travel Plan;
 - BREEAM Pre-Assessment;
 - Statement of Community Involvement;
 - Tree/Landscape Plan;
 - Childrens Play Strategy;
 - Education Statement; and,

- Heritage Statement.

4.0 Consultation

4.1 This section outlines the consultation carried out by the applicant prior to submission and the Council following the submission of the application and summarises the responses received. The Council's consultation exceeded the minimum statutory requirements and those required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

4.2 Site notices were displayed and letters were sent to residents and business in the surrounding area and the relevant ward Councillors. The Conservation Team, Highway Department, Forest Hill Society and TfL were also consulted.

Pre-Application Consultation

a) Pre-Application Advice

4.3 Pre-application discussions were undertaken between the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and the applicants.

4.4 In discussions held in October, the LPA raised concerns with the proposals, management procedures and the standard of the documents completed in support of the application. Significant work was required before the application would be supported.

4.5 Following discussions in February and March and the preparation of adequate supporting documents, a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) was signed in March 2015.

b) Pre-Application Community Consultation

4.6 Following initial conversations with the LPA, the local community and Local Councillors were consulted on the scheme during October. The results are detailed in the Statement of Community Involvement.

4.7 An initial meeting was held on the 13th October with the Local Councillors invited. Following discussions with Councillor Upex, residents within a 500m radius were contacted for a local meeting. The meetings were held on the 23rd October and the 25th October 2014 at the Civic Centre. Approximately 36 residents attended.

4.8 The following feedback was received from residents:-

- Scepticism over the number of hostels within Forest Hill;
- Concern was raised over the impacts on school places;
- The level of occupancy and concentration within the area is an issue, with concerns on the impact on the community due to the residents, parking and other services;
- The site may be better used as an extension of Fairlawn Primary School; and,

- It was noted that prior to the use of Hamilton Lodge as a nursing home, the property was used as a language school.

4.9 Following the consultation, minor alterations to the scheme were made to amend the room layout and number of units. Furthermore, additional work was conducted to explore the full impact on school premises and clarification was made on the details of the application such as the emergency accommodation.

Post Planning Application Submission Statutory Consultation

a) Written Responses received from Local Residents and Organisations

4.10 Surrounding properties within 100m were directly notified by letter, together with a site notice posted on the 16th April 2015 and a press notice placed in the Local Shopper.

4.11 37 written representations were received, including 31 letters of objection. The following valid planning objections were raised:-

- There is an existing pressure on school places and the proposed hostel for families would increase this. The site may be better used as an extension of the nearby Fairlawn Primary School;
- The proposed development has not completed adequate research to determine the exact impact it would have on school places such as child age. It is considered that the majority of children would be of primary school age and therefore would significantly impact on school places to the primary schools in the area;
- Concerns over the standard of accommodation in particular the size of rooms, shared facilities and lack of communal internal space. Furthermore, some rooms seem to have a lack of sunlight/daylight leading to poor internal amenities;
- The proposed rooms are not adequate for permanent accommodation and therefore, if planning permission was given, a condition should be added to ensure residents shall not stay beyond 26 weeks;
- The number of beds and density of residents (both in the proposed site and the adjoining 118 Canonbie Road) is too great for the buildings to handle;
- The PTAL rating is incorrect and could impact on its acceptability;
- The need for housing could be met by converting the property into flats;
- Parking will be a major issue. The increase from 100 beds would add to noise, pollution and traffic safety. There are concerns over the accuracy of the parking survey as it was done at 10pm, not when school was occupied;
- Impact on the provision of services, such as public transport, police and health care facilities;
- The increase of homeless people in the area would add to anti-social behaviour and reduce safety for residents, especially at night;

- The number of children on site, together with residents with possible mental disorders and drug dependencies could impact on the residential amenity in terms of noise and general disturbances;
- The historic problems of anti social behaviour from previous hostels in the area and it is believed this hostel would not be any different. Miriam Lodge and 118 Canonbie Road have been used as examples;
- Objections to the removal of trees to the site;
- When coupled with the other development in the area (primarily Tyson Road residential development), the development would place more pressure on services, transport and parking;
- The use should continue as a nursing home as it fits with the area needs and has less impact on services;
- The number of staff employed by the applicant over all of their hostels would not be adequate;
- Concerns over the lack of 24 hour on-site management;
- Concerns over the transparency of the Council's consultation, including the Statement of Community Involvement and the Local Planning Authorities consultation;
- Questions were raised about the money spent on the purchase of the property and the upgrade of the facilities;
- Concerns were raised over the conflict of interest between the Council and the Local Planning Authority;
- The number of hostels in Forest Hill (such as Miriam Lodge) was raised. It was argued that the over density of hostels in the postcode leads to an unbalanced community and therefore they should be spread over the other parts of the Borough. The prospect of two hostels neighbouring each other would add to the high density of hostels in SE23;
- The application is contrary to the Council's Local Development Framework as it would undermine the stable character of the area and deny the use of the site for permanent accommodation. The proposal also contravenes the provisions of DM Policy 5, relating to the loss of specialised accommodation for elderly people, DM Policy 6 relating to Houses in Multiple Occupancy (HMO) and the BREEAM requirement of 'Excellent';
- Impact of more children in the area on the ecological value of nearby nature reserves;
- Poor provision of refuse storage;
- The development would impact on the heritage asset of a locally listed building; and,
- The amenity space is unsuitable for child's play.

- 4.12 5 letters for comment were received raising the following additional points to those raised above:-
- The location is inconvenient for families that move to the location. Unless children are already at nearby schools it would be difficult to travel to other parts of the Borough;
 - The population of Hamilton Lodge would almost double, which raises concerns over living standards, safety and maintenance costs. The number of people would prove stressful for families in the facilities; and,
 - Poor consultation of the development by the applicant and LPA.
- 4.13 The Forest Hill Society also objected, raising the following concerns:-
- The size and amenities of the rooms, together with the lack of internal communal space, is concerning and the quality of life would be effected;
 - Concerns over the number of bed spaces;
 - The transport statement is erroneous; and,
 - The premises is not suitable for permanent accommodation and therefore if the development goes ahead, the use for temporary accommodation should be ensured.
- 4.14 One letter of support was received stating that the proposed development would benefit homeless households in a suitable location.
- 4.15 The letters are available for members to view.
- 4.16 Objections to the Council's consultation were raised. It should be noted that the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) requires non-major applications to only consult adjoining neighbours and post a site notice. On this occasion, due to the controversial nature of the application, the consultation went above the measures outlined in the SCI. Further to this, letters of objection were received and taken into account up until the writing of this report.

Written Responses received from Statutory Agencies

a) Highways

- 4.17 Verbal comments were received from the Transport Officer outlining that, based on the data of car ownership in the Borough and the amount of staff required, the development is likely to require 11 car parking spaces.
- 4.18 Given the concern raised by residents with regard to parking, a site visit was conducted by the Council's Transport Officer on the night of the 18th of June 2015. The site visit found sufficient space to incorporate the expected car parking demand from the proposed development similar to the levels detailed in the parking survey.

4.19 A Travel Plan Framework was submitted as part of the application and it was recommended that a condition should be added requiring the submission of evidence of the travel plan implementation within 9 months of occupation.

4.20 Overall the development is considered to be unobjectionable on the grounds of highways and transport.

b) TfL

4.21 Overall the proposal is unobjectionable. The cycle parking numbers are considered adequate, however changing facilities for staff should be included. The travel plan should also include measures to identify the need to increase cycle parking should it be required.

4.22 The amount of parking is adequate given the location and number of on-street parking provided. One blue badge parking and electric charging point should be provided.

4.23 No objection was raised concerning the impact on public transport.

c) Conservation

4.24 The temporary change of use to a hostel is acceptable in conservation terms. The proposed internal changes to the 1963 and 1978 extension are acceptable since these areas are of no special interest.

4.25 The proposed works are stated to be exclusively internal. Clarification is required that there will be no changes to the external envelope of the building.

4.26 The proposals involve relatively minor changes to the floorplan. These proposed changes are broadly acceptable in conservation terms, since there has sadly already been very significant damage to the original floorplan of the building.

4.27 The proposed works involve the introduction of a number of new bathrooms and kitchens into the building. These are likely to be acceptable, since the building has already undergone the introduction of large amounts of plumbing and other services in similar locations in the previous institutional uses. Further detail is required on the proposed routes for plumbing and ventilation services. A planning condition should be imposed prohibiting all external, wall-mounted pipework. A planning condition should be imposed prohibiting all external window, wall or roof-mounted ventilation exhausts or grilles.

4.28 The building currently has suspended ceilings, introduced presumably to make the historic building match the new extensions. These create an unpleasantly institutional feel and may conceal fine historic ceilings. Consideration should be given to their wholesale removal as part of the proposed works; this would create a more homely atmosphere and reveal some of the beauties of the building.

4.29 The proposed new use will mean that the building is occupied by families and there will be many young children in and around the building. The current rear garden is short and steeply sloping; although the proposals include improved play provision this is likely to be problematic. As noted above, the front garden of the building has been sacrificed to tarmac and car parking. The proposals would be vastly improved if the front parking could be minimised or ideally removed

altogether (assuming the proposed residents do not require parking). This would enable the soft landscaping of the front garden with planting and removal of the tarmac, improving the local streetscape and the setting of the building and creating a secondary and flatter play area for children. The current boundary treatment could also be rebuilt in a manner which was both more appropriate for the building and able to contain children safely.

- 4.30 The proposed bin storage appears optimistically small for the number of proposed occupants. The proposed cycle storage is awkward and hard to access. Reconfiguration of the front garden would also provide an opportunity for better planning of bin and cycle storage.
- 4.31 The south side and rear extensions have form a large flat-roofed area. If a suitable railing were introduced and the structures were adequate, these could be reconfigured as a roof garden and play area.

Local Meeting

- 4.32 A local meeting was held on the 3rd of June 2015 at the Honor Oak Christian Fellowship, 39 Honor Oak Road. In total 63 residents were in attendance, together with Ward Councillors, the applicant team and planning officers.
- 4.33 The minutes of the meeting are attached as an appendix to this report.

5.0 Policy Context

Introduction

- 5.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-
- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
 - (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
 - (c) any other material considerations.

A local finance consideration means:

- (a) a grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown, or
 - (b) sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- 5.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that 'if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise'. The development plan for Lewisham comprises the Core Strategy, the Development Management Local Plan, the Site Allocations Local Plan and the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, and the London Plan. The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

National Planning Policy Framework

- 5.3 The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains at paragraph 14, a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Annex 1 of the NPPF provides guidance on implementation of the NPPF. In summary, this states in paragraph 211, that policies in the development plan should not be considered out of date just because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF. At paragraphs 214 and 215 guidance is given on the weight to be given to policies in the development plan. As the NPPF is now more than 12 months old paragraph 215 comes into effect. This states in part that '...due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)'.
- 5.4 Officers have reviewed the Core Strategy for consistency with the NPPF and consider there is no issue of significant conflict. As such, full weight can be given to these policies in the decision making process in accordance with paragraphs 211, and 215 of the NPPF.

Other National Guidance

- 5.5 On 6 March 2014, DCLG launched the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) resource. This replaced a number of planning practice guidance documents.

London Plan (March 2015)

- 5.6 On 10 March 2015 the London Plan (consolidated with alterations since 2011) was adopted. The policies relevant to this application are:

Policy 3.1 Ensuring equal life chances for all
Policy 3.2 Improving health and addressing health inequalities
Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
Policy 3.6 Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities
Policy 3.8 Housing choice
Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
Policy 3.16 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure
Policy 3.17 Health and social care facilities
Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

- 5.7 The London Plan SPG's relevant to this application are:

Housing (2012)

Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation (2012)

Core Strategy

- 5.8 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 29 June 2011. The Core Strategy, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Development Management Local Plan and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Lewisham Core Strategy as they relate to this application:

Spatial Policy 1 Lewisham Spatial Strategy

Spatial Policy 5 Areas of Stability and Managed Change

Core Strategy Policy 1 Housing provision, mix and affordability

Core Strategy Policy 8 Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency

Core Strategy Policy 14 Sustainable movement and transport

Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham

Core Strategy Policy 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment

Core Strategy Policy 19 Provision and maintenance of community and recreational facilities

Development Management Local Plan

- 5.9 The Development Management Local Plan was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 26 November 2014. The Development Management Local Plan, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Core Strategy and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Development Management Local Plan as they relate to this application:

- 5.10 The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:

DM Policy 1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development

DM Policy 5 Sheltered housing and care homes

DM Policy 32 Housing design, layout and space standards

DM Policy 37 Non designated heritage assets including locally listed buildings, areas of special local character and areas of archaeological interest

Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (August 2012)

- 5.11 This document sets out guidance and standards relating to design, sustainable development, renewable energy, flood risk, sustainable drainage, dwelling mix, density, layout, neighbour amenity, the amenities of the future occupants of developments, safety and security, refuse, affordable housing, self containment, noise and room positioning, room and dwelling sizes, storage, recycling facilities and bin storage, noise insulation, parking, cycle parking and storage, gardens and amenity space, landscaping, play space, Lifetime Homes and accessibility, and materials.

6.0 Planning Considerations

- 6.1 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- a) Principle of Development
- b) Hostel Management
- c) Impact on Adjoining Properties
- d) Impact on Local Services
- e) Standard of Accommodation
- f) Highways and Traffic Issues
- g) Impact on Heritage Assets
- h) Sustainability and Energy
- i) Trees and Landscaping

Principle of Development

a) Loss of Specialist Accommodation for Older People

- 6.2 The application is for a temporary change of use to a hostel for homeless families for five years. After this time, the use would cease.
- 6.3 The proposed development involves the loss of a vacant nursing home. DM Policy 5 addresses specialist accommodation for older people. Part 3 and 4 of the policy refers to the loss of such accommodation. There have been numerous objections on the loss of the nursing home.
- 6.4 Part 3 states that:-
- “The Council will resist development that involves the net loss of floorspace in specialist accommodation unless:*
- a) adequate replacement specialist accommodation will be provided;*
 - b) it can be demonstrated that there is a surplus of that particular type of specialist accommodation in the area, and,*
 - c) it can be demonstrated that the existing specialist accommodation is incapable of meeting relevant industry standards for suitable accommodation.”*
- 6.5 Part 4 of the policy advises that where the Council is satisfied that a development involving the loss of specialist accommodation is appropriate, it will expect re-provision of an equivalent amount of floorspace, or of permanent housing in C3 Use Class.
- 6.6 The building is a three storey Edwardian era building and is located on sloping terrain. In the 1960-70's, the site was converted for a language school with extensions to the side and rear. In 1995 the building was converted into a nursing home.
- 6.7 The premises was run by Premier Southern Care Limited up until October 2013. Following an inspection in June 2013, it was concluded the home no longer met Care Quality Commission standards and it was not considered by the owners to be economically viable or practical to refurbish the property. As such it closed and has remained vacant since.
- 6.8 In regards to Part 3A, while the proposal does not comply with Part 3A as no replacement accommodation is proposed, the property is vacant and no residents

remain to be relocated. On balance replacement accommodation is not considered to be necessary in this instance.

- 6.9 The planning statement submitted in support of the application included a list of the nearby care homes for older people. Further to the number shown in this document, an online search by Planning Officers for care homes of elderly residents found a total of four facilities within 1 mile of the site providing a total of 104 beds.
- 6.10 As noted above there are no residents to be relocated to an alternative home and therefore the provision of 104 bed spaces within 1 mile is considered to demonstrate that there is alternative provision in the area and satisfy Part 3B of DM Policy 5.
- 6.11 The building has been vacant for 20 months now. As stated in the supporting documents, due to the costs of redevelopment and restrictions of the building, the internal area is considered to be inadequate for use as a nursing home for the elderly in its current form. Therefore the property is not considered capable of providing the standard of care required by industry standards. Officers have reviewed this report and consider that its current state and given the potential cost of upgrading the current building to a suitable standard for the elderly that the temporary change of use would be justified against Part 3C of DM5.
- 6.12 Part 4 of DM Policy 5 requires the re-provision of specialist accommodation or self-contained housing in Use Class C3. The supporting text of DM Policy 5 that where the Council accepts that an existing site or property is no longer appropriate for specialist accommodation, development for self-contained standard housing will be the preferred option. It is also noted that this is raised in objections and in the local meeting.
- 6.13 While the proposal would not result in the re-provision of housing in Use Class C3, it is considered that the scheme would provide another form of specialist accommodation in the form of temporary accommodation for homeless households. The application is for a temporary change of use for a period of five years to address a specific pressing need within the borough. It is considered that there is suitable need within the Borough (as outlined below) to justify the temporary change of use on this basis. The use would cease after five years. There would be nothing to preclude the property returning to the use as a care home for the elderly or an alternative C2 use at the end of this temporary five year period, subject to any relevant industry standards being able to be met on site.
- 6.14 It should be noted that the proposed use is not a House in Multiple Occupation and therefore DM Policy 6 on HMO's does not apply, as raised in some objections.

b) Principle of Homeless Household Hostel

- 6.15 The NPPF promotes mixed and balanced communities. This is reflected in Policy 3.9 of the London Plan which states that communities mixed and balanced by tenure and household income should be promoted, which foster social diversity, redress social exclusion and strengthen communities' sense of responsibility for, and identity with, their neighbourhoods.

- 6.16 Section 3.1.58 of the London Plan Housing SPG states that Boroughs are recommended not to put restrictions on the provision of hostels, such as restricting their numbers in specific locations, unless there is clear evidence of significant negative impact on both the neighbourhood and residents. This is discussed later in the report.
- 6.17 There is no specific policy within the Council's Local Development Framework, however Core Strategy Policy 1 is concerned with meeting housing need generally. The policy states within the supporting text that the Council is seeking to reduce inequalities and create socially mixed communities with a greater housing choice of mix, size, type and location in order to represent the needs of Lewisham's diverse community. This is in line with the London Plan and NPPF.
- 6.18 Given the above, provided it can be proven that there is an established need for the development and the development would not result in an unbalanced community, the principle of the use of the building as a temporary hostel is considered acceptable.
- 6.19 The background behind the need for hostel accommodation for homeless households is contained within the supporting Management Statement and a summary is provided below.
- 6.20 The statement advises that a combination of historic and on-going lack of new supply, welfare reform, right to buy and rising property prices and rents has led to rapidly increasing demand in all tenures. Together with the rise in house prices, there has been a significant increase in the cost of privately rented accommodation. Finally, the demand for suitable housing is not being met by development from the private sector or Local Authorities.
- 6.21 Overall, this has led to an increase in homeless households who have been made homeless through no fault of their own. It was noted during the local meeting that 60% of homeless applications have been through evictions due to rising rent.
- 6.22 This has resulted in an increase in the use of temporary accommodation for homeless households by the Council as an interim measure. The use of Bed & Breakfast accommodation (B&B) has substantially increased over the past year with more than 575 households currently accommodated in B&B's, which is up from 59 during 2012/13. This form of accommodation is considered a wasteful use of resources and budget and therefore the Local Authority is looking to increase its hostel accommodation for temporary use through expanding existing accommodation and new acquisitions.
- 6.23 Numerous representations from residents acknowledge the need for this type of accommodation, however, object to the density of hostels within the SE23 postcode. While it is acknowledged that there are six Lewisham Council operated hostels located within the SE23 postcode, five of those are located within the Perry Vale Ward approximately 2-3km from the application site. It is worth noting that these properties are closer to Catford town centre than Forest Hill town centre. The nearest Lewisham Council operated hostel is located at Arnon Oak in Malham Road approximately 1.7km from the application site.
- 6.24 An online search by planning officers for other hostels in the area did not find any significant number of hostels operated by other providers within the immediate

vicinity. The closest facility is Miriam Lodge, which is located 1.6km from the site within SE26 and Sydenham Ward.

- 6.25 It was noted during the Local Meeting that two applications for hostels at Wood Vale have been submitted to Southwark Council. However a search of the planning register and enquiries with Southwark Council Planning Authority found no such applications.
- 6.26 Therefore, the clearest information shows the nearest operating hostels to be those shown on the supporting documents. Overall, the number of hostel accommodation within SE23 or around the site proposed is not considered to be significant enough to result in the refusal of the scheme.
- 6.27 In terms of the remaining tenure within the area, information has been taken from the 2011 census to determine the amount of social housing. Within the Forest Hill Ward there is a total of 6,661 dwellings and of these 26.4% are socially rented, contrasted with a combined 71.9% of owned or private rented dwellings. This is compared with 31.1% of housing within Lewisham as a whole being socially rented. Therefore the mix of housing in SE23 is considered to have a high percentage of private housing, especially when compared with the Borough as a whole.
- 6.28 The Housing Department has confirmed that within Forest Hill Ward there is a total of 417 social housing units operated by the Local Authority as of January 2015. This includes 47 in Tyson Road, which lies off Honor Oak Park, 48 in Greystead Road 400m away and 3 in Ewelme Road 200m away. This supports the 2011 census which outlines the number of social dwellings in the vicinity when compared with housing overall.
- 6.29 Taking these factors into account, the level of social housing within the Forest Hill Ward is not considered to be unbalanced towards social housing. Rather, the opposite is seen with more private housing when compared with the Borough altogether. Therefore it is considered that the addition of the hostel (together with the adjoining application) would not have a detrimental impact on the mix of housing types in the area.
- 6.30 On the whole, it is considered that the application has adequately demonstrated that there is a need for temporary accommodation for homeless households within the supporting material. Therefore the proposals would benefit the housing needs of residents within the Borough. Furthermore, the proposed change of use (combined with the adjoining application) is not considered to be unacceptable in creating unbalanced communities in terms of tenure or community mix. On the contrary, the proposal is likely to create a more mixed and balanced community in line with national, regional and local policies.
- 6.31 Applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In regards to this proposal the loss of the nursing home use and a temporary consent for a hostel for homeless households would be considered justified on balance when considered against the criteria in the development plan and other material considerations. In particular there is a considerable, identified need within the borough for this type of specialised residential accommodation.

- 6.32 The applicant has included details that outline mitigation measures to ensure no adverse impact and officers consider these would be suitable. However, a five year temporary permission would allow the Council an opportunity to assess the impact of the proposal on the wider area and therefore a temporary change of use is recommended.

Hostel Management

- 6.33 The application is for the assessment of a hostel for the temporary accommodation of homeless households. It is not for the accommodation of single adults or highly dependent residents such as those with mental health issues or restrictive disabilities. For the purposes of this application, a household is defined as at least one adult with at least one child under the age of 18.
- 6.34 Numerous objections have been received which raise concerns regarding the management of the proposed hostel and disturbances to residential amenity as a result of future residents. Residents are worried that the use of the premises, if granted planning permission, could lapse to use by single adults (similar to other hostels in the Borough) who may have more complex needs including drug/alcohol dependencies or mental health issues. As such, the impact of the hostel management is taken as a material consideration in this application.
- 6.35 Single adults with drug/alcohol dependencies or mental health issues are not only likely to result in more instances of anti-social behaviour but also require more services, such as counselling, advice and medical services. This has a different impact in comparison with the proposed hostel for households with children. It is considered the proposed use would require less intensive management and rely on less medial services such as mental health checks and drug rehabilitation.
- 6.36 In light of the concern raised by residents, it is considered that a suitably worded condition would be adequately enforceable to limit the use to households. Therefore, any change of use for the use of the hostel from homeless households as defined in this application would need to be assessed under a separate planning application.
- 6.37 If the Council assesses that the household is homeless then the household will be transferred temporarily to a suite at Hamilton Lodge or Canonbie Road or one of the other Council owned hostels in the Borough. Prior to occupation, the tenants would agree with and sign the license agreement (a copy is attached as an appendix to the Management Statement).
- 6.38 The applicant has a set procedure for dealing with anti-social behaviour in line with expectations set out in the license agreement. If it is found that anti-social behaviour has taken place, the tenant will be given a written warning followed by likely eviction if reoffending.
- 6.39 It is noted that the applicants operates 26 other homeless hostels using the same methods and staff management as proposed within this application. It is understood that in the past year four instances of anti-social behaviour were registered leading to two evictions over the whole hostel portfolio. In general, this is considered to be a very low rate of incident.
- 6.40 Therefore, the applicants are considered to satisfactorily manage their facilities and adequately respond to anti-social behaviour to ensure there would be no

severe impact on residential amenity. In addition to this, through the initial screening process and adequate conditioning of planning permission, the premises would be used by households who most need the service and are less likely to cause disturbances.

- 6.41 Many objections make comparisons to Miriam Lodge, which is a hostel located 1.6km to the south. It is worth noting, however, that this premises is a privately run institution not subject to the Council's management procedures and with little control from the Council. Furthermore, this facility is offered for single people, as opposed to households proposed in this application. Therefore the comparison is not considered to indicate that the proposed development would result in similar levels of disturbances as indicated in objections.
- 6.42 Comparisons were also made between the proposal and the previous use of 118 Canonbie Road. The property was originally granted planning permission as a care home for elderly people, however it was leased by a known Rogue Landlord who, at one point, was known to house up to 40 residents. Many of these residents were vulnerable and in need of specific services, with some suffering from alcohol and drug dependencies and mental health issues.
- 6.43 Objections were received based on the potential of repeat anti-social behaviour as occurred in the past at 118 Canonbie Road. However, the premises would be operated by the Council, who would be accountable to the residents of the Borough, and not for use by single adults or vulnerable residents.
- 6.44 Overall, the proposed use for homeless families rather than higher need homeless groups and the management plan is considered to appropriately address the concerns raised by objections and to ensure there would be no adverse impact as a result of the proposed development.
- 6.45 Notwithstanding the above, a temporary consent for a period of five years would allow the Council to assess the impact of the proposal on the wider area and provide some degree on control as the use would cease after this period. If the applicant wished to extend the use a further application would be required which would be assessed against development plan and other material considerations at that time.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 6.46 The proposed development does not involve any material alteration to the building. Overall it is considered there would be no adverse impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy or loss of sunlight/daylight.
- 6.47 The majority of objections were based on the impact of the proposed hostel on the residential amenity in terms of noise, general disturbances and traffic generation. The impact of traffic is detailed further in the report.
- 6.48 Measures of preventing and managing anti-social behaviour are detailed in the Hostel Management section. Based on this officers consider that any incidents of anti-social behaviour would be managed and would not have an unacceptable impact as a result of the proposed use as a hostel for homeless families. Therefore the impact on residential amenity in terms of noise and general disturbances would not be significant enough to warrant refusal on this basis.

- 6.49 However, as noted above, and given concerns expressed by local residents, a temporary consent for a period of five years would allow the Council to assess the impact of the proposal on the wider area and provide some degree of control as the use would cease after this period. This is considered a suitable approach to ensure the mitigation detailed in the application is appropriate and allow the Council to assess the impact of the proposal on the wider area.

Impact on Local Services

- 6.50 Objections have been received based on the impact on education, doctors, emergency services and public transport. The impact on public transport is addressed in the Highways and Transport section.
- 6.51 The NPPF promotes healthy communities and this is implemented in the policies and strategies of the Core Strategy. Section 7.4.3 of the Core Strategy Policy states that the Council wishes to ensure a thriving environment in which people can live, work and learn. Sustainable communities can only exist where a network of appropriately located facilities is provided within a local area. Education and health facilities are considered two essential basic services and are supplemented through other community, leisure, arts, cultural, entertainment and emergency services, and sports and recreational facilities.
- 6.52 The concerns in respect of educational provisions relate to children occupying the proposed hostel being placed in local schools, with particular mention of Fairlawn Primary School.
- 6.53 An Education Statement was included with the application. Within the statement, it concludes that, from surveys of existing residents at other hostels, the majority of residents in hostel accommodation do not remove their children from their existing schools. This is more than likely due to the temporary nature of the accommodation and disturbance caused to the children during the relocation process. Therefore it is considered unlikely that a large number of children would be relocated to nearby schools. Officers agree with this conclusion.
- 6.54 The Education Statement quotes the Education Authority's Admissions and Fair Access Policy which outlines that only children that live in permanent housing nearby the school would be accepted. However, after discussions with the Childrens and Young People Admissions Team within the Council, Officers consider that in certain cases some children may be accepted if families can prove they live in the area.
- 6.55 However it should be noted that in order to be placed in a school starting in September, children must be registered in the previous January. Given the average time a household would stay in the hostel is 26 weeks, it is unlikely that residents would be located in the accommodation long enough to be accepted into local schools. In terms of mid-year school acceptances, this would require an existing pupil to leave and in any case, the wait list of schools in the vicinity would restrict the possibility of children using temporary accommodation from accessing schools mid-year.
- 6.56 Therefore, regardless of the Education Authority's Admissions and Fair Access Policy, it is still considered that the proposal would be unlikely to severely impact on school places in the vicinity due to the temporary nature of the development.

- 6.57 It was also raised during the local meeting that school places may be affected by children with special needs, who have a higher priority on the admissions policy. However, as was stated in the local meeting, the likelihood of homeless households having children with special needs is as the same as normal families. The overall level is not expected to be high and therefore would not be significantly adverse on school places.
- 6.58 Whilst objections to the education statement regarding research of the expected age of children is noted, it is not considered possible to predict the age of children given the variable nature of who would be housed in this hostel. Based on the information submitted, Officers considered it would be unlikely that the age of the children housed within the premises would impact on the provision of school places.
- 6.59 Overall the occupation of the site as a homeless hostel for households is not expected to adversely impact on the school places available.
- 6.60 Several of the comments made also relate to why the site could not be used by Fairlawn to provide extra school places. While the Council look to increase the provision of school places through the expansion of existing schools, it is understood that Fairlawn will not be looked at for expansion until the next phase of development. Notwithstanding this, Hamilton Lodge is likely to be unsuitable given the limited amenity space, part of which is steeply sloping. Overall, the objection on the missed opportunity for Fairlawn expansion is not considered to be valid under this planning application.
- 6.61 With regard to the impacts on medical services, similar to removing children from their schools, future residents are considered to be apprehensive about changing GP's whilst in temporary accommodation. Therefore, due to the transient nature of the accommodation, access to health facilities would not be substantially impacted as a result of the proposed development.
- 6.62 It should be noted that the previous uses of both Hamilton Lodge and 118 Canonbie Road were known to accommodate up to 50-60 people. Taking into account the occupancy level over both sites as hostels would be 100 and the total population of Forest Hill Ward is 15,300 as of the last census, this is not considered to be a significant increase in terms of population. Furthermore, these residents would be already located within the Borough and therefore reliant on existing services such as schools and GP's and as such unlikely to require these services within the area.
- 6.63 Therefore, while the concerns regarding the current access to services in the area are appreciated, the increase in population is not considered to be significantly noticeable within the existing population.
- 6.64 Overall the impact on local services such as schools and health facilities would not be considered significant enough to warrant a refusal. Again, a temporary consent would allow Council to assess the impact of the proposal on the wider area.

Standard of Accommodation

6.65 Objections have been raised on the basis of poor standard of accommodation in terms of size, density and amenities for future residents, which is assessed in the sections below.

a) Unit size and Amenities

6.66 DM Policy 32 states that new development is expected to provide a satisfactory level of privacy, outlook and natural lighting, together with meeting the functional requirements, for its future residents. Development should provide accommodation of a good size, a good outlook, with acceptable shape and layout of rooms, with main habitable rooms receiving direct sunlight and daylight, and adequate privacy.

6.67 The standards of the London Plan Housing SPG are used to assess whether new housing development provides an appropriate level of residential quality and amenity. While there are no standards provided for hostel development, it is stated that housing development should be fit for purpose given the temporary nature of the accommodation.

6.68 Overall, 21 suites are provided within the scheme. The unit layout is summarised in Table 1.

Table [1]: Unit Mix and Size

| | Self-Contained | Shared Facilities |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ground Floor | 2 bed* (15m ²) | NONE |
| | 2 bed (21.2m ²) | |
| | 4 bed (29.2m ²) | |
| | 4 bed (36.1m ²) | |
| | 4 bed (40.5m ²) | |
| | 5 bed (37.8m ²) | |
| First Floor | 2 bed (26.1m ²) | 2 bed (18.6m ²) |
| | 2 bed (35.2m ²) | 4 bed (31.1m ²) |
| | 4 bed (34.6m ²) | |
| | 4 bed (45.2m ²) | |
| | 5 bed (52.3m ²) | |
| | 5 bed (32.5m ²) | |
| 6 bed (49.9m ²) | | |
| Second Floor | 4 bed (33.6m ²) | 2 bed (30.7m ²) |
| | 6 bed (40.9m ²) | 4 bed (26.8m ²) |
| | | 5 bed (24.9m ²) |
| Third Floor | 4 bed (65.6m ²) | NONE |

* denotes emergency room

6.69 The ground floor also includes a laundry, plant room, office and storage. On the first floor, there are three shared toilets and four shared shower rooms with toilets, together with small cupboards. On the second floor there is one shared toilet and three shared shower rooms with toilets, together with small cupboards.

6.70 Objections regarding the lack of an internal communal space for residents is noted. However, based on their wider experience the applicants have advised that a communal space is not required for the occupants. Additionally, the provision of

external amenity space is considered to adequately supply communal space for residents and in particular children.

- 6.71 The proposal is a straight conversion of the original building. Therefore the level of privacy for future residents is considered acceptable.
- 6.72 All of the rooms have access to windows with 10 units being dual aspect. Two units would be single aspect north facing. However this must be weighed against the temporary nature of the accommodation and the need of the housing type. Furthermore, the provision of extra windows would not be acceptable given the heritage significance of the building.
- 6.73 There are no minimum size standards for hostel accommodation. It is also taken into consideration that the premises would be for temporary accommodation, on average residents would stay between 23-26 weeks.
- 6.74 Therefore, while the size of some rooms may be small when considered against minimum standards for residential accommodation, the proposed development is considered to be fit for purpose as temporary accommodation. Furthermore, when weighed against the need to provide temporary housing for homeless households, the standard of accommodation is not considered to be severely detrimental to outweigh the benefit of providing a needed form of housing.
- 6.75 It is noted within the objections that a condition be added to ensure residents do not stay beyond 26 weeks. This was raised in order to prevent long term residents residing in what is proposed as temporary accommodation.
- 6.76 It should be noted that within the NPPF, paragraph 206 states that planning conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. Therefore conditions must meet these tests to be added to a planning permission.
- 6.77 It is considered that restricting residents to a 26 week stay would be unenforceable, given the difficulty and costs in enforcing the condition. Furthermore, it is considered that the nature of the hostel development and the responsibility of the Council's Private Sector Housing Agency in finding residents permanent accommodation would indicate that residents are unlikely to stay far beyond the 26 week period. As such it is considered the condition would be unreasonable and unnecessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.
- 6.78 On the whole, a condition for preventing residents from staying longer than 26 weeks is not considered to meet the six tests and would not be recommended.

b) Unit Density

- 6.79 The Local Planning Authority uses the density matrix of the London Plan and London Plan Housing SPG. However, as stated in the supporting text of the Housing SPG, the matrix relates only to Use Class C3 dwellinghouses and is not intended for application to short term serviced accommodation. It was designed primarily to address new build development.

6.80 On the whole, the number of units proposed is derived from the wider experience of the applicants in managing homeless hostels across the borough and by the capacity of the existing building. Therefore, taking into regard the fact the standard of accommodation is considered acceptable and fit for purpose and the temporary nature of the accommodation, the proposed density of the development would not be considered to severely impact on the amenity of future residents.

b) External Amenity Space

6.81 London Plan Policy 3.6 outlines that proposals that include housing should make provision for play and informal recreation based on the expected child population generated.

6.82 The London Plan Play and Informal Space SPG outlines steps in assessing and determining the amount of space for play and informal activities within schemes. This includes:-

- Determine if the development generates a demand for play space provision;
- Calculate how much space is required;
- Establish accessibility to existing play provision; and,
- Establish requirement for on-site or off-site provision. If there is a requirement for on-site provision, establish type of on-site provision to meet requirements.

6.83 Overall, the expected child population of the development is expected to be approximately 50%, given the development would be for homeless households comprising of at least 1 child. The age of these children would be varied however.

6.84 Concerns were raised over the research and detail provided on the age of children. However, as residents come and go, the ages of children would be varied and it would not be possible to provide an accurate number and age group. For this reason, play space for children aged up to 18 has been assessed in this application.

6.85 It is noted that Horniman Museum and Gardens is located 550m from the subject site, however there is a significant uphill section along Horniman Drive which affects accessibility. Given this, the accessibility to Horniman, it is considered to be good for older children above 12 years of age, however for younger children aged 5-11, and especially under the years of 5 and reliable on pushchairs, the accessibility of this play space is reduced significantly.

6.86 The play space within Horniman Museum and Gardens is well frequented by children and parents, together with school groups. There is considered to be sufficient space for play, child interaction and parent supervision and therefore the quality of the existing play space in the vicinity is considered to be good.

6.87 Table 4.7 of the SPG outlines play provision in new developments. For development expected to see an increase in 30-49 children, 300-500m² of play space is recommended. On site local playable space for children aged 0-11 should be provided with suitable space for children aged 12+ within 800m walking distance. Given the accessibility of existing space at Horniman Museum and

Gardens for older children, it is considered that space for play and informal interaction for children aged 0-11 between 300-500m² in size would be necessary on site.

- 6.88 The proposed development would incorporate 309m² general open space, including play equipment for children. Further to this, a wildflower garden measuring 298m² is proposed and accessed from a separate area of the rear amenity space. Overall the size is considered acceptable to provide for childrens play space.
- 6.89 It is noted that the rear of the site is quite heavily sloped. However, this may not severely impact on the provision of children play space as the landscape and topography could lead to interactive and fun activities. For example, the slope could be used to incorporate changes in levels and allow children to swing, climb and slide. Therefore the slope to the rear of the property is not considered to severely impact on the provision of childrens play space.
- 6.90 However, there is insufficient detail relating to the standard of equipment to ensure the space will be actively used and provide fun and interactive play. This was raised with the agent during pre-application discussions and it was subsequently agreed that details of the play space should be provided prior to the commencement of development in the form of a condition.
- 6.91 Overall, the proposed development is considered to provide a sufficient level of play and informal space to meet the expected demand of the child population.

Highways and Traffic Issues

a) Car Parking and Traffic Generation

- 6.92 Numerous objections have been received on the basis of impact on parking demand as a result of the proposed uses. A Parking Survey was conducted in support of the application.
- 6.93 It should be noted that the NPPF promotes sustainable movement of people and states that the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes.
- 6.94 Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
- 6.95 Paragraph 39 of the NPPF states that, if setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account:-
- the accessibility of the development;
 - the type, mix and use of development;
 - the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
 - local car ownership levels; and,

- an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.

- 6.96 A key tool to facilitate the promotion of sustainable movement is a Travel Plan. All developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a Travel Plan.
- 6.97 The Core Strategy Policy 14 is in line with the NPPF and outlines that a managed and restrained approach to car parking provision will be adopted to contribute to the objectives of traffic reduction while protecting the operational needs of major public facilities, essential economic development and the needs of people with disabilities.
- 6.98 The car parking standards contained within the London Plan will be used as a basis for assessment. The parking addendum to chapter 6 of the London Plan outlines the standards for residential development, however it is not considered to be a sufficient match to the proposed use of the site as a hostel. In addition, the section titled parking for hotel and leisure use is likewise unsuitable for the proposed development.
- 6.99 As stated in the parking addendum, if there is no standard provided, the level of parking should be determined by the transport statement undertaken.
- 6.100 The site is located on Honor Oak Road, which has parking restrictions in the form of double yellow lines near the property. However, there are several residential streets in the vicinity with no parking restrictions. The PTAL rating of the site is 3, which is based on a scale of 1-6 with 6 being the highest.
- 6.101 The proposed development at Hamilton Lodge would accommodate an on-site caretaker during Monday-Friday 9am to 5pm, together with the on-site caretaker of 118 Canonbie Road. Furthermore, the site would need to accommodate parking for support officers and Temporary Administration Officers, as well as service vehicles. However these would be more sporadic. Based on this, between 2-3 parking spaces is expected to be generated for non-residents as a result of the development.
- 6.102 It is also understood that the rate of car ownership of households within the Borough is 50%. The applicant has confirmed in the local meeting that, in their experience of operating hostels, levels of car ownership has been low amongst residents and this should be taken into consideration.
- 6.103 Taking all of this into account, it is considered that the worst case scenario of 21 suites (and including staff) would be 11 parking spaces generated. It is noted within the transport assessment that 2 parking spaces would be required pursuant to Lewisham standards. However there are no standards in determining parking spaces required, rather it is an estimate based on PTAL, size of development and units and the existing amount of car ownership within the borough.
- 6.104 The proposal includes 8 parking spaces to the front of Hamilton Lodge, which were used for the previous nursing home.
- 6.105 The original parking survey was a snap-shot survey which counted the number of spare spaces/roadside availability and included photographs, however it was not conducted to the full Lambeth Methodology, being the standard practice for determining car ownership. It was considered that, due to the relatively low level

of parking expected that it would not be necessary to conduct a full survey. However, following the local meeting, planning officers considered it practical to conduct a full survey taking into account the local residents remaining concerns on parking.

- 6.106 The full parking survey was completed on the nights of Tuesday the 23rd and Thursday the 25th of June. This parking survey was completed in line with the Lambeth Method and to the satisfaction of the Council. While the residents call for a survey during the school period is noted, it is considered that by conducting the survey beyond 10pm, it offers a true reflection of car ownership within the area as residents return from work or leisure activities to their homes.
- 6.107 The parking survey found that on the two nights surveyed there were over 120 parking spaces with an average parking stress of 59.5%. This is considered to be a very high availability of parking in the area.
- 6.108 Taking into account the parking provided, the availability of on-street parking and the likelihood of low car ownership amongst residents, it is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on parking availability.
- 6.109 It should be noted also that the previous use was a nursing home, which generated parking demand from staff, visitors and service vehicles. It is considered that the number of staff would have been greater than the number proposed. Furthermore, the likelihood of visitor parking during early evenings and on the weekend would have impacted on the demand in the area. It is noted that the impact from the proposed development at these times were raised in some objections.
- 6.110 When compared with the previous nursing home, it is considered that the parking demand is unlikely to be greater for the proposed use.
- 6.111 It was raised in written objections and in the local meeting that the parking survey was not a true reflection of the impact of parking in the area due to the survey being recorded at 10pm, as opposed to during school hours when parking is in most demand.
- 6.112 The amount of car parking available was confirmed by the Council's Highway Officer who conducted a visit of the vicinity at 10pm on the 18th of June. It was considered by the Officer that there was more than sufficient space for the expected increase of not only this application but 118 Canonbie Road. Therefore, on the whole, the Council is satisfied that the on street parking would accommodate the expected demand of the proposed development.
- 6.113 While it is acknowledged that parking during the school hours is at its highest demand due to the proximity of Fairlawn Primary School, it is considered that this is a relatively small period of the day. Furthermore if some residents do have vehicles, they are likely to be used for work purposes and therefore unlikely to be utilising parking during this period but rather in the evening when returning home. Likewise, any visitors with private vehicles are expected to arrive outside of these peak hours.
- 6.114 Therefore, it was not considered that parking would significantly increase during the school period as a result of the development.

- 6.115 Overall, the proposed development is expected to result in a minor increase in parking demand due to the nature of the homeless households residing in the property. Furthermore, the provision of on-site parking and the availability of on-street parking means the proposed development would not result in a severe impact on parking to warrant a refusal.
- 6.116 A Travel Plan Framework has been submitted as part of the application. Within it are objectives and aims, together with measures to improve sustainable movements. However it is noted that it does not include movements from staff. The Council's Highway Officer has requested a condition should be added to ensure that, within 9 months of occupation, evidence should be submitted outlining the measures of the Travel Plan have been implemented, including staff movements. This evidence should include successful and unsuccessful measures, together with further monitoring methods. This, in conjunction with the recommendation for a temporary consent would allow the Council to monitor the impact of traffic and parking on the wider area. Additionally, the travel plan would allow solutions to particular issues to be discussed and a suitable solution agreed.

b) Public Transport

- 6.117 Based on a search of the TfL database, the property has a PTAL rating of 3, which is based on a scale of 1-6 with 6 being the highest. Furthermore, the site is located within close proximity to a bus stop with bus routes which access Honor Oak Park, as well as terminating at Lewisham and Brixton. 600-700m from the site are bus stops which service Forest Hill, Catford, Sydenham and further afield such as Victoria and Peckham. Finally, the site is 900m walking distance from Forest Hill Station with connections to London Bridge, Brighton and the overground.
- 6.118 It should be noted that, regardless of the planning statement which outlines that hostels should be within PTAL 3, there is no policy that states the minimum PTAL of a hostel but rather a material assessment of the individual cases. Overall, the accessibility of public transport is considered to be acceptable given the moderate PTAL rating, the close proximity of a bus stop and the accessibility of the Forest Hill Station.
- 6.119 The Forest Hill Town Centre is located 900m away. Whilst it is acknowledged that the topography is quite hilly and prove difficult for those with less mobility or buggies, the impact this has on residents access to services is reduced due to the satisfactory level of public transport with either 2 buses to the centre.
- 6.120 The objections relating to the transport statement and inaccuracies relating to access to public transport and distances to the town centre are noted and any errors have not been used to assess the accessibility as detailed above.
- 6.121 Nonetheless, officers still consider the public transport to be adequate for the proposed development.
- 6.122 Objections on the impact on the service of public transport is also noted. However, the net addition of 50-60 people (taking into account 118 Canonbie Road and the existing care home uses) into the area would not be expected to create additional significant stress on buses. It should be noted that TfL were consulted on the scheme and no objections were raised based on the impact on public transport.

c) Cycle Parking

- 6.123 The Council uses the standards within the parking addendum to chapter 6 of the London Plan to determine the number of cycle spaces provided within development. For Sui Generis uses, the most relevant use standard shall be used.
- 6.124 In this instance, the closest use falls between secured accommodation (which requires 1 space per 5 staff plus 1 space per 20 bedrooms) and C3-C4 dwellings (which requires 1 space per 1 bedroom unit, 2 spaces per all other dwellings and 1 space per 40 units for visitors).
- 6.125 The proposed scheme includes 22 spaces and is located to the north of the building. This is expected to be an acceptable number of bicycle storage for the development.
- 6.126 However, details of the vertical stands would need to be provided prior to development to ensure the spaces are secure and dry. Furthermore, the space would need to be accessed via a staircase and therefore details of how bicycles could be easily transported, such as a wheel track, would need to be secured. This should be added as a condition.

e) Refuse

- 6.127 Refuse space is provided to the front of the building utilising the existing refuse area. This includes the following:-
- 4x 240L bins; and,
 - 4x 1100L bins.

Overall there would be 5,360L for refuse.

- 6.128 Taking into consideration the standard 55L of refuse per resident, the total amount of refuse space required would be 4,400L, with 50% of this set aside for recycling. The proposed development would satisfy the refuse requirements.
- 6.129 The location of the bin store would be suitable to allow collection by the Local Authority.

Impact on Heritage Assets

- 6.130 Hamilton Lodge is a locally listed building and therefore a non-designated heritage asset. Core Strategy 16 provides the framework for the protection of the borough's non-designated heritage assets. The Core Strategy Policy is in line with the NPPF and London Plan policies.
- 6.131 DM Policy 37 seeks to implement the framework of Core Strategy Policy 16. The policy states that the Local Planning Authority will seek to retain and enhance locally listed buildings and structures and may use its powers to protect their character, significance and contribution made by their setting, where appropriate.
- 6.132 The listed description of the building is as follows:-

Villa. 1898-9. Architect Edward Hide. Red brick and slate with stone dressings. Built to two storeys and three bays plus domed corner turret with round-arched windows at first floor. Right hand bay projects through full height. Stone surrounds and mullions to flat-arched windows. Three stone bands over stone string at first floor level. Now Hamilton House. Presently a retirement home.

- 6.133 In the past, there have been unsympathetic alterations and extensions to the external appearance, particularly with two large side and rear extensions. As such, this has had an existing adverse impact on the appearance of Hamilton Lodge.
- 6.134 There are no material changes to the external appearance of the building as a result of the present proposals. Therefore there would be no harm to the building in this sense.
- 6.135 The internal appearance of the building has also been significantly altered due to the previous uses. Modern internal partitions, fittings and a lift have been added. Towards the middle of the original building is a large oak staircase with stained glass windows. This seems to be the main original element of heritage significance that remains internally.
- 6.136 The proposed internal partitioning is not considered to adversely impact on any significant heritage items within the building.
- 6.137 Overall the proposed development is considered to have no impact on the heritage significance of the listed building.

