

# **APPENDIX**

## **HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**Date 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2018**

<b>Application No:</b>	HPK/2018/0428	
<b>Location</b>	Land Rear of 20 Sunlaws Street, Glossop, Derbyshire,	
<b>Proposal</b>	Detached 4 bedroom stone house with natural slate roof with associated external works and landscaping. Using existing vehicular access from Sunlaws Street	
<b>Applicant</b>	Mrs E Garratt	
<b>Agent</b>	Mr Eric Smith	
<b>Parish/ward</b>	Howard Town Ward	<b>Date registered</b> 23/08/2018
<b>If you have a question about this report please contact:</b> Mark Ollerenshaw - Email <a href="mailto:mark.ollerenshaw@highpeak.gov.uk">mark.ollerenshaw@highpeak.gov.uk</a> ; Tel: 01538 395400 Ext: 4921		

### **REFERRAL**

The application has been referred to the Committee by Councillor Godfrey Claff for reasons of transparency as the Applicant is the wife of a former employee of High Peak Borough Council Planning Department.

#### **1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION**

**Approve, subject to conditions**

#### **2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

2.1 The site is a rectangular piece of land accessed from Sunlaws Street and is at the rear of the Applicant's house at No. 20 Sunlaws Street and also extends behind the neighbour's house at No. 22. The site is surrounded by neighbouring properties' gardens. No. 22A's garden is to the south west side of the site, No. 16's garden is to the north east side, Nos. 20 and 22's rear yards are to the east and the site is bounded by a garden serving No 60 Queen Street to the west. The site generally slopes down from Sunlaws Street.

2.2 The site is within the built up area boundary of Glossop.

#### **3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL**

3.1 The application is for the erection of a detached dwelling and associated works and landscaping. Revised plans have been received during the course of the application. These change the scale and design of the new dwelling.

3.2 The proposed dwelling would be a detached two storey building with four bedrooms. The dwelling would be sited centrally on the rear part of the site. The existing single width vehicular access driveway from Sunlaws Street would be utilised and the plans indicate 3 parking spaces to the front of the new dwelling and a turning area. The plans also indicate new screen hedge at the back of the parking area on the boundary with both No. 16 and No. 22A Sunlaws Street.

3.3 The application and details attached to it - including the plans, supporting documents, representations and responses from consultees - can be found on the Council's website at:-

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=226673>

#### **4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 The site has a history of refused applications and subsequent appeals for residential development. The most recent applications are as follows:

HPK/2009/0041 – Proposed detached dwelling and garage – Refused 03/04/2009.

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=108667>

HPK/2007/0748 - Resubmission of HPK/2007/0032: Land to the rear of 22 Sunlaws Street : detached dwelling and garage – Refused 12/11/2007.

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=99088>

HPK/2007/0032 – Detached dwelling and garage – Refused 13/03/2007.

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=94515>

HPK/2004/0401 – Resubmission of HPK/2003/0167 – one dwelling – Refused 17/06/2004.

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=43251>

HPK/2003/0167 – One detached dwelling – Refused 07/05/2003.

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=40133>

HPK/2001/0152 – Resubmission of application no. 039711 for 8 no. lock up garages – Refused 16/07/2001.

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=36093>

HPK/0003/9711 – 8 lock up garages for rent to local residents – Refused 12/03/2001.

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=35309>

## **5. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION**

### **Adopted High Peak Local Plan 2016**

- S1 Sustainable Development Principles
- S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- S2 Settlement Hierarchy
- S3 Strategic Housing Development
- S5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy
- EQ1 Climate Change
- EQ5 Biodiversity
- EQ6 Design and Place Making
- EQ9 Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows
- EQ10 Pollution Control and Unstable Land
- EQ11 Flood Risk Management
- H1 Location of Housing Development
- H2 Housing Allocations
- H3 New Housing Development
- H4 Affordable Housing
- CF3 Local Infrastructure Provision
- CF4 Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities
- CF6 Accessibility and Transport
- CF7 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy

### **Supplementary Planning Documents**

- High Peak Design Guide 2018
- Residential Design
- Landscape Character
- Housing Needs Survey
- Planning Obligations

### **National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018)**

### **National Planning Practice Guidance**

## **6. CONSULTATIONS**

<b>Site notice</b>	Expiry date for comments: 28.09.2018
<b>Press notice</b>	Expiry date for comments: N/A
<b>Neighbours</b>	Expiry date for comments on the amended scheme: 02.12.2018

