

3/15/1011/FUL – Erection of 2no 2 bedroomed dwellings and 5no 4 bedroomed dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping at Land at Walnut Close, Much Hadham, SG10 6AJ for Marden Homes

Date of Receipt: 01.06.2015

Type: Full – Minor

Parish: MUCH HADHAM

Ward: MUCH HADHAM

RECOMMENDATION:

That, subject to the applicant or successor in title entering into a Legal Agreement pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to cover the following matters:

1. The promotion and implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to restrict waiting at any time on Tower Hill at the junction with Kettle Green Lane;
2. The provision of 25% (2 units) as affordable housing;
3. The provision of 15% (1 unit) as Lifetime Homes;

The Director of Neighbourhood Services be authorised to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Three year time limit (1T12)
2. Approved Plans (2E10)
3. Samples of materials (2E12)
4. Programme of archaeological work (2E02)
5. Levels (2E05)
6. The proposed window openings in the first floor east elevation of Plot 3 (bathroom); the first floor east and west windows of Plot 4 (bathrooms), and the first floor west flank window of Plot 6 (bedroom) shall be fitted with obscured glazing and shall be permanently retained in that condition.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of the adjoining property, in accordance with policies ENV1 and ENV5 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007.

3/15/1011/FUL

7. Boundary walls and fences (2E07)
8. Lighting details (2E27)
9. Contaminated land survey and remediation (2E33)
10. Prior to the commencement of development, a schedule for the repair and future maintenance of the Grade I listed wall to the east of the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the repair works shall be carried out prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To protect the significance of this heritage asset in accordance with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. Tree/hedge retention and protection (4P05)
12. The following ecological reports shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the stated timescales, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved mitigation measures:
 - a) Prior to the commencement of development, a Reptile Mitigation Strategy including measures to be undertaken in the event that reptiles are found during construction, and the provision of a hibernacula;
 - b) Prior to site clearance, a Method Statement outlining measures to prevent and control the spread of invasive species such as Rhododendron;
 - c) Within 6 months prior to the commencement of development, a Badger Report setting out the results of an updated Badger walkover and any necessary mitigation measures.

Reason: In the interests of protected species in accordance with policy ENV16 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007.

13. Landscape design proposals (4P12 e, l, j, k, l)
14. Landscape works implementation (4P13)
15. Notwithstanding the details shown on drawing 14018-04 D, and prior to the first occupation of any part of the development, the first 4.5 metres of Walnut Close shall be surfaced with bituminous material to match the existing on Kettle Green Lane to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

3/15/1011/FUL

Reason: To ensure that a suitable access is provided in the interests of highway safety.

16. Prior to the commencement of development, Walnut Close shall be widened to a minimum of 4.1 metres where possible, in accordance with approved drawing 14018-04 D.

Reason: To allow for the safe passing of vehicles in the interests of highway safety.

17. Prior to the commencement of development, a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter be implemented in accordance with those details. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall identify details of:

- a) a timetable for development of the site, including any highway works;
- b) methods for accessing the site, including construction vehicle numbers and routing;
- c) location and details of wheel washing facilities;
- d) associated parking and storage areas for construction vehicles clear of the public highway.

Reason: To ensure that the satisfactory management of construction traffic in the interests of highway safety.

18. Construction Hours of Working (6N07)

Informatives:

1. Other legislation (01OL)
2. Street Naming and Numbering (19SN)
3. Highway works (05FC)
4. The applicant is advised that the Fire Station Ditch main river runs in a culvert along the north and east of the site. Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Thames Land Drainage Byelaws 1981, prior consent is required from the Environment Agency for any proposed works or structure in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the river bank.

3/15/1011/FUL

5. The development is located in an area of serious water stress due to limited water resources in the local area and growing demand for water. The applicant is recommended to investigate the use of water efficiency measures to achieve 105 litres/head/day within the development. Further advice can be sought from www.environment-agency.gov.uk/savewater.
6. The applicant is made aware that there is a culverted watercourse to the northern boundary of the site and the Lead Local Flood Authority should be contacted for advice on consent for any works within 5 metres of this culvert.
7. Unsuspected Contamination (33UC)

Summary of Reasons for Decision

East Herts Council has considered the applicant's proposal in a positive and proactive manner with regard to the policies of the Development Plan (Minerals Local Plan, Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD 2012 and the 'saved' policies of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007); the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies is that permission should be granted.

_____(101115FUL.HI)

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The application site is shown on the attached OS extract and comprises an undeveloped and currently overgrown site. To the east is Tower Hill with a Grade I listed wall forming the boundary, to the west lies Walnut Close with detached dwellings facing the development site. To the south is the Grade II* listed Yew Tree House and neighbouring properties, and to the north is the fire station. There are a number of trees across the site, particularly on the eastern part of the site which was previously part of the garden of Yew Tree House. Land levels fall to the east, and the site sits approximately 1m higher than Tower Hill.
- 1.2 This application proposes a new development of 7 dwellings, comprising 2 no. 2 bed single storey semi-detached affordable dwellings, and 5 no. 4 bed two storey detached market dwellings with access from Walnut Close – a private single track drive that joins Kettle Green Lane.

3/15/1011/FUL

- 1.3 The site lies in the built-up part of Much Hadham and within the Much Hadham Conservation Area. This application is the result of pre-application discussions with Officers.

2.0 Site History

- 2.1 Planning permission was refused, and an appeal dismissed, for 8 dwellings on the western part of the site in 1991 (reference 3/89/2251/OP). The reasons for refusal related to poor visibility at the highway junctions, loss of an open and undeveloped part of the village to the detriment of the Landscape Conservation Area, