

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Application No: 191816/FUL

Address: 82 Chichester Road, Tilehurst, Reading

Proposal: Erection of 2 x 3 bed houses and 1 x 2 bed house

Case officer: Ethne Humphreys

Decision date: 07/01/2020; Extension of Time Agreed 08/04/2020

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site relates to land north of Chichester Road, opposite the junction of Aylesham Close. The site used to comprise a bungalow; however, this has recently been demolished. There is a change in site levels and No.84 is set at a higher level than the application site. There is a pathway to the east of the site. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, comprising a mix of traditional and modern housing.

Proposal:

The application as described is for 2 x 3 bed houses and 1 x 2 bed house. It is noted that the existing bungalow has already been demolished.

The proposed materials would include bricks and tiles to reflect adjacent properties.

Plans Considered:

Drawing No: Plan Layout and Elevations 01 F

Received 7th January 2020

Drawing No: Amenity Space Comparisons and Street Scene 02

Drawing No: Topographical Survey S416/0400/P0001

Received 12th November 2019

Design and Access Statement

Received 12th November 2019

Relevant Planning History:

190902/FUL Erection of 2 x 3-bed semi detached dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling (part retrospective). Permitted subject to S106 Legal Agreement

182117/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2 x 3 bed houses and

1 x 2 bed house. Resubmission of 181553. Refused

181553/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2 x 3 bed houses and 1 x 2 bed house. Withdrawn

171907/HOU Proposed 1st floor extension to chalet bungalow to form 2 storey house. Finally Disposed Of (and the bungalow has already been demolished).

171931/FUL Proposed detached 3 bed chalet dwelling to the rear garden of 82 Chichester Road. Pending Consideration

Consultation Responses:

Highways Officer: No objection subject to conditions and informatives.

Ecologist: No objection subject to condition.

Tree Officer: No objection subject to conditions.

Neighbour letters were sent to numbers 60, 62, 81 and 84 Chichester Road and numbers 78 and 80 Norcot Road.

2 letters of neighbour representation received concerned with:

- Possible access from Sanctuary Close
- Parking

Summary of discussions with applicant/agent:

The applicant was advised by email that the proposals were considered to result in overdevelopment of the site.

The applicant confirmed that they wished to receive the decision notice, with a view to appealing any such refusal.

No pre-application advice was sought; however, the agent was advised of the above concerns under application 181553/FUL which was subsequently withdrawn and 182117/FUL which was refused.

Equality Act 2010:

In determining this application the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. However, there is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application. Therefore in terms of the key equalities protected characteristics it is considered there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

Reading Borough Local Plan 2019

CC1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction

CC3: Adaptation to Climate Change

CC5: Waste Minimisation and Storage

CC6: Accessibility and the Intensity of Development

CC7: Design and the Public Realm

CC8: Safeguarding Amenity

CC9: Securing Infrastructure

EM3: Loss of Employment Land

EN9: Provision of Open Space

EN12: Biodiversity and the Green Network

EN14: Trees, Hedges and Woodland

EN15: Air Quality

EN16: Pollution and Water Resources

H1: Provision of Housing

H2: Density and Mix

H3: Affordable Housing

H5: Standards for New Housing

H10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space

H11: Development of Private Residential Gardens

RL1: Network and Hierarchy of Centres

RL3: Vitality and Viability of Smaller Centres

TR1: Achieving the Transport Strategy

TR3: Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters

TR5: Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging

RBC Supplementary Planning Documents

Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD (2011)

Supplementary Planning Document: Affordable Housing (July 2013)

Supplementary Planning Document: S106 Planning Obligations (March 2014)

The main issues are:

- a) Principle
- b) Design, Impact on the Character of the Area and Street Scene
- c) Impact on Neighbour Amenity
- d) Amenity of Future Occupiers
- e) Transport Issues
- f) Natural Environment
- g) Sustainability
- h) Affordable Housing
- i) CIL

Appraisal

Principle

The NPPF states that LPAs should “*encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value*”. The NPPF definition of ‘previously developed land’ excludes private residential gardens.

