



Planning Statement

54 Bradenham Road
HAYES
UB4 8LR

December 2022

Re: **Conversion from C4 to Sui generis**

Dear Planning officer,

We have been instructed by our client to submit a planning application for the following development description:

'Erection of a rear extension and a first-floor side extension with the conversion of property from Class C4 to Sui generis (8 persons)'

The planning application forms a resubmission of a similar scheme and is therefore exempt from a planning fee.

This Planning Statement should be read in conjunction with the planning application documents scheduled the following;

- Existing Drawings
- Proposed Drawings
- CIL Form
- HMO Management Procedure
- Parking stress survey
- Estate Agent Letter
- Travel plan

Background

The proposed scheme forms a resubmission of the recently refused application **77542/APP/2022/2858** for the following proposal:

Erection of a part rear/side two storey extension and conversion from Class C4 (6 persons) to Sui Generis (9 persons).

The application was refused due to the following reasons;



1. Due to the excessive extension would harm its character and appearance.

Therefore, we have reduced the width and depth of the side extension within the new planning application.

In regards to the existing extensions, single storey side, single storey rear and rear dormer extensions have been constructed and complies with Permitted development under Class A,B and C Part 1 Schedule 2, of the GPDO 2015.

2. Due to the number of occupants would give rise to undue noise and general disturbance to neighbouring residents.

As of today, as the property is currently an existing C4 property with a maximum occupancy of 6 people and the existing HMO has not resulted in any noise complaints.

Furthermore, we have also submitted an HMO management plan where the applicants are experienced landlords to maintain the HMO to a very high standard and to avoid anti-social behaviour, crime-rates and other potential issues.

The old SPG HMO 2004 suggests that for semi-detached properties, the maximum HMO occupancy is 9 people, although the newly adopted Local Plan Part 2 has not specified the maximum number of people, as the current proposal is for up to a maximum of 7 people this would not exceed any of the policies or guideline adopted by the authority.

It is proposed that the overall bedrooms and occupant would not be exceeding 8 (where this amount can be achieved by a single family) and as such the applicant would welcome the Council to impose planning condition to restrict the maximum number of bedroom and occupants should the proposal be permitted.

I would also like to bring to your attention a recent approval of 10 HMO units in the area at 12 Walnut Close with reference number 67768/APP/2021/3542 as well an appeal decision with reference APP/R5510/W/17/3178166

For the above reasons I am of the opinion that 2 more occupants would not cause any rise to undue noise and general disturbance to neighbouring residents.

And we are happy for any other necessary conditions to be added (e.g. Sound insulation report, noise assessment) to demonstrate that the noise would not affect neighbouring residents.

- 3. Due to the proposed vehicular access is located within a hazardous position (within 5m of the junction between Bradenham Road and Weymouth Road) Due to its position, cars entering and existing the site would have poor visibility of cars coming around the corner.**

Plans have been amended to move over the 2 x parking spaces more than 5 Meters of the junction between Bradenham Road and Weymouth Road where there is an existing dropped kerb/vehicle crossing.

And the parking survey submitted demonstrates very clearly that there is capacity for additional cars in the surrounding area, however, we have proposed 8 cycle parking spaces at the front of the property.

Therefore, this would not result in any unacceptable parking or highway safety concerns.

Conclusion

It is clear from the contents above that the proposal has adopted the council's current policy, HMO standards and officer report from previous refusal to meet the strict requirements for both planning and housing purposes, the conversion should therefore be considered acceptable.