

## PLANNING COMMITTEE – 18 MARCH 2021

### PART I - DELEGATED

5. **20/2306/FUL: First floor side and single storey rear extension, conversion of garage and single storey side extension to form a garage and extension of residential curtilage (change of use of amenity land to land forming part of residential planning unit) via re-positioning of fencing at 2 ARUNDEL ROAD, ABBOTS LANGLEY, WD5 0TP. (DCES)**

Parish: Abbots Langley Parish Council  
Expiry of Statutory Period: 30.12.20  
Extension of time agreed: 23.03.21

Ward: Leavesden  
Case Officer: Clara Loveland

Recommendation: That the decision be delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services to consider any representations received and that planning permission be refused.

Reason for consideration by the Committee: Acting agent is a Ward Councillor.

#### 1 Relevant Planning History

- 1.1 94/321/8 - Erection of 105 dwellings.

#### 2 Description of Application Site

- 2.1 The application site comprises of a two storey detached dwelling with an integral garage with a mono-pitched roof located on the north-western side of Arundel Road in Abbots Langley. The highway boundary of the application site is splayed as it follows the curve in the road with the garden area to the north narrowing as a result. Arundel Road is a residential street characterised by dwellings of a similar style and design.
- 2.2 The application dwelling has a gable end roof form and is finished in light brown brick. The integral garage located to the southern side of the dwelling accommodates 1 vehicle space. The principle elevation of the house is characterised by a bay window at ground floor and a front canopy extending across the width of the dwelling. There is a gable end feature at first floor.
- 2.3 The dwelling is set back from the highway by a driveway which accommodates 2 spaces. To the immediate site of the house to the north there is an area of hard-surfacing with an associated drop kerb which can accommodate a further vehicle space. The current total off road parking is 4 spaces.
- 2.4 There is a single storey conservatory to the rear.
- 2.5 To the rear there is a patio area and a garden area which contains two sheds. The garden is enclosed by close boarded fencing and there is a protected beech tree located within the application site (TPO285). To the front of the northern parcel of the garden and in-between the fencing and the highway there is an open strip of amenity land.

#### 3 Description of Proposed Development

- 3.1 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a first floor side and single storey rear extension, conversion of garage and single storey side extension to form a garage and extension of residential curtilage (change of use of amenity land to land forming part of residential planning unit) via re-positioning of fencing.

- 3.2 The proposed first floor side extension will be located above the existing garage. It will have a width of 2.9m. Its depth would extend part way across the south-western flank elevation to a depth of 5m. At this point a further first floor side extension would extend to be level with the rear elevation, albeit it would have a splayed wall. The total depth of the extensions would be 8m. The front element of the extension would have a gable end roof form with a height of 7.5m and would extend in line with the existing ridge line, falling to an eaves height of 5m. The splayed part of the side extension towards the rear would have a flat roof with a height of 4.8m. The first floor side extension would serve a bedroom and an en-suite bathroom. There would be a 3 casement window within the front elevation at first floor and an obscurely glazed fixed shut window located within the splayed wall at first floor. The extension would be bricked to match the external appearance of the existing house.
- 3.3 The existing garage would be converted into a playroom. The existing garage door would be replaced by a window and materials to match the existing dwelling.
- 3.4 The existing conservatory at the rear would be removed and replaced with a single storey extension with a depth of 3m from the rear elevation and would extend part way across the rear elevation to a width of 4.9m. It would have a flat roof with a height of 3m. Within the roof an aluminium skylight would be located centrally and would project 0.4m above the surface of the roof. The rear extension would be finished in brick to match the existing dwelling. The windows would be an aluminium framed.
- 3.5 There would be alterations in the existing ground floor rear elevation. A large window, serving the kitchen would replace the existing windows and door.
- 3.6 To the north and physically attached the dwelling a proposed garage would be located and would measure 5.1m in width and 5.4m in depth. It would have a gable end roof with a height of 4m falling to an eaves height of 2.3m. The front of the garage would be narrower at a width of 4.1m due to a proposed splayed front-to-side wall. Due to the splayed wall on this side, the garage would be built up to the front boundary line. The garage would be set back from the front elevation by 2.8m. It would be finished in painted timber barge board. There would be double doors in the flank elevation. There would be triple doors within the rear elevation. The fenestration would be aluminium framed.
- 3.7 The proposal also includes the relocation of the front close boarded fencing by shifting the fence line 2m towards the east, up the boundary with the pavement. The relocation of the fence line would extend to extent of the residential curtilage. The fence would retain a height of 1.8m.
- 3.8 During the course of the application it came to light the plans had some discrepancies and did not accurately reflect the existing front gable feature. Also, the south-west elevation indicates the proposed side extension would have a ridge height of 6.4m and be set down from the existing ridge line by 1m. However, the south-eastern and north-western elevations indicate it would have a ridge height of 7.5m and would extend in line with the existing ridge line. While requested, amended plans have not been received to date.