Therefore, it is clear that the priority for development should be on previously developed land, in particular vacant and derelict sites and buildings. However, that does not mean that the development of private residential garden land is unacceptable in principle, rather that previously developed land should be the first choice for housing development.

The Council’s Local Plan Policy Policy H11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) requires that new residential development that involves land within the curtilage of private residential gardens will be acceptable where:

- 1) It makes a positive contribution to the character of the area;
- 2) The site is of an adequate size to accommodate the development;
- 3) The proposal has a suitable access;
- 4) The proposal would not lead to an unacceptable tandem development;
- 5) The design minimises the exposure of existing private boundaries to public areas;
- 6) It does not cause detrimental impact on residential amenities;
- 7) The emphasis is on the provision of family housing;
- 8) There is no adverse impact on biodiversity, and
- 9) The proposal does not prejudice the development of a wider area.

Therefore, while the proposed site is not 'previously developed land', the principle of redevelopment is considered acceptable providing the criteria outlined in Policy H11 is met and the replacement being appropriate in all other respects (which is detailed further below).

With regard to the principle of the proposed use, from purely a land use perspective, it is considered that a proposal to introduce three residential units would comply with the principles of Policy H1. This is by contributing to the housing needs within the borough.

However, as the remainder of this appraisal shall demonstrate, the proposals fail to meet a number of the Policy H11 criteria, in particular elements 1), 2) and 6).

Design, Impact on the Character of the Area and Street Scene

Policies CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) and H11 (Development of Private and Residential Gardens) both seek to ensure that new development enhances and preserves the local character. Policy H10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space) states that the design of outdoor areas will respect the size and character of other similar spaces in the vicinity.

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF 2019 details that decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

The agent was advised under application 181553 that the three units proposed in place of one, would result in harm to the character of the area and the proposals were considered to

represent an overdevelopment of the plot in this respect. The application was subsequently withdrawn. Subsequent application 182117, which was also for three units, was refused for the following reason:

“The proposed development, due to the number of units relative to proposed plot sizes, uncharacteristically small garden areas and overly dominant parking area, would result in a cramped arrangement of buildings and spaces, representing an overdevelopment of the site. For these reasons the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS7 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015) and Policies DM4, DM10 and DM11 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015).”

The current scheme remains for three units.

The existing site is wide, which allowed for a spacious feel to the plot when the previous (now demolished) bungalow was there. In contrast, the proposals would give rise to a disparity in plot size between the existing and proposed development, with the 3 dwellings occupying near on the entire width of the site at two storey with little relief to the side boundaries. The proposed built form would effectively fill the site to its margins such that it would appear cramped and overdeveloped. This would result in a considerably constrained form of development.

The proposals considered under 182117, were, due to the detailed design, increased height and massing, considered to be notably asymmetrical, appearing very prominent within the Chichester Road streetscene especially when view alongside the bungalow of No.84. This harm considered to be accentuated by the angled site boundary and elevated position relative to the road and neighbouring properties and result in a visually harmful form of development.

Whilst acknowledging that the proposed dwellings would not be quite so asymmetrical as previous, the proposed design includes for the right hand end house to be set forward from the other two, and to include rooflights on the forward projection, as well as a small window on the side elevation of the forward projection. As discussed below, this is due to neighbour privacy. However, it does result in a contrived design and its need is symptomatic of the overdeveloped nature of the site. In addition, there is no logic to this stagger in the context of the immediate area. It does not reflect the existing surrounding terraces, which either

have the same front building line (e.g. 86-92) or have a stagger across all of the houses (e.g. 80-76).

It is considered that the cramped character identified above would be worsened by the proposed parking arrangement and other hard surfacing at the front of the site, which would result in a vehicle-dominated frontage which would worsen the overdeveloped character with a stark and unattractive highly prominent frontage.