## Neighbours

6.1 7 no. neighbours have submitted objections to the proposal. Details can be read on file. A summary of the issues raised is provided below:-

- Loss of wildlife and trees.
- Loss of privacy to nearby properties on Sunlaws Street and Queen Street.
- The dwelling will be imposing for neighbours and cause overshadowing.
- Increased noise disturbance to neighbours.
- The Applicant is considerate in their use of the driveway but future occupiers of the proposed dwelling may not be.
- The noise survey doesn't predict future uses of the drive by different types of vehicles.
- Nuisance from car lights and light pollution.
- Security risk due to potential of uninvited visitors going down the driveway. There will be no knowing who is legitimately round the back of the gardens and houses.
- The Applicant's husband objected to previous applications and is therefore being disingenuous and tactical. He has contradicted his previous objection now there is some benefit to himself.
- The Applicant was formerly a planning officer at HPBC
- The new blockwork garage is a replacement of a previous car port.
- The acoustic fence has been erected against the wishes of the occupiers of No. 22 and has caused distress.
- The new fence is not an "acoustic" fence.
- The acoustic fence deflects sound back towards No. 22A and the two neighbours at Nos 20 and 22A can no longer see each other for a chat..
- The dwelling is not in keeping and will dominate existing terraces.
- Over development of the site and the proposal will appear cramped.
- Previous applications for a dwelling have been refused so there is no justification for now approving the proposal. There have been no material changes to justify it.
- This is not an affordable dwelling.
- The site is not brownfield.
- The building design does not take account of sustainable building practice.
- There are two nearby schools and the street is very congested.
- Disruption and noise due to construction vehicles/deliveries.
- Danger to pedestrians from cars pulling out of the access. The access drive is narrow – too narrow for emergency vehicles.
- Neighbours at Nos. 22 and 22A may both decide to increase fence height making exit from the drive potentially dangerous.
- No explanation of how the site will be accessible to all.
- The proposed dwelling may be sold in the future and future owners may wish to develop the land further.

- Will planting be inspected after construction?

6.2 2 no. letters of support have also been received (one of which is from a relative of the Applicant) in which the following comments are made:-

- The Applicant has kept the occupier of No. 16 informed throughout and the application seeks to minimize the impact on No. 16's garden.
- The application incorrectly states that the boundary to the north side of the site is with the garden of No. 18 Sunlaws Street. In fact the north boundary of the site is within No. 16's garden.
- There is a severe shortage of homes in the UK.
- If this development is not accepted then it is only a matter of time before another future owner would want to develop it.
- The Applicant has been open and transparent with their neighbours with this development.
- Personal comments about the Applicant are unacceptable and unnecessary.
- The development is sympathetically designed and the land was just a parking area and wasteland, hardly a haven for wildlife.
- The development is not profit driven but seeks to accommodate family and friends.
- Denying permission on the basis of overlooking would be unreasonable.

### Consultees

Consultee	Comment	Officer response
<b>DCC Highways</b>	The Highway Authority did not raise objections to the previous applications HPK/2007/0032 and HPK/2009/0041. The highway comments remain as previously stated. If minded to approved please include all previously recommended highway conditions (see consultation letter dated 6 February 2007).	Paras 7.32-7.35
<b>Arboricultural Officer</b>	Main concern is the Lime tree T23 which is on neighbour's land. It is not protected but the applicant needs to be concerned about the implications of the construction of this tree. The tree report deals with this at section 4.3, it will require some exploratory excavation to identify roots and there is the potential that the building may need to be built on pile and beam foundations to accommodate it. There is also potential impact on another neighbour tree. There will be tree removal required but this is either of low quality or small trees. Therefore based on the above there will not be an overriding arboricultural objection as long as any approval is suitably conditioned to deal with the impact on neighbouring trees and that there is some landscape mitigation.	Paras 7.36-7.39

