

- a) **DOV/18/01133 – Erection of an additional storey containing six apartments, incorporating a new pitched/Mansard roof to replace the existing flat roofs and associated alterations - Chalkwell Court, Eaves Road, Dover**

Reason for report: Due to the number of contrary views.

- b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning permission be granted

- c) **Planning Policies and Guidance**

Core Strategy Policies

- CP1 – The location and scale of development in the District must comply with the Settlement Hierarchy.
- CP3 – Of the 14,000 houses identified by the plan 9,700 (around 70%) is identified for Dover.
- CP6 – Development which generates a demand for infrastructure will only be permitted if the necessary infrastructure to support it is either in place, or there is a reliable mechanism to ensure that it will be provided at the time it is needed.
- DM1 – Development will not be permitted outside of the settlement confines, unless it is specifically justified by other development plan policies, or it functionally requires such a location, or it is ancillary to existing development or uses.
- DM5 – Development of between 5 and 14 dwellings will need to make a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing.
- DM11 – Development that would generate high levels of travel will only be permitted within the urban areas in locations that are, or can be made to be, well served by a range of means of transport.
- DM13 – Parking provision should be design-led, based upon an area's characteristics, the nature of the development and design objectives, having regard for the guidance in Table 1.1 of the Core Strategy.

Land Allocations Local Plan

- DM27 - Residential development of five or more dwellings will be required to provide or contribute towards the provision of open space, unless existing provision within the relevant accessibility standard has sufficient capacity to accommodate this additional demand.

National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (NPPF)

- Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.
- Paragraph 11 states that decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are

most important for determining the application are out-of-date (including where an LPA cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply), granting permission unless:

- i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance (set out in footnote 6) provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
  - ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole
- Paragraph 12 states that the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan.
  - Chapter five of the NPPF confirms that the Government's objective is to significantly boost the supply of homes and requires authorities to seek to deliver a sufficient supply of homes, based on a local housing need assessment. The size, type and tenure of housing for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in policies. Where a need for affordable housing is identified, planning policies should specify the type of affordable housing required and expect it to be met on-site unless:
    1. off-site provision or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu can be robustly justified; and
    2. the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities

Local Planning Authorities should identify a five year supply of specific, deliverable sites and identify more broadly supply beyond this.

- Chapter eight promotes healthy and safe communities. This includes the promotion of social interaction, including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other. Developments should be safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder and the fear of crime and disorder do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion. Policies and decisions should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments; guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs; and ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise, and are retained for the benefit of the community.
- Chapter nine promotes sustainable transport, requiring that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of this objective; although opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas. Development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

- Chapter eleven requires that land is used effectively, having regard for: the need for different types of housing and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it; local market conditions and viability; the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services (including the ability to promote sustainable travel modes); the desirability of maintaining an areas prevailing character; and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places. Where there is an anticipated shortfall of land to meet identified need, low densities should be avoided.
- Chapter twelve confirms that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:
  - a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
  - b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
  - c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
  - d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
  - e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
  - f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents.

- Chapter fourteen requires that development should be directed away from areas at the highest risk from flooding.

#### The Kent Design Guide (KDG)

- The Guide provides criteria and advice on providing well designed development.

#### d) **Relevant Planning History**

DOV/16/00224 – Erection of a fourth floor extension with mansard roof and dormer windows to incorporate 6no. self-contained flats - Refused

#### e) **Consultee and Third Party Responses**

KCC Public Rights of Way – No objection as there will not be a significant impact on public footpath EB4. The applicant's attention is drawn to general informatives to avoid damage to/obstruction is the footpath.

DDC Environmental Health – There are stacking issues here between the proposed third floor and the existing second floor accommodation, in particular flat 21's kitchen/living room is directly above a bedroom in Flat 15 and flat 19 has a bedroom directly above the kitchen in flat 9. As such, it is recommended that a condition be attached to any grant of permission requiring that a scheme of sound mitigation is submitted, approved and provided.