As above, the NPPF acknowledges that planning decisions should not attempt to stifle innovation, originality or initiative; but it too seeks to reinforce local distinctiveness and to integrate new development into the natural, built and historic environment. In this instance, the resultant building would be in stark contrast to the existing character, with the combination of the scale, plot coverage and detailed design resulting in a cramped, uncharacteristic and overdeveloped appearance.

As such, the proposals would be contrary to Policies H10, H11 and CS7 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

Impact on Neighbour Amenity

Residential amenity is assessed against Policy CC8 which requires developments to not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing properties in terms of: Privacy and overlooking; Access to sunlight and daylight; Visual dominance and overbearing; Harm to outlook; Noise and disturbance; Artificial lighting; Vibration; Dust and fumes; Smell; and Crime and safety.

No. 84 is a bungalow, which due to the change in site levels, sits at a higher level than the application site. A first floor side window is proposed in the flank elevation facing No.84. As this would serve a bathroom it could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and maintained in that way so as to prevent any material loss of privacy.

The proposals would not project past the rear of No.84 but would project forward of the front elevation. No.84 features a dormer window on the flank elevation, the only source of light/outlook to a bedroom. Application 182117 was refused as it was considered that the proposed dwelling as annotated on the plans as 82c would be overbearing to the occupiers of this property due to the height and mass of the building and its proximity to the common

boundary in combination with its siting. Application 190902 sited the building away from the common boundary to help reduce/minimise the impact.

Whilst the current plans show the proposal in a similar position to that refused under application 182117, the applicant has submitted a sectional elevation drawing showing that the proposal would not breach a 25 degree line from the bedroom window of No.84. Whilst the proposal is still considered to be somewhat overbearing, given the sectional drawing (which was not provided under application 182117), combined with the 1m ground level in variation between properties, on balance this is considered to be acceptable and the previous reason for refusal overcome.

In relation to No.80 Chichester Road, to the south east of the site, the proposals would clearly be visible and have some impact on the rear amenity space of this property. However, given the distance to No.80 itself, the intervening passageway and that the proposals would be located adjacent the rearmost part of the garden of No.82, they are not considered to result in such material loss of light or overbearing impact to warrant a refusal on this basis.

Two windows are proposed on the flank elevation facing across the rear garden of No.80, one at ground floor serving the kitchen and one at first floor serving the bathroom. Two rooflights are also proposed on the front elevation (proposed unit 82a) facing, albeit at an angle given their nature, towards the rear of No.80. It is recognised that the bathroom window could be conditioned to be obscurely glazed, so as to present any material loss of privacy. However, due to the number, position and distance of windows - those on the flank elevation much closer to the boundary than previously in the bungalow - combined with the change in site levels and further heightened by the increase scale of the building, they would result in a strong perception of overlooking to the rear elevation of No.80 and its private garden area. It is considered that the need for rooflights to serve the front bedroom of proposed unit 82a is considered indicative of the perceived level of overlooking in this respect.

To the rear of the site, there is an application pending consideration for a detached bungalow with rooms in the roof space, application reference 171931. Should permission be granted and the scheme built, given the distance between the schemes, the proposals would not result in any material loss of light or overbearing impact. No first floor windows are proposed on the flank elevation of the detached bungalow, so again, should it be built, there would be no material loss of privacy to the bungalow itself. Whilst the proposed first floor windows to No.82c would face towards the proposed rear garden of the bungalow, given the distance of

approximately 20m, this is considered sufficient so as not to result in any significant material loss of privacy and no conflict is identified with Policy CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

Amenity of Future Occupiers

Policy H5 (Standards for New Housing) seeks that all new building housing is built to high standards. Policy EN16 (Pollution and Water Resources) seeks to protect future occupiers from the impacts of pollution and Policy H10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space) seeks that residential developments area provided with adequate private or communal outdoor amenity space.