	<p>Recommend (standard) conditions:  LA03 basic landscaping  LA10 tree retention  LA13 method statement  LA14 implementation of tree protection</p>	
<b>Environmental Health Officer</b>	<p>Cannot see the proposed development having a significant (in a planning context) long term impact on amenity with regard to noise. The proposed residential use isn't inherently noisy.</p> <p>You may wish to consider conditions to protect amenity during the construction phase – control of dust, no burning/fires on site, restriction on construction hours and piling, and no amplified music/radios during construction phase.</p> <p>There is little to suggest a significant risk due to land contamination, however, as the end use is sensitive a condition is recommended – if during development any contamination is identified then the applicant shall submit a written scheme to identify and control that contamination.</p>	
<b>Derbyshire Wildlife Trust</b>	<p>Based on the information provided and consulting our biological records database, the application area appears to be of limited ecological value. Ecological survey work is not considered necessary and a net biodiversity gain can be achieved by incorporating a bat box and bird box within the structure of the new building as detailed in the Planning Statement. The commitment to planting to benefit pollinators and birds is also welcomed. Condition is recommended requiring an integral bat box and bird box to be incorporated within the new dwelling. The type and location of the boxes shall be approved by the LPA.</p>	Paras 7.36-7.39
<b>HPBC Waste and Recycling</b>	<p>No issue with the planning application. However the occupiers of the new dwelling will need to bring their waste to the edge of their curtilage on Sunlaws Street.</p>	
<b>United Utilities</b>	<p>Recommend condition requiring foul and surface water to be drained on separate systems.</p>	Paras 7.40-7.42

## 7. POLICY AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS AND PLANNING BALANCE

### Policy Context

7.1 The determination of a planning application is to be made pursuant to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which is to be read in conjunction with section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

7.2 Section 38(6) requires the Local Planning Authority to determine planning applications in accordance with the development plan, unless there are material considerations which 'indicate otherwise'. Section 70(2) provides that in determining applications the Local Planning Authority "*shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the application and to any other material considerations.*" The Development Plan currently consists of the High Peak Local Plan Policies Adopted April 2016.

7.3 Paragraph 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) explains that at the heart of the Framework is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision makers this means that when considering development proposals which accord with the development plan they should be approved without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, grant planning permission unless:-

- i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance 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. (Para 11 NPPF July 2018).*

7.4 Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies the three dimensions to sustainable development as economic, social and environmental.

7.5 Local Plan policy S1a establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development as contained within the NPPF.

7.6 Section 5 of the NPPF seeks to deliver a sufficient supply of homes.

7.7 The Council is considered to have a five year housing land supply and therefore housing supply policies are up-to-date.

7.8 The policies contained in the Framework are supplemented by the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), which is also a material consideration in the determination of applications.

7.9 A list of key policies, guidance and other material considerations is provided above (section 5).

### **Principle of development**

7.10 Policies H1, H2, H3, H4, H5 and H6 of the Local Plan provide for housing development within the Borough in accordance with specific site allocations, other sites and instances as outlined in policy H1.

7.11 Policy H2 identifies the specific sites that are allocated for housing development across the Borough. The application site is not an allocated site.

7.12 Policy H1 states that provision will be made for housing by supporting development of allocated sites, promoting the effective reuse of land, supporting housing development on unallocated sites within defined built up area boundaries of the towns and larger villages, encouraging the inclusion of housing in mixed use schemes, supporting development identified through a Community Right to Build Order and supporting self-build housing schemes.

7.13 The site is within the built up area boundary of Glossop and is sustainably located having good links to local services and shops by walking/cycling and nearby public transport. The site is in a mainly residential area and is adjacent to residential properties.

7.14 Overall the principle of a new dwelling on this site accords with LP Policy H1.

### **Design/impact on the character and appearance of the area**

7.15 The NPPF highlights that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and creating better places in which to live and work (Paragraph 124). Section 15 of the NPPF seeks to protect and enhance the natural and local environment. Local Plan Policies S1 and EQ6 seek to secure high quality design in all developments; developments are required to respond positively to the environment and contribute to local distinctiveness and sense of place by taking account of the distinct character, townscape and setting of the area.

7.16 Given its proposed siting, the proposal could be considered a “backland” form of development as it lies behind the terrace of properties. However, the housing development at Wren Nest Close within close proximity to the south west is a similar form of development situated behind terraced properties and it should be noted that the previously refused applications in 2007 and 2009 did not raise this as an issue and therefore it would be unreasonable to resist the proposal on this basis.

7.17 As noted above, revised plans have been submitted during the course of the application which reduce the footprint and overall scale of the proposed dwelling. The long side elevations originally proposed have been reduced to create a more square footprint and a dwelling which will sit more comfortably within the plot with sufficient gaps from the side and rear boundaries. There are to be garden areas to both sides of the dwelling as well as the front and rear.