## **4 Consultation**

### **4.1 Statutory Consultation**

4.1.1 Abbots Langley Parish Council: [No objection]

4.1.2 Landscape Officer: [No objection]

*I would recommend that the application should be approved, from a tree & landscape perspective. A condition should be applied that requires the applicant to implement and follow the submitted tree protection method statement (Ref: Land at 2 Arundel Road, Abbots Langley / 1241 SK 202C) prior to and during construction.*

4.1.3 National Grid: [No comment received. Any comments received will be verbally updated at the Committee meeting]

4.1.4 Hertfordshire Council Highways: [No objection]

#### *Decision*

*Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.*

#### *Highway Informatives*

*HCC as Highway Authority recommends inclusion of the following Advisory Note (AN) / highway informative to ensure that any works within the highway are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980:*

*AN 1) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.*

*AN 2) Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.*

*AN 3) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.*

#### *Comments*

*The proposal is for the construction of a first floor side and single storey rear extension, conversion of garage and single storey side extension to form a garage at 2 Arundel Road, Abbots Langley. Arundel Road is a 30 mph, unclassified local access road that is maintained at public expense.*

#### *Vehicle access and parking*

*The dwelling currently has two vehicle cross overs (VXO's) which serve a double drive to the current garage and a side single hard standing for an additional car. Within the application form it states that there will be a new or altered vehicle access proposed to or from the public highway. However, from the drawings it seems as if the current smaller*

*access to the east of the property will be used to allow access to the newly proposed garage. I would like to include no mention has been made of a new or amended VXO in drawings 1241 SK 202C or 1241 SK 201B. Hertfordshire County Council Highways would deem that the current single VXO consisting of 3 dropped kerbs and two risers is adequate to facilitate the new double garage. Therefore, having analysed the plans and concluding that there will be no change to the VXO's (dropped kerbs) HCC Highways deems the current access is adequate. If this is the wrong assumption and the VXO is to be extended or moved then HCC would like to see detailed plans including widths and visibility splays.*

*Although HCC would recommend that the current VXO's at the site not be altered.*

*Parking is a matter for the Local Planning Authority (LPA). However, HCC Highways would comment that the dwelling will lose a parking space through the loss of the garage. This will be replaced by 2 spaces in the newly proposed garage which is deemed acceptable.*

#### *Drainage*

*The proposed new driveway would need to make adequate provision for drainage on site to ensure that surface water does not discharge onto the highway. Surface water from the existing and the new driveway would need to be collected and disposed of on site.*

#### *Sustainability*

*The dwelling is located 320 metres from the nearest bus stop and is close to amenities such as Tesco express. The bus stop has links to the local stations of Garston and Hemel Hempstead. The location meets policies set out within Hertfordshire Local Transport plan (adopted 2018) and therefore is deemed acceptable.*

#### *Refuge / waste*

*Provision has been made for an on-site bin-refuse store within 30m of the dwelling and within 25m of the kerbside/bin collection point. The collection method must be confirmed as acceptable by TRDC waste management.*

#### *Emergency Vehicle Access*

*The proposed dwelling is within the recommended emergency vehicle access of 45 metres from the highway to all parts of the buildings. This is in accordance with the guidance in 'MfS', 'Roads in Hertfordshire; A Design Guide' and 'Building Regulations 2010: Fire Safety Approved Document B Vol 1 – Dwellinghouses'.*

#### *Conclusion*

*HCC has no objections or further comments on highway grounds to the proposed development, subject to the inclusion of the above highway informatives.*

## **4.2 Public/Neighbour Consultation**

4.2.1 Number consulted: 7

4.2.2 No of responses received: 0.

4.2.3 Site Notice: Posted 12.11.20. Expired 03.12.20.

4.2.4 Press notice: Not required.

4.2.5 It should be noted that neighbours have been re-consulted for a 21 days period, ending 26.03.21. During the course of the application it came to light that the application sought permission to change of use of amenity land to land forming part of residential planning unit) via the re-positioning of fencing. Therefore, neighbours were required to be re-consulted.