The proposed front bedroom of proposed unit 82c (as annotated on the plans) would be served by one small window on the side of the forward projection and two rooflights (due to overlooking issues of No.80 as discussed above). Not only is the need for such window arrangements considered indicative of the overdeveloped nature of the site, it is considered a contrived arrangement resulting in poor outlook for future occupiers of this family-sized dwelling, contrary to Policy CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

It is considered that the remainder of the proposals would provide adequate room sizes with suitable outlook, natural lighting and ventilation. Further to revised plans, the proposals would comply with the room sizes as stated in Policy H5.

Linked to the above concerns about overdevelopment of the site, the increase from 1 single storey dwelling to 3 two storey dwellings would be such that the remaining amenity space would be insufficient and out of keeping with the size of amenity spaces to the majority of two storey dwellings in the locality, which predominantly feature deeper gardens.

Application/permission 190902, for a reduced scheme of 2 units, acknowledged that whilst the depth of the gardens would remain the same as under the refused application 182117 for 3 units, the reduction in the number of units proposed would allow for greater width of garden to each property. Reverting to 3 units, it is considered that the amenity space afforded to the dwellings is indicative of the proposed overdeveloped nature of the plot. As highlighted above, the subdivision of the plot to accommodate the 3 units would, due to the scale of the dwellings in relation to the plot sizes, result in uncharacteristically small rear gardens when compared to the prevailing gardens in the locality. The smaller gardens, in particular for '82a' are considered to provide inadequate private garden amenity space to

the proposed family units to the detriment of the future occupiers of the dwellings, contrary to Policy H10 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

Transport Issues

The site is located within Zone 3, Secondary Core Area, of the Council's adopted Parking Standards and Design SPD. Typically these areas are within 400m of a Reading Buses high frequency 'Premier Route', which provides high quality bus routes to and from Reading town centre and other local centre facilities.

In accordance with the adopted Parking Standards and Design SPD the proposed development would be required to provide off road parking of 2.0 parking spaces for each of the 3 bedroom dwellings, and 1.5 spaces for the 2 bed dwelling. This equates to a provision of 6 spaces in total. Following on from Transport comments made for application 181553, the proposed car parking layout has been revised and a 6m forecourt depth to the rear of the vehicles has now been provided and is deemed acceptable.

As advised in previous comments, the plans indicate that the existing access from Chichester Road is to be widened to 4.1m to accommodate the additional movements created by the proposed dwellings and section of the existing driveway stopped up and realigned with the footway. This is therefore deemed acceptable. The applicant should be aware that a license will be required from the Highways department to undertake and adjustments to the public highway this includes reinstatement of the footway.

As previously advised, cycle storage is to be provided in the rear gardens and is acceptable.

Refuse store has been proposed to the site frontage and is acceptable.

Policy TR5 requires each new house to be provided with an electric charging point. Whilst this has not been shown on the proposed plans, it is considered that should the application have otherwise been considered acceptable, that this could be dealt with by way of a suitably worded condition.

From a transport perspective, there is no objection subject to conditions and informatives.

Natural Environment

There are no significant trees on or adjacent to 82 Chichester Road. There is scope for additional planting and soft landscaping which, should the application otherwise have been considered acceptable, the Council's Tree Officer considers that this could be dealt with by way of suitably worded conditions. No objection.

Sustainability

The Design and Access Statement highlights that the proposed scheme has been designed to accommodate air source heat pumps and/or solar thermal panels where appropriate.

Notwithstanding the above, Policy H5 'Housing Standards' requires that all new build housing integrate additional measures for sustainability. In light of this, and should the application have otherwise been recommended for approval, then conditions would have been recommended to ensure the development meets the following requirements:

- Higher water efficiency standards of 110 litres per person per day; and
- A 19% improvement over building regulations energy requirements

Although part of a planning condition, these requirements would have been administered through the Building Regulations. It should be noted that given the cramped nature of the development, the siting of ASHPs may be difficult to accommodate.