7.18 The dwelling is a two storey detached building with 4 bedrooms and therefore larger in scale than the existing terraced properties on Sunlaws Street. However, it is noted that there is a pair of semi-detached villas and a substantial detached dwelling on the other side of Sunlaws Street. The proposal will not therefore appear out of context in the street scene. The proposal will be partially visible from Sunlaws Street in the gap between Nos 22 and 22A as indicated on the street scene drawing. However, the dwelling will be set back a considerable distance from the road frontage and sits lower than the existing terraces due to the topography of the site. The hipped roof to the south west side of the building will reflect the hipped roofs of the terraced properties. The existing trees on the site boundaries together with new hedges to be planted will soften the impact of the development. The proposed materials are stone elevations and a slate roof which are sympathetic to the



character of the area. All windows and doors would have stone heads and cills to reflect the character of the nearby properties and windows have a vertical emphasis. The revised design and resulting impact on the street scene are considered acceptable.

7.19 The parking area to the front of the property will be shielded from Sunlaws Street by the existing terrace and hedge planting is proposed to the boundaries of the turning and parking area which will further soften this aspect of the development.

7.20 Bearing all the above points in mind it is considered that the siting, layout, size, scale, design and materials of the proposed development is acceptable. The proposal would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposed development accords with Local Plan policies S1 and EQ6 and Section 12 of the NPPF.

### **Impact on neighbouring residential amenity**

7.21 LP Policy EQ6 seeks to ensure that new development achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development, taking into account factors such as privacy, visual intrusion, shadowing and overlooking.

7.22 The impact on the neighbouring properties was a key consideration in the determination of the previous applications and appeals relating to this site. There have been a number of attempts to develop the land: an appeal was dismissed in 1990 for the erection of a bungalow, and an outline application for residential development was also dismissed in 2005. The most recent application to have been refused and subsequently dismissed on appeal is HPK/2009/0041. Other applications for the development of the land, going back to 1984, have all been the subject of refusals by the Council. Each of these decisions included the harmful impact on the amenity of adjoining residents as a reason for refusing planning permission.

7.23 The Inspector for the 2009 appeal found that the main issue was *'the effect which the proposal would have on the living conditions of adjoining residents, especially in relation to any noise and disturbance or loss of privacy which might be involved'*. The Inspector considered the impact on the living conditions of No. 22 unacceptable as a result of the use of the driveway by people and movement of vehicles.

7.24 The driveway runs between the driveways of Nos. 22 and 22A and the use of this driveway to access a dwelling at the rear has been a key area of concern for the previous applications. In particular, No. 22 has ground floor windows to habitable rooms facing the driveway. It is noted that in the case of No. 22A, this neighbouring property does not contain any window openings to the side elevation facing the driveway.

7.25 Since the previous refusal in 2009 the Applicant has erected a close boarded fence to a height of 1.8m along the boundary of the driveway with No. 22 to mitigate noise and disturbance to the occupiers of No. 22 from people and vehicles using the driveway. This is in addition to the existing palisade fence and hedge noted by the

Inspector in 2009. The new fence provides No. 22 with privacy to their side facing windows and garden. The submitted Noise Assessment Report assesses the potential impact from the use of the existing driveway of the proposed dwelling on the side windows of No. 22 Sunlaws Street. The report was carried out through daytime and evening conditions and assumed an average 8 car movements per day. It measured the noise of vehicles using the driveway over the existing loose gravel surface. The noise report, which was undertaken before the 1.8m high close boarded fence was erected, concludes that the effect on the local noise levels would be negligible or less. In addition to the new fence, the Applicant also proposes to replace the existing gravel driveway with a bonded surface to reduce movement noise further.

7.26 It is understood that the Applicant has been using the driveway since 2010 to access their rear garden and parking area and no complaints have been received from the neighbours over the last 8 years. This would suggest that the movements of vehicles / people along the driveway is not causing a significant nuisance to the neighbours.

7.27 The Applicant also states that their existing right of way along the side of No. 22 needs to be taken into account. They state that they have a right of way immediately to the side of No. 22 which runs alongside that house and past its side windows which they can use at any time, something which previous inspectors were not aware of.