## **5 Reason for Delay**

- 5.1 There have been on-going discussions with the applicant regarding the extent of works proposed, specifically in respect of the fact that the plans show the extension of the residential planning unit as the re-positioning of the fencing would enclose an existing area which is considered open amenity area, a different planning use. Whilst the open amenity area falls within the ownership of the applicant, it does not automatically follow that the both the garden and open amenity area fall within the same planning use or planning unit. Officers have amended the description on the basis of the submitted plans and assessed the application accordingly.

## **6 Relevant Planning Policy, Guidance and Legislation**

### **6.1 National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance**

- 6.1.1 In 2019 the new National Planning Policy Framework was published. This is read alongside the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The determination of planning applications is made mindful of Central Government advice and the Local Plan for the area. It is recognised that Local Planning Authorities must determine applications in accordance with the statutory Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, and that the planning system does not exist to protect the private interests of one person against another. The NPPF is clear that “existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework”.

- 6.1.2 The NPPF states that ‘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’. The NPPF retains a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This applies unless any adverse impacts of a development would ‘significantly and demonstrably’ outweigh the benefits.

### **6.2 The Three Rivers Local Development Plan**

The application has been considered against the policies of the Local Plan, including the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), the Development Management Policies Local Development Document (adopted July 2013) and the Site Allocations Local Development Document (adopted November 2014) as well as government guidance. The policies of Three Rivers District Council reflect the content of the NPPF.

The Core Strategy was adopted on 17 October 2011 having been through a full public participation process and Examination in Public. Relevant policies include Policies CP1, CP9, CP10 and CP12.

The Development Management Policies Local Development Document (DMLDD) was adopted on 26 July 2013 after the Inspector concluded that it was sound following Examination in Public which took place in March 2013. Relevant policies include DM1, DM6, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5.

### **6.3 Other**

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (adopted February 2015).

The Localism Act received Royal Assent on 15 November 2011. The growth and Infrastructure Act achieved Royal Assent on 25 April 2013.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and the Habitat Regulations 1994 may also be relevant.

## **7 Planning Analysis**

### **7.1 Impact on Character and Street Scene**

- 7.1.1 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) seeks to promote buildings of a high enduring design quality that respect local distinctiveness and Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) relates to design and states that in seeking a high standard of design the Council will expect development proposals to 'have regard to the local context and conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area'. Development should make efficient use of land but should also respect the 'distinctiveness of the surrounding area in terms of density, character, layout and spacing, amenity, scale, height, massing and use of materials'; 'have regard to the local context and conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area' and 'incorporate visually attractive frontages to adjoining streets and public spaces'.
- 7.1.2 Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document set out that development should not have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the area. Extensions should not be excessively prominent and should respect the existing character of the dwelling, particularly with regard to the roof form, positioning and style of windows and doors, and materials. The Design Guidelines at Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document state that generally the maximum depth of single storey rear extensions to detached dwellings should be 4m although this distance may be reduced if the extension would adversely affect adjoining properties or be unduly prominent. First floor side extensions shall be a minimum of 1.2m from the flank boundary. Additionally, new development should not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties or to the general street scene.
- 7.2 It should be noted that during the course of the application Officers raised concerns that the proposed development would be contrived and of a design which exacerbates the bulk and massing of the extension. It was considered that significant alterations would be required to overcome the concerns and no amendments were sought.
- 7.2.1 The proposed first floor side extension would be visible from the wider street of Arundel Road. Although visible, the side extension would be set down from the main ridge line by 1m, appearing subordinate in nature. However, given the discrepancy in the plans, this is not certain. It would also have fenestration, brick and tiling to match the existing dwelling such that its design would not appear out of character or unduly prominent. However, the first floor side extension would be set in from the boundary line with no.4 by 0.9m, failing to meet the criteria set out within Appendix 2 which indicates that 1.2m spacing should generally be provided. Additionally, this stretch of Arundel Road is characterised by garages with space above providing separation between dwellings. It has been considered that there are some signs of development above garages (e.g. 23 Arundel Road) and the proposal to extend above the garage would not be out of character in this regard. Nevertheless, the proposal seeks to enclose the spacing above the garage closest to neighbour No.4 which is set along the boundary line which exacerbates the impact of the extension. As such, there would be a limited separation distance between the flank wall of the proposed and the neighbouring wall of only 0.9m. It is therefore considered that the proposed side extension would physically enclose the existing space at first floor level to such an extent that a terracing effect would arise with No.4 to the detriment to the visual amenity of the streetscene.
- 7.2.2 Furthermore, the first floor side extension towards the rear would have a splayed rear wall. While this does diminish the appearance of the extension when viewed from the rear or at an oblique angle, it would appear contrived by virtue of its design. The rearmost part of the