Affordable Housing

A contribution towards affordable housing is required in accordance with Policy H3 of the RBLP. The applicant stated they agree in principle to enter into a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution. However, no valuations have been submitted and this would have been required had the proposal been acceptable. As the proposal is not considered acceptable in other planning terms, the Council has not pursued the S106 legal agreement to secure the financial affordable housing provision.

The applicant, whilst stating agreement in principle to such a contribution, stated that this was subject to a written request on the Written Ministerial Statement in relation to S106 payments for 4 units or less and the successful appeal against payment that was granted on appeal for the rear of 52 Norcot Road.

The applicant has not offered any financial appraisal of the proposal to suggest that the contribution sought by the Council would make the scheme unviable, but instead simply refers to the Court of Appeal judgment of 11 May 2016 in respect of a challenge to the Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014 (WMS). Policy H3 is clear that only in instance where it can be demonstrated through viability evidence that the provision would be unviable will the Council forgo or seek a lower contribution. As stated, no viability appraisal has been submitted with the application and it is not considered that the evidence submitted demonstrates that the development is completely unviable without the submission of a suitable contribution towards affordable housing.

The Council's affordable housing policies are central in seeking to assist the Council in meeting the requirements of the NPPF which state that: *"local planning authorities should...use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework,...."*

The provision of affordable housing is a major issue in the borough. The borough continues to experience high levels of need as evidenced by a recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment and other indicators, its residents face major issues relating to affordability as a result of high and increasing house prices compared to average local incomes and significant issues in the future supply of affordable housing to meet identified needs.

Recent appeal decisions in the Reading Borough found in favour of the Council's approach, whereby the Planning Inspector has agreed with the Council's position that the 'local circumstances in Reading justify the need for small sites to make contributions to affordable housing as an exception to national policy'. These include:

- Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/W/16/3162427 171 Blagdon Road, Reading
- Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/W/16/3153661 17 St Barnabas Road, Reading
- Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/W/16/3159962 8 Thornton Road, Reading
- Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/W/16/3154971 51 Cressingham Road, Reading

In the Appeal decision dated 2nd December 2016 (Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/W/16/3153661, 17 St Barnabas Road, Emmer Green RG4 8RA), the Inspector concluded that:

“In light of this, while the case in hand would be an exception to national policy, I consider there to be local circumstances that indicate the proposal should be determined in line with the development plan. A means of securing a contribution towards affordable housing would therefore, in my judgement, be justifiably sought in this instance. As the proposal fails to make an adequate provision for affordable housing, the development would also run contrary to Policy DM6 of the SDPD and the SPD.”

In the Appeal decision dated 13th March 2017 (Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/W/16/316427 171 Blagdon Road, Reading, RG2 7NE) the Inspector concluded that:

‘...given the circumstances of this proposal and the acute and substantial need for affordable housing in the Borough, and the significance of small sites in achieving the aim of SDPD Policy DM6, outweigh the development plan. Accordingly, the need for the contribution sought by the Council arises from the proposal and satisfies the tests in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 and paragraph 204 of the Framework... My findings above are consistent with the most recent decisions by Inspectors in like cases, in which light the determination of this case in a like manner is a material consideration to which I attach substantial weight. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed development should provide a financial contribution to affordable housing, the absence of which would place the proposal in conflict with SDPD Policy DM6 and the SPD.’

Both Inspectors considered that whilst the WMS carries considerable weight, it was not considered to outweigh the development plan given the acute and substantial need for affordable housing in the Borough and the importance of delivery through small sites towards this. The extent of the Council’s evidence was found to be compelling and the Council’s approach with regards to Policy DM6 (now H3 since the adoption of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019) to be consistent with paragraphs 47 and 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which require local planning authorities to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing.

On this basis and in the absence of a financial contribution, the proposed development would not therefore make adequate provision for the delivery of affordable housing, failing to comply with H3 (Affordable Housing) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2013). It would also conflict with paragraphs 47 and 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 which seek, amongst other things, to secure the delivery of affordable housing.