7.28 In relation to the impact on No. 22A, it is understood that this neighbour has built a blockwork garage at the end of their drive which provides some screening from the proposed driveway. As noted, this neighbouring property does not contain any windows to the side elevation facing towards the driveway and therefore should not be significantly affected by the proposal.

7.29 Taking the above considerations into account, it is considered that there have been material changes to the site circumstances which lead me to conclude that the use of the driveway would not lead to significant noise and disturbance to the neighbouring occupiers. The Environmental Health Officer does not anticipate any noise disturbance for the neighbours as a result of this application though conditions are recommended to control and mitigate the impact of the construction phase.

7.30 The siting of the proposed dwelling is intended to respect the privacy of the nearby properties. The site is well screened with a variety of buildings and garages between the proposed dwelling and the neighbouring properties on Sunlaws Street. Separation distances of at least 21 metres are maintained from all neighbouring properties' windows. The orientation of the dwelling is front-back with only secondary or non-habitable windows looking to the sides. The main habitable room windows in the front elevation look down the gap between houses on Sunlaws Street. It is acknowledged that the proposed dwelling will be within relative close proximity of the rear gardens of Nos. 16 and 22A Sunlaws Street, however, following receipt of amended plans the scale and footprint of the proposed dwelling is much reduced. The revised proposal will be much less overbearing in relation to the neighbouring gardens as the side elevations are shorter. There is some tree/shrub planting along these boundaries which will minimise any overlooking/overbearing impact. The main

sitting out areas for these neighbours are located immediately to the rear of the properties. To the rear site boundary, a mature hedge will screen the proposal from the neighbouring property on Queen Street.

7.31 Bearing these points in mind, the proposed development accords with the residential amenity tenets of Local Plan policies S1 and EQ6 and bullet point 'f' of para 127 of the NPPF.

### **Highway safety**

7.32 The NPPF promotes sustainable transport and recommends that local planning authorities should seek to encourage and facilitate where possible sustainable patterns of transport using practical alternatives to private motor vehicles so that people have a real choice about how they travel.

7.33 Local Plan Policy CF6 seeks to ensure that new development can be accessed safely, provides access to a range of transport modes and minimise the need to travel by unsustainable modes.

7.34 The proposed access to the dwelling will be from the existing driveway onto Sunlaws Street. The plans indicate parking for 3 vehicles and a turning area is provided. The Highway Authority does not object to the proposal subject to the conditions recommended for the previous applications in 2007 and 2009. These conditions require 2m x 70m visibility splays from the existing access to be maintained; provision of parking and manoeuvring space within the site in accordance with the submitted plans; and space to be provided within the site for storage of plant and materials, loading and unloading of good vehicles. An informative was also recommended advising that the proposed access driveway should be surfaced with a solid, bound material for the initial 5m measured back from the highway. These conditions have been added to the recommendation.

7.35 Bearing the above points in mind it is considered that the application accords with Local Plan Policy CF6 and section 9 of the NPPF.

### **Arboricultural, landscaping and ecological issues**

7.36 Local Plan policy EQ9 seeks to protect existing trees, woodland and hedgerows. Local Plan policy EQ2 seeks to protect, enhance and restore the landscape character of the Plan Area for its own intrinsic beauty requiring, inter alia, development to protect and/or enhance the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the landscape and to resist development which would be detrimental to the local or wider landscape. Local Plan policy EQ5 seeks, inter alia, to preserve and/or enhance biodiversity. Section 15 of the NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment.

7.37 There are trees within the site and on neighbouring land. The submitted Arboricultural Report identifies that the lime tree within the garden of No. 16 in particular will require pruning works as well as exploratory excavation to identify any significant roots and if so special foundation design could be used to avoid negative impacts on the condition of the tree. Two trees will require removal as they are

situated on the footprint of the new dwelling however these are both of low value, retention category 'C'. The tree report also identifies that the development provides an opportunity to undertake new tree planting as part of the soft landscaping scheme to mitigate for the required tree removals. The Arboricultural Officer raises no objection on arboricultural grounds, subject to conditions relating to tree protection measures and landscaping.

7.38 Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (DWT) does not object to the proposal stating that the site is of little ecological value. A net biodiversity gain can be achieved by incorporating bat and bird boxes within the structure of the new dwelling and a condition has been included within the recommendation to this effect.

7.39 Bearing in mind all the above points it is considered that, subject to conditions, there are no significant arboricultural, landscape or ecological issues arising from the proposal. As such, the proposal accords with Local Plan policies EQ2, EQ3, EQ5 & EQ9 and section 15 of the NPPF.

### **Flooding & drainage**

7.40 Policy EQ11 of the Local Plan seeks to support development which avoids areas of current or future flood risk. Para. 155 of the NPPF states that development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk. The site is not located within an area identified as high risk.

7.41 United Utilities have raised no objection to the current application, subject to conditions relating to details of surface water and foul drainage. The application states that the development will incorporate sustainable drainage systems with permeable paving used on the drive, parking area and paths.

7.42 Bearing the above comments in mind, it is considered that, subject to the condition recommended by United Utilities, the proposal does not raise any significant issues relating to surface water run-off, flood risk and drainage. As such it is considered that the proposal accords with Local Plan policy EQ11 and section 14 of the NPPF.

### **8. Conclusion & Planning Balance**

8.1 It is considered that the principle of development is acceptable. The siting, layout, scale, design and materials proposed would not harm the visual amenities of the locality. There are no adverse impacts in respect of highway safety, trees and biodiversity and there no flooding or drainage issues arising from the proposal.

8.2 In respect of the impact on the amenities of number 22 Sunlaws Street, the development proposals are finely balanced. On the one hand, as noted by the Planning Inspector in his appeal decision, even with the erection of a fence, there would still be a perception of intrusion as a result of the movements alongside the house (22 Sunlaws Street) that would be over and above that which would be considered reasonable. Conversely, this application is supported by a noise assessment and the applicant has offered to surface the access with a solid bound

surface (rather than gravel as presently found), thereby reducing the potential impact of noise.

8.3 There would be economic benefits stemming from the construction phase, future residents contributing to the local economy and additional Council Tax and potential New Homes Bonus payments. There would be some limited social benefits with the contribution of 1 No. dwelling to the housing needs of the Borough, notwithstanding that the Council can currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. As such, on balance, it is considered that the proposed development is a sustainable form of development that accords with Local Plan policies S1 and S1a and the concept of sustainability at the heart of the NPPF. Therefore, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

## 10. RECOMMENDATION

**A. That planning permission is APPROVED subject to the conditions outlined below.**

**B. In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Operations Manager - Development Services has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Development Control Committee, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.**

### Conditions

Condition number	Brief description	Comment
TL01	The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission	
AP01	Development in accordance with approved/amended plans	
LA10	Tree retention	
LA13	Arboricultural Method Statement	
LA14	Tree Protection	
NON STANDARD	Landscaping scheme to be submitted and agreed.	
LA02	Landscaping to be carried out and maintained.	
NON STANDARD	Biodiversity enhancements – integral bat box and bird box shall be incorporated within the new dwelling in accordance with details to be agreed.	
NON STANDARD	Construction working times: i. 07:30 - 18:00 hours (Monday to Friday);	

	<p>ii. 08:30 - 14:00 hours (Saturday)</p> <p>iii. No working is permitted on Sundays or Bank Holidays.</p>	
NON STANDARD	Any piling restricted to the hours of 09:00 to 16:00 Monday to Friday only	
NON STANDARD	There shall be no visible dust emissions beyond the site boundary.	
CL05	If during development any contamination or evidence of likely contamination is identified that has not previously been identified or considered, then the applicant shall submit a written scheme to identify and control that contamination. This shall include a phased risk assessment.	
NON STANDARD	Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems.	
NON STANDARD	Details of facing materials to be submitted.	
NON STANDARD	Details of rainwater goods to be submitted.	
NON STANDARD	Joinery details to be submitted.	
NON STANDARD	Details for the storage of plant and materials, site accommodation, loading, unloading and manoeuvring of goods vehicles, parking and manoeuvring of employees and visitors vehicles during construction works.	
NON STANDARD	2m x 70m visibility splays shall be maintained from the existing vehicular access clear of all obstructions greater than 1m in height (0.6m in the case of vegetation).	
NON STANDARD	No dwelling shall be occupied until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the application drawings for parking and manoeuvring of residents and visitors vehicles.	
NON STANDARD	Solid bound surface to the access road	

### Informative

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process and thorough discussion with the applicants. In accordance with Paragraph 38 of the NPPF the Case Officer has sought solutions

where possible to secure a development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

**Site Plan**