Sustainability and Energy

- 6.138 Core Strategy Policy 8 outlines the framework for the Council to reduce its carbon emissions in line with national and regional policies. Part 4 of the Policy requires all minor non-residential development to meet BREEAM rating 'Excellent'.
- 6.139 DM Policy 22 implements the framework set out in the Core Strategy and expects non-residential conversions to deliver the highest BREEAM standard provision possible for both the new and existing parts of the development. Evidence will be required to justify the standard proposed.
- 6.140 The proposal includes a BREEAM pre-assessment which outlines that the development would have a rating of 'Very Good'. It is considered that, in the instance of conversions, it is difficult to meet the standards of BREEAM 'Excellent'. Especially when considering other factors such as the cost of such measures and historical significance.
- 6.141 Therefore, as the development is a conversion of a building with heritage value, the measures outlined within the BREEAM pre-assessment is considered acceptable to meet the Council policies.

Trees and Landscaping

- 6.142 It is noted that objections were raised to the felling of trees along Honor Oak Road. However, based on the information in the plans, there is no loss of existing vegetation proposed, with the exception of some small sycamore trees in the rear yard.

- 6.143 The Council's tree officer conducted a site visit and found no tree worthy of protection. Overall there is no objection to the proposal on the impact on trees.
- 6.144 The only other proposed landscaping works would be the creation of terraced planting between the amenity space and the rear elevation. The planting would be based on 30-40cm shrubs. The species and location of planting is considered acceptable.

7.0 Community Infrastructure Levy

- 7.1 The proposed development, being a change of use to Sui Generis (classed as 'all other development') under the CIL charging schedule, would be CIL liable. An informative should be added to the decision notice acknowledging this.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.
- 8.2 Officers consider that the loss of the nursing home and the temporary change of use to a homeless household hostel would be in principle acceptable. The proposal is considered to provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation, given the temporary nature of the use. Furthermore, it is considered that the application documents set out appropriate management and mitigation measures that would address any impacts in terms residential amenity, local services and highway and transport issues. Conditions have been recommended that would secure these measures.
- 8.3 On balance, officers therefore consider the proposal for a temporary change of use to the hostel for homeless families for a five year period acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:-

- (1) The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the application plans, drawings and documents hereby approved and as detailed below:

E.01 Rev B, E.02 Rev A, P.51 Rev B, LSDP 11216.01 (Landscape Proposal/Tree Survey), BREEAM Pre-Assessment Estimator Report, Travel Plan Framework (received 2nd April 2015); Management Statement (received 17th June 2015); P.52 Rev D (received 19th June 2015).

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application and is acceptable to the local planning authority.

- (2) The use as a homeless hostel for households (sui generis) hereby permitted shall cease on or before 5 years from the date of this grant of planning permission.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may assess the impact of the use at the end of the limited period hereby permitted, in the light of relevant

policies in the London Plan (2015), Core Strategy (2011) and Development Management Local Plan (2014) and having regard to any complaints received and any other material considerations existing at the time.

- (3) The buildings hereby approved shall achieve a minimum BREEAM Rating of 'Very Good'.

Reason: To comply with Core Strategy Policy 7 Climate change and adapting to the effects, Core Strategy Policy 8 Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency (2011).

- (4) The refuse and recycling storage shall be provided as detailed within drawing no P.51 Rev B hereby approved. Such provisions shall be made available prior to the occupation of the development and maintained during the use as a homeless hostel for households.

Reason: To ensure the adequate provisions for recycling facilities and refuse storage are provided as approved, in compliance with Core Strategy Policy 13 Addressing Lewisham waste management requirements (2011) and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

- (5) (a) A minimum of 22 secure and dry cycle parking spaces shall be provided within the development as indicated on drawing no. P.51 Rev B hereby approved.

(b) Prior to occupation, full details of the cycle parking facilities, including a level means of access, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

(c) All cycle parking spaces shall be provided and made available for use prior to occupation of the development and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure adequate provision for cycle parking and to comply with Policy 14: Sustainable movement and transport of the Core Strategy (2011).

- (6) (a) Prior to occupation, a scheme of landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The landscaping scheme shall include, but not limited to, the following details:-

(i) detailed information of the proposed childrens play area;

(ii) details of any trees or hedges to be retained and proposed plant numbers, species, location and size of trees and tree pits; and,

(iii) details of the management and maintenance of the landscaping for a period of five years.

(b) All planting, seeding or turfing shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the completion of the development, in accordance with the approved scheme under part (a). Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

(c) The childrens play area shall be made available for use prior to occupation of the development and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the details of the proposal and to comply with the London Plan Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation (2012), Core Strategy Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets, Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 25 Landscaping and trees and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

(7) (a) The development shall operate in full accordance with all measures identified within the Travel Plan Framework hereby approved from first occupation.

(b) Within 9 months of occupation, evidence shall be submitted to demonstrate compliance with the monitoring and review mechanisms outlined within the Travel Plan Framework.

Reason: In order that both the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the practicality, viability and sustainability of the Travel Plan for the site and to comply with Policy 14 Sustainable movement and transport of the Core Strategy (June 2011).

(8) The premises hereby approved shall be used for the accommodation of homeless households comprising at least one adult with at least one child who are homeless as defined by the Housing Act 1996.

Reason: To restrict the use of the accommodation to homeless households, ensuring the proposed development meets the specified housing need as outlined in the Management Statement and to ensure the provision of mixed and balanced communities in line with Policy 3.9 of the London Plan (March 2015) and Policy 1 of the Core Strategy (June 2011).

(9) (a) The development shall operate in accordance with the Management Statement received 17th June 2015 and hereby approved.

(b) Within 9 months of occupation, evidence shall be submitted to demonstrate compliance, together with monitoring and review outcomes of the monthly meetings.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority is satisfied that the hostel is appropriately managed and neighbour concerns are satisfactorily logged and handled in line with the approved scheme.

INFORMATIVES

(1) **Positive and Proactive Statement:** The Council engages with all applicants in a positive and proactive way through specific pre-application enquiries and the detailed advice available on the Council's website. On this particular application, positive and proactive discussions took place with the applicant prior to the application being submitted through a planning performance agreement.

The proposal was largely in accordance with these discussions and the Development Plan. However, prior to determination further information was required and positive discussions took place, which resulted in the information being provided.

- (2) As you are aware the approved development is liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which will be payable on commencement of the development. An '**assumption of liability form**' must be completed and before development commences you must submit a '**CIL Commencement Notice form**' to the council. You should note that any claims for relief, where they apply, must be submitted and determined prior to commencement of the development. Failure to follow the CIL payment process may result in penalties. More information on CIL is available at: - <http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/myserVICES/planning/apply-for-planning-permission/application-process/Pages/Community-Infrastructure-Levy.aspx>