side extension would require a flat roof to accommodate the splayed nature of the development. While it is acknowledged that this would have limited views from the wider street, the differing roof forms and splayed wall would be highly visible from a neighbouring perspective and partially visible from rear public vantage points within Leavesden Country Park. Thus, the rear element of the first floor side extension would appear contrived and relate poorly to the existing dwelling. It is therefore considered that the design of the side extension would arise in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and be unacceptable.

- 7.2.3 The garage conversion which includes the introduction of a window within the front elevation would be visible from the wider street. Although visible the window would be finished in materials that match the size, scale, design and appearance of the existing fenestration within the dwelling. As such, the conversion and subsequent external alterations would not appear unduly prominent, excessive or out of character by comparison of the host dwelling or wider street.
- 7.2.4 Although the proposed single storey rear extension would be located to the rear of the dwelling, due to the orientation of the dwelling to the north, it would be visible from an oblique angle from Arundel Road. Although visible from an oblique angle, at a depth of 3m from the rear elevation it would be compliant with the criteria detailed within Appendix 2. Further, it is also acknowledged that the single storey rear extension largely replaces an existing conservatory thus, there is already some built form to this part of the site. While the single storey rear extension would be larger than the existing conservatory, the proposed extension would be finished in brick to match the existing dwelling which would also be an enhancement in appearance compared with the existing conservatory. Moreover, it would be read in conjunction with the existing two storey dwelling, appearing subordinate in nature and not excessively prominent as a result. Therefore, the ground floor rear extension would not appear unduly prominent or excessive in relation to the host dwelling, application site or wider street.
- 7.2.5 The proposed garage located along the north-eastern flank elevation would be readily visible within the wider street. Garages of this sort are not uncommon within the wider area thus, its principle would not be out of character. Although the garage would be set down and read against the backdrop of the two storey dwelling, at a width of 5.1m and depth of 5.4m, it would appear large in relation to the host dwelling. Further, many of the dwellings along this stretch of Arundel Road have garages which are smaller in scale, accommodating 1 vehicle. Thus, by comparison of the wider street, the proposed garage which could sufficiently accommodate 1 vehicle. It is also acknowledged that the dwelling is located on a corner plot which would further exacerbate the appearance and prominence of the garage. Further, the garage would have a splayed wall located to the north-east and would adjoin the existing footway. It is noted that this would be partially screened by the proposed close board fencing and the splayed wall is small in scale. Nevertheless, the splayed wall indicates the contrived nature of the development and would be out of keeping with the host dwelling and wider area.
- 7.2.6 The proposal also includes the extension of residential planning unit, i.e. the extension of the existing residential curtilage as it seeks to enclose an area of grassed open amenity land. The existing grassed area contains a lamppost and signage. No details have been provided as to the removal, replacement and/or relocation of these. A review of historic images indicates that the amenity area previously contained soft landscaping. By virtue of the re-positioning of the fencing this space would be lost. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that there are other close board fences immediately abutting the pathway within the immediate vicinity of the site and as such, the relocation of the fence line would not, on balance, be considered out of character. Whilst it is unfortunate that fence line would not be set back slightly from the pavement, i.e. behind the road sign it is not considered that the incorporation of the open amenity space into the garden would have a significant detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area.