Dover Town Council – Object. The proposed development, by virtue of the scale, height and form of the roof extension, would form a dominant and visually intrusive feature within Eaves Road, out-of-character with the established scale and character of development in the road. Consequently, the development would cause significant and demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to paragraphs 58, 60, 61 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework which would outweigh the benefits of the proposal.

In addition, the Committee were concerned by the lack of sufficient on street parking, congestion creating dangers for children and the major disruption the works will cause for residents kept on site during construction.

Public Representations – Seven objections have been received, raising the following points:

- Inadequate car parking
- It is difficult for residents to manoeuvre their cars out of their driveways and onto Eaves Road
- Disruption during construction
- Congestion
- Construction is inappropriate in this location due to the proximity of the school
- The conifers on the site are dangerous and cause loss of light
- Loss of light/overshadowing
- Loss of privacy
- Sense of enclosure
- Insufficient provision for the storage of refuse

- f) 1. **The Site and the Proposal**
- 1.1 The site lies within the settlement confines of Dover. Eaves Road is the southernmost road within Elms Vale and is located halfway up the side of the valley. The area is wholly residential in character, although St Martins School is located to the north west of the site. The valley rises fairly steeply to the north and south, with the valley running east to west. Dwellings in the area are predominantly two storey and semi-detached or terraced.
- 1.2 The existing site contains a three storey flat roofed block of flats. The building sits on a plinth which provides a level ground floor level on the rising land (although the plinth is visually indistinguishable from the façade of the building). The building provides sixteen flats.
- 1.3 The application seeks permission to erect a Mansard style roof to the top of the existing building, following the removal of an existing parapet. The Mansard, which would include seven dormers to the front roof slopes, ten to

the rear and five to the internal roof slopes, would provide space for an additional six flats to the building. The car parking area to the side and rear of the building would be augmented to increase the number of spaces provided.

## 2. **Main Issues**

2.1 The main issues are:

- The principle of the development
- The impact on the character and appearance of the area
- The impact on neighbouring properties
- The impact on the highway network

### **Assessment**

#### Principle of Development

2.2 The site lies within the settlement confines of Dover and, as such, the principle of the development is acceptable, being in accordance with Dover Core Strategy Policy DM1.

#### Character and Appearance

2.3 A previous application (DOV/16/00224) for this site, which similarly sought permission for a fourth floor extension within a Mansard-style roof, was refused. The reason for refusal read as follows:

“The proposed development, by virtue of the scale, height and form of the roof extension, would form a dominant and visually intrusive feature within Eaves Road, out-of-character with the established scale and character of development in the road. Consequently, the development would cause significant and demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to paragraphs 58, 60, 61 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework which would outweigh the benefits of the proposal”.

The current application will need to overcome this reason for refusal.

2.4 Eaves Road is a dead-end road which is accessed from Markland Road. Markland Road is typified by two storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings. Eaves Road rises up from Markland Road, with semi-detached dwellings to the western side of the road and single storey buildings (one scout hut and two detached bungalows) to its eastern side. Towards the top of the rise, the road turns at a right angle to the west and on the outside of this bend is the application site. To the left of the building are several tall conifer trees. The building on the site is a large block of flats rising to three storeys (the plinth on which the building sits is more raised to its eastern side to account for the slope). The building has a flat roof and has few architectural details. Continuing along the road to its southern side are further three storey buildings, which form terraces of dwellings. To the northern side, no buildings visibly front onto the road with the lower land beyond forming gardens and an access to a school. At this point the road is still rising reasonably steeply, although not as steeply as the section of road up to the application site. Beyond the terraced dwellings, the land begins to flatten out (although still

gradually rising). The buildings now return to two storeys in height and are semi-detached.

- 2.5 The existing building is, together with the short terraces of dwellings, the tallest in the road at present. As you travel up the hill towards the site, the building already has a dominant presence due to its height, being set above the level of the road, and its relationship with the smaller buildings (or lack of buildings, to its north (from where views are taken). The visual impact is balanced, to a degree, by the three storey dwellings to its west; however, the building remains an unusual feature within the area.
- 2.6 The detailed design of the roof is something of a departure for the area, with no other similar roof forms being present in the area. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that the existing building is itself distinct from the character of buildings in the locality. As such, whilst the proposed detailed design is not locally distinctive, neither does it cause harm to the character of the area. The principle of erecting a Mansard roof on this building is therefore accepted, as the existing building is already visually divergent from the character of buildings in the road. Moreover, the introduction of a Mansard roof has the potential to both enhance the appearance of the building, by adding architectural detail to the building, whilst replacing the flat roof with a pitching roof that sits more comfortably with the pitched roofs typically found in the area.
- 2.7 The proposal seeks to increase the height of the building to accommodate an additional floor, which would take the form of a Mansard roof which would replace the existing parapet. In these respects, the application would be the same as the refused application. However, the 'face' of the roof (the steeply pitching part of the roof) would be around 1.6m higher than the existing parapet, whilst the ridge of the roof would be around 2.6m higher (albeit, this part of the roof would not be highly visible in views from the ground due to its elevated position). The refused scheme had proposed a larger roof, with its 'face' extending around 1.7m higher than the existing parapet and a ridge rising to around 3.7 higher than the existing parapet. Three of the dormer windows to the front elevation have also been reduced in size, from triple casements to double casements. Finally, the application now proposes vertical hung slates to the upper parts of the side gables of the building, whereas previously it had been proposed to continue the brickwork up to soffit level.
- 2.8 From the west, the resultant building would appear to be no taller than the neighbouring dwellings due to the change in levels. The replacement of the brick with hanging tiles would provide a continuity of material at roof level, such that the scale of the side elevation would be broken. Likewise, the reduction in overall height would physically reduce the mass of the building in views. The reduction in size of three of the dormer windows (which would be located above narrower windows on the existing floors) would reduce the bulk at roof level and provide an order to the fenestration. Whilst, on their own the changes are relatively limited, in combination it is considered that they significantly reduce the dominance of the extension, such that the reason for refusal has been overcome.
- 2.9 It is considered that the reduction in scale of the proposed roof extension, reduction in size of three dormer windows to the front roof slope and provision of hanging tiles to the upper parts of the side elevations of the building have, in combination, overcome the reason for refusal. The detailed design would add some interest to the building. For these reasons it is considered that the

development would cause no unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.

#### Impact on Residential Amenity

- 2.10 There are no dwellings to the south of the site which could be affected by the development. However, regard must be had for whether the nearest dwellings to the north, No.8 Eaves Road, north east, No. 5 Eaves Road, or west, No.47 Eaves Road, would be unacceptably impacted by the development. It is not considered that any other properties would be directly affected by the development.
- 2.11 No.47 is located around 10.3m to the east of the block of flats. It is set around 1m to 1.5m higher than the application site and is set partially into the hillside, such that its garden is approximately at first floor level. It contains only one window to its side elevation (facing Chalkwell Court) which is not considered to be a primary window and is set adjacent to the boundary wall which limits views out. The development would increase the eaves height of the side elevation (currently finished with a parapet) by around 1.6m, above which would be a Mansard roof with a side gable below a shallow roof, rising 2.6m above the existing parapet. The additional floor created would contain four windows, the rear two of which would be high level, one would serve a hallway and be obscure glazed and one would be an angled oriel style window. Whilst the extended building would be notable reaching 10.2m to eaves and 11.1m to ridge (the refused scheme was 10.3m and 12.2m high respectively), due to the separation distance, relative heights of buildings, the limited fenestration to the side elevation of No.47 and the raised position of rear garden of No.47, it is not considered that any unacceptable loss of light or sense of enclosure would be caused. The new windows would be located above four existing windows at second floor level (and a further four at first floor level). In addition to having regard for the existing windows at second floor level, all of the proposed windows have been designed to minimise the potential for overlooking or the perception of overlooking, being high level, orientated away from the neighbours rear garden or being capable of being conditioned so as to be obscure glazed. As such, it is not considered that the development would cause an unacceptable increase in overlooking or the perception of overlooking.
- 2.12 No.8 is located on the opposite side of Eaves Road and is well separated (around 21m at its nearest point) from Chalkwell Court. Given the separation distance, and despite the change in levels, it is not considered that a significant loss of light or sense of enclosure would be caused. Furthermore, whilst there would be five dormers on the closest roof slope (and an additional three set further back), it is not considered that the development would significantly exacerbate existing overlooking from first and second floor windows.
- 2.13 No.5 is located around 16m to the north east of the application site. Between the site and No.5 are several large conifer trees, which are not protected. Given the separation distance, it is not considered that the increased height of the building would cause a significant loss of light or sense of enclosure. The side elevation of the proposed third floor would include three windows, which would be full size and clear (serving a bedroom, kitchen and living room, from front to back). The nearest of these windows, serving a bedroom, is around 21m from the south western corner (front) of No.5 and around 26m from the nearest part of the rear garden of No.5. Due to the location of the window and

its relationship with No.5, views would be angled and, in respect of views toward the rear garden of No.5, blocked by the dwelling itself. It is also noted that there are existing windows in the same position on lower floors. Taking these factors in the round, it is not considered that the development would cause an unacceptable degree of overlooking.

- 2.14 Concern has been raised by third parties that the development would lead to unacceptable noise and disturbance during the construction. Due to the scale of the development, it is not considered that the development would require unusually noisy activities (with no piling or foundations necessary) and would be unlikely to cause disruption over a prolonged period. Environmental Health have raised no concerns in this respect. It is not, therefore, considered that it would be reasonable or proportionate to place any restrictive conditions on the developer regarding the construction period. This would not inhibit Environmental Protection legislation from being enforced, if required.
- 2.15 The flats would be of a reasonable size, whilst individual rooms would be naturally lit and ventilated. Concern has been raised by Environmental Health Officers that the stacking arrangements for some of the flats could lead to unacceptable living conditions, for example where living rooms would be over bedrooms. However, it is considered that this concern could be overcome through the use of a suitably worded condition which requires the submission and approval of measures for noise insulation.
- 2.16 The proposed block plan shows an area for refuse storage. Following concerns raised regarding the size of this refuse area, amendments have been received which increase the size of the area available. At present, the site is provided with four large Euro-bins, two smaller euro-bins and four wheelie bins. As originally submitted, the plan indicated capacity for five large Euro-bins. The amended layout indicates capacity for seven large Euro-bins. The layout of the bins does allow for additional bins along the western boundary of the site (as there are currently), subject to leaving sufficient space for vehicles to manoeuvre around the corner of the building. Whilst the areas available for refuse storage are shown to be restricted on the submitted plans, it is not considered that the provision would cause planning harm, particularly as additional bins could be provided without inhibiting access and egress from the rear parking area. Consequently, it is not considered that it would be reasonable to refuse planning permission for this reason. A condition could be attached to any grant of permission requiring further details of the precise provision area.
- 2.17 Subject to conditions being attached to any grant of permission, it is considered that the living conditions of future occupiers, and those within the existing block of flats, would be acceptable.

#### Impact on Local Highway Network

- 2.18 The proposal would utilise the existing access to the site, which has reasonable visibility in each direction, being set away from the western boundary by a low brick wall beyond which is a wide footpath.
- 2.19 Policy DM13 of the Core Strategy requires developments to provide sufficient car parking, having regard for the scale of the development and its location. DM13 does, however, acknowledge that car parking provision should be design-led. The site is considered to be in a suburban location. In such locations, Table 1.1 of the Core Strategy advises that one and two bedroom

flats will be expected to provide a minimum of one car parking space per dwelling, together with 0.2 spaces per dwelling for visitors.

- 2.20 At present, the car parking on site is not formally laid out. However, cars tend to park along the western boundary of the site, one or two to the front of the building adjacent to the access and a couple to the rear of the building. There are also six garages to the rear of the building, although it is unclear how many of these are used for the parking of cars. On visiting the site, most cars tended to be parked on site in the evening, although the area more generally is very busy at school picking up time.
- 2.21 The proposed development would formalise the car parking at the site and extend the area of hard standing to the front of the site. Having regard for the number of cars currently using the site and the parking spaces which would be created, it is considered that around four additional spaces would be provided (the site plan suggests five spaces; however, I have witnessed cars parking to the rear, so the number of new spaces here are disputed). Table 1.1 of the Core Strategy advises that seven car parking spaces should be provided (six for occupants of the new flats and one visitor space). There are, at present, sixteen flats which would increase to twenty-two should permission be granted. Twenty car parking spaces would be available on site. During visits to Eaves Road, it has been noted that there is some capacity for on-street car parking, particularly to the southern side of the road (there are zig-zag markings opposite the site either side of the school entrance). An exception to this is at school drop-off and pick-up times, when there is little spare parking capacity close to the site. Whilst on-street car parking is less convenient than on-site parking, it does provide some overflow capacity. It is also worth noting that this ward has lower than average car ownership compared to the District as a whole, with 28.8% of households not owning a car (the average for the District is 23.5%). It is also noted that the site is relatively close to several bus stops which provide regular services. The proximity to high quality bus routes means that the site is complemented by a sustainable alternative to car ownership.
- 2.22 The development would therefore fail to provide the level of car parking advised within Table 1.1 of the Core Strategy (albeit the car parking levels set out in this table are not categorical requirements, as set out in the policy). It has been witnessed that the car park is, at times, at capacity and this has been commented upon by third parties. I have also witnessed that the road becomes busy at school drop-off/pick up times. That being said, at other times there has been capacity on the street for additional parking. The development will increase the pressure for on-street spaces and increase competition for spaces. However, whilst this a balanced assessment, it is not considered that the additional demand for car parking generated by the development would cause an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in a severe residual cumulative impact, which are the relevant tests within the NPPF. Likewise, whilst the development would increase vehicle movements to and from the site, it is not considered that this would cause sufficient harm to the functioning of the highway to warrant refusal, having regard for the tests in the NPPF.
- 2.23 In addition to car parking, cycle parking at one space per flat should be provided. Given the deficiency in car parking provision, it is vital that this sustainable form of transport be encouraged. This conclusion is reached despite acknowledgement that the gradient of the hill may discourage cyclists as, once down the hill, easy cycling routes are abundant (such that cyclists

may simply choose to walk their bike up the hill). This should be secured by condition, should permission be granted.

- 2.24 Concern has been raised that the access to the site and Eaves Road are not suitable for HGV's. Whilst larger vehicles may be required to facilitate construction, the use of larger vehicles during construction could be appropriately controlled by a condition requiring the submission and approval of a construction management plan, should permission be granted (although it is noted that when Kent Fire and Rescue responded to the previous application for six additional flats, they were satisfied that a fire appliance could access the site).

#### Contributions

- 2.25 Core Strategy Policy DM5 requires that for schemes of more than 15 dwellings an on-site provision of affordable housing, amounting to 30% of the dwellings proposed, will be required. For developments of between 5 and 14 dwellings, a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing, equivalent to 5% of the GDV, should be sought. The policy also acknowledges that the exact amount of affordable housing, or financial contribution, to be delivered from any scheme will be determined by economic viability, having regard to individual site and market conditions. However, paragraph 63 of the NPPF advises that "provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas". This is expanded upon by Planning Practice Guidance which advises that "contributions should not be sought from development of 10-units or less and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1,000 square metres (gross internal area)". The floor space created to provide the six dwellings would be approximately 365sqm. As such, the NPPF and PPG advises that affordable housing contributions should not be sought. KCC have not requested any contribution be made in respect of local facilities and services and no other contributions have been requested. For these reasons, no contributions are sought.

#### The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, Regulation 63: Appropriate Assessment

- 2.26 All impacts of the development have been considered and assessed. It is concluded that the only aspect of the development that causes uncertainty regarding the likely significant effects on a European Site is the potential disturbance of birds due to increased recreational activity at Sandwich Bay and Pegwell Bay.
- 2.27 Detailed surveys at Sandwich Bay and Pegwell Bay were carried out in 2011, 2012 and 2018. However, applying a precautionary approach and with the best scientific knowledge in the field, it is not currently possible to discount the potential for housing development within Dover district, when considered in combination with all other housing development within the district, to have a likely significant effect on the protected Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar sites.
- 2.28 Following consultation with Natural England, the identified pathway for such a likely significant effect is an increase in recreational activity which causes disturbance, predominantly by dog-walking, of the species which led to the designation of the sites and the integrity of the sites themselves.

- 2.29 The Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar Mitigation Strategy was agreed with Natural England in 2012 and is still considered to be effective in preventing or reducing the harmful effects of housing development on the sites.
- 2.30 Given the limited scale of the development proposed by this application, a contribution towards the Councils Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar Mitigation Strategy will not be required as the costs of administration would negate the benefit of collecting a contribution. However, the development would still be mitigated by the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar Mitigation Strategy as the Council will draw on existing resources to fully implement the agreed Strategy.
- 2.31 Having had regard to the proposed mitigation measures, it is considered that the proposal would not have a likely significant adverse effect on the integrity of the protected Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar sites. The mitigation measures (which were agreed following receipt of ecological advice and in consultation with Natural England) will ensure that the harmful effects on the designated site, caused by recreational activities from existing and new residents, will be effectively managed.

#### Other Matters

- 2.32 It is relevant to note that, whilst the presumption in favour of sustainable development (set out at paragraph 11 of the NPPF), or 'tilted balance', is disengaged by paragraph 177 of the NPPF, the benefits of the development (bringing forward six additional dwellings in a sustainable location where the council cannot, at present, demonstrate a five-year housing land supply) continue to carry weight, albeit within a 'flat balance'.
- 2.33 Concern has also been raised that existing conifers on the site are unsafe. The proposed development would not affect these conifers and, as such, it is not considered that they are material to the determination of the planning application.

### **3. Conclusions**

- 3.1 The site is located within the settlement confines of Dover, which is identified as the 'major focus for development in the District; suitable for the largest scale developments'. The principle of the development is therefore supported.
- 3.2 The sole reason for the refusal of the previous application was the impact that the development would have on the character of the area, which was considered to form a dominant and visually intrusive feature within the road. Since that refusal, the scheme has been amended to reduce the height and bulk of the roof and to provide vertical hung slates to the side gables to break up the elevation. It is considered that, in combination, these changes have successfully overcome the previous reason for refusal.
- 3.3 Some concern is raised regarding the level of car parking which is to be provided, being below the level advised by Table 1.1. of the Core Strategy. However, amendments have been received to maximise the level of car parking possible on the site and, whilst not ideal, it is not considered that the shortfall in spaces would cause sufficient harm to warrant refusal, having regard for the requirements of the NPPF.

- 3.4 The development has been designed so as to limit the impacts on neighbouring properties to acceptable levels, whilst providing a reasonable standard of accommodation to future occupiers, subject to conditions. Understandable concerns were raised by third parties regarding refuse storage; however, it is considered that the applicant has demonstrated that a suitable area for refuse storage can be provided.
- 3.5 It is considered that the development is acceptable in all other material respects and, therefore, it is recommended that permission be granted.

g)

**Recommendation**

- I PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to conditions to include:-
- (1) standard time limits, (2) approved plans, (3) samples of materials, (4) provision of access, car parking and turning areas prior to first occupation (including use of a bound surface material), (5) provision and retention of cycle parking, (6) provision of suitable facilities for refuse storage, (7) obscure glazing to relevant windows, (8) scheme of sound insulation, and (9) construction management plan.
- II Powers to be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions, in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by Planning Committee.

Case Officer

Luke Blaskett