In respect of the aforementioned 52 Norcot Road application reference 151144, it is stated that this was a successful appeal against payment of an affordable housing contribution. This is incorrect. The application was refused solely due to the absence of a S106 legal agreement to secure a contribution towards affordable housing. During the course of the appeal a Unilateral Undertaking for the provision of affordable housing was submitted and secured. The Inspector for the appeal concluded that there was substantial evidence from the LPA to demonstrate an acute housing need for affordable housing in the Borough and that the appellant had not demonstrated that the application of Policy DM6 (now H3) had frustrated small scale development proposals coming forward. Furthermore, the appellant's action in submitted a UU for the agreed contribution supported his view. Given this, the Inspector the Inspector considered that the UU satisfied the requirements of Policy DM6 (now H3) and allowed the appeal.

Given the above, this clearly does not support the applicant's argument, in fact, the opposite, and it is not considered that there is any validity in the applicant's argument, and that the Council's evidence and justification for the requirement for affordable housing which contributed to the other appeal decisions referred to earlier in this report does outweigh national policy and the Written Ministerial Statement in this instance. There is clear conflict with Policy H3 and the SPD.

It is noted that an affordable housing contribution was agreed under application 190902 and secured by S106 Legal Agreement as appropriate.

An informative will specify that this reason for refusal could be overcome, in the context of an acceptable scheme in all other respects, by entering into a s106 or unilateral undertaking.

CIL

The proposal would be a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liable development. The applicant has provided the CIL Additional Information Form. If the scheme had been acceptable an informative would have been attached to the decision notice to advise the applicant of their responsibilities in this respect.

Conclusion

The proposal is unacceptable in terms of its impact on the character of the area, unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity, and because of the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure financial contributions towards affordable housing in the Borough. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy and is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE

The proposed development, due to its detailed design, combined with the number of units relative to proposed plot sizes, uncharacteristically small garden areas and overly dominant parking area, would result in a cramped arrangement of buildings and spaces, representing an overdevelopment of the site. For these reasons the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CC7 (Design and the Public Realm), H10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space) and H11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

The proposed front bedroom window arrangements of the proposed dwelling 82c would form a contrived arrangement resulting in poor outlook for future occupiers. This would be contrary to Policy CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

The proposed window arrangements of proposed dwelling No.82a combined with the significant increase in massing and close proximity to the boundary would result in a strong perception of overlooking of No.80 Chichester Road and its private garden area. This would be harmful to the amenity of occupiers of this property, contrary to Policies CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) and H11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

Due to the depth of the plots proposed, the proposed development would provide inadequate outdoor amenity space to serve future occupiers in terms of its amount and nor would it reflect the size or character of private residential gardens in the surrounding area contrary to Policy H10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure an acceptable contribution towards the provision of Affordable Housing, the proposal fails to contribute adequately to the housing needs of Reading Borough, contrary to Policy H3 (Affordable Housing) of the Reading

Borough Local Plan 2019 and the Council's Adopted Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2013.

Informatives

The decision relates to the following drawings and documents:

Drawing No: Plan Layout and Elevations 01 F

Received 7th January 2020

Drawing No: Amenity Space Comparisons and Street Scene 02

Drawing No: Topographical Survey S416/0400/P0001

Received 12th November 2019

Design and Access Statement

Received 12th November 2019

The local planning authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way by clearly setting out concerns relating to the proposal and providing an opportunity for the applicant to withdraw the application. However, the applicant chose not to withdraw the application, hence the issuing of this refusal notice within the statutory time period to determine the application by.

The applicant is advised that the refused scheme, had it been able to be approved, would have been a CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) liable development.

Without prejudice to any future application or appeal, the applicant is advised that reason for refusal 5 (affordable housing) could be overcome by entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement or unilateral undertaking for a scheme that was in all other respects acceptable.