7.2.7 In summary, it is considered that the proposed first floor side extension would unacceptably erode the spacing between the host dwelling and No.4 to the south and the rear element of the first floor side extension would be of poor design by virtue of its contrived form incorporating a splayed wall. The proposed garage is considered excessive in size and of an un-sympathetic design, appearing prominent and contrived as to arise in harm to the host dwelling and the visual amenity of the streetscene. As such, it is considered that the development is contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD (adopted July 2013).

### 7.3 Impact on amenity of neighbours

7.4 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should 'protect residential amenities by taking into account the need for adequate levels of disposition of privacy, prospect, amenity and garden space'.

7.4.1 Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document set out that development should not result in the loss of light to the windows of neighbouring properties nor allow overlooking, and should not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties.

7.4.2 There are no adjacent dwellings located to the north-eastern side of the application site and opposing dwellings are sufficiently separated by the presence of the adjacent highway. Thus, the single storey rear extension, proposed garage and extension of the residential planning unit would not arise in any intrusion, loss of light or be overbearing to any neighbour.

7.4.3 The proposed first floor side extension would fail to comply with Appendix 2 by virtue of its spacing of 0.9m from the boundary line. This is further exacerbated by the reason that south western neighbour is set along the boundary line. Submitted plans indicate that the proposed development would not introduce the 45 degree splay line. However, when drawn from a point on the shared boundary level with the rear wall of this neighbour, plans indicate that there would be an intrusion of approximately 1.4m. However, when considering the orientation of the sun and the fact the neighbour is located to the south the impact of the extension would avoid unacceptable levels of loss of light to the neighbouring rear windows which appear to serve a bedroom. It is additionally noted that the dwellings are staged and the proposed development would extend beyond the rear of this by approximately 5m. However, the splayed wall and flat roof design would reduce its dominance and thus it is not considered to appear unduly prominent to the neighbouring property.

7.4.4 The window located within the first floor flank (splayed) elevation is proposed to be obscure and fixed shut which would avoid overlooking issues. In the event of an approval a condition would be imposed to ensure the window was obscurely glazed and either fixed shut or top level opening only at 1.7m above the floor level of the room.

7.4.5 Given the separation distance of 5m between the flank wall of the single storey rear extension and this neighbour (no.4) it would not arise in any harm.

7.4.6 The additional glazing at ground level would have an outlook of the private rear amenity space at the site and as such, the views available would not be significantly different to those already available from the existing fenestration. Therefore, the proposed rear fenestration is considered to be acceptable in this regard.

7.4.7 The proposed development is not considered to result in any adverse impact upon neighbouring properties and is acceptable in accordance with Policy C12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013).

### 7.5 Amenity Space Provision for future occupants

7.5.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should take into account the need for adequate levels and disposition of amenity and garden space. Section 3 (Amenity Space) of Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document provides indicative levels of amenity/garden space provision.

7.5.2 The proposal would result in a 4 bedroom dwelling. The application site would benefit from a private amenity space measuring approximately 240sqm as a result of the proposed extension of residential curtilage. Given that the indicative level for a 4 bedroom dwelling is 105sqm, the rear private amenity space is considered sufficient in size to adequately serve current and future occupiers of the dwelling following the proposed development.

## 7.6 Wildlife and Biodiversity

7.6.1 Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 requires Local Planning Authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. This is further emphasised by regulation 3(4) of the Habitat Regulations 1994 which state that Councils must have regard to the strict protection for certain species required by the EC Habitats Directive.

7.6.2 The protection of biodiversity and protected species is a material planning consideration in the assessment of applications in accordance with Policy CP9 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM6 of the DMLDD. National Planning Policy requires Local Authorities to ensure that a protected species survey is undertaken for applications that may be affected prior to determination of a planning application.

7.6.3 The application has been submitted with a Biodiversity Checklist was submitted with the application and states that no protected species or biodiversity interests will be affected as a result of the application. The Local Planning Authority is not aware of any records of bats (or other protected species) within the immediate area that would necessitate further surveying work being undertaken.

## 7.7 Trees and Landscaping

7.7.1 Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD states that development proposals should seek to retain trees and other important landscape and nature conservation features whilst including new trees and other planting to enhance the landscape of the site and its surroundings as appropriate. It also states that development proposals should demonstrate that existing trees, hedgerows and woodlands will be safeguarded and managed during and after development in accordance with the relevant British Standards and that development should be designed in such a way as to allow trees and hedgerows to grow to maturity without causing undue problems of visibility, shading or damage.

7.7.2 The application site contains a protected beech tree – TPO 285. A proposed tree protection plan (1241 SK 202C) was provided at submission. A Landscape Officer comments that a condition should be applied that requires the applicant to implement and follow the submitted tree protection method statement (Ref: Land at 2 Arundel Road, Abbots Langley / 1241 SK 202C) prior to and during construction in the event of an approval.

7.7.3 Subject to this condition it is considered that no harm would arise to the protected tree and would be acceptable in this regard.

## 7.8 Highways, Access and Parking

7.8.1 Core Strategy Policy CP10 (adopted October 2011) requires development to make adequate provision for all users, including car parking. Policy DM13 in the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013) states that development should make provision for parking in accordance with the Parking Standards set out within Appendix 5.

- 7.8.2 The proposal includes the conversion of the existing garage space. However, the scheme would include the 2 off-road spaces located to the front of the dwelling. The proposal also includes the addition of a garage. Plans indicate that the garage would accommodate 2 vehicles. However, it is considered this would be unlikely given that the internal size for a standard garage is 3m wide x 6 long m. When considering its narrow opening due to the splayed wall, the likelihood of using this garage for 2 vehicles is considered limited. Additionally, the area of hard standing adjacent to the dwelling would be reduced in size to accommodate the larger garage such that it would no longer accommodate an additional parking space.
- 7.8.3 Overall, the application site (with the proposed extension of residential curtilage) would retain 3 off-road parking spaces, with 2 of these located on the existing driveway and 1 would be within the proposed garage.
- 7.8.4 The extended dwelling is shown to accommodate 4 bedrooms. As a result, having regard to the parking standards as set out within Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD it states that for a 4 or more bedroom dwelling 3 spaces are required. Therefore, the proposed driveway and new garage are sufficient for the dwelling and proposed development thus compliant with the above criteria. In the event of an approval a condition would be attached to ensure that the garage is retained as a garage for the parking/storage of a private vehicle.
- 7.8.5 It is additionally noted that a Highways Officer was consulted during the course of the application who raised no objection to the proposed parking arrangements. However, the Highway's Officer did outline that the proposed new driveway would need to make adequate provision for drainage on site. The submitted plans provide no indication of onsite drainage. In the event of an approval a condition would be imposed to ensure onsite drainage could be achieved.

## 7.9 Refuse/Recycling

- 7.9.1 Policy DM10 (Waste Management) of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) advises that the Council will ensure that there is adequate provision for the storage and recycling of waste and that these facilities are fully integrated into design proposals. New developments will only be supported where:
- i) The siting or design of waste/recycling areas would not result in any adverse impact to residential or work place amenity
  - ii) Waste/recycling areas can be easily accessed (and moved) by occupiers and by local authority/private waste providers
  - iii) There would be no obstruction of pedestrian, cyclists or driver site lines
- 7.9.2 The bin are would be retained on site as existing. Therefore, the bin area would therefore be acceptable in regard to Policy DM10 (Waste Management) of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

## 8 **Recommendation**

- 8.1 That the decision be delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services to consider any representations received and that PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED for the following reason:
- R1: The proposed front element of the first floor side extension by virtue of its siting and relationship with the neighbouring dwelling, No.4 Arundel Road would result in terracing impact. The rear element of the first floor side extension would appear contrived by virtue of its poor design, comprising a splayed wall and flat roof form which integrates poorly with the existing dwelling and would be out of character with

the wider area. The proposed garage would also appear prominent, contrived and out of character with the streetscene. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

## 8.2 **Informatives:**

- 11 The Local Planning Authority has been positive and proactive in considering this planning application in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority encourages applicants to have pre-application discussions as advocated in the NPPF. The applicant and/or their agent did not have formal pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority and the proposed development fails to comply with the requirements of the Development Plan and does not maintain/improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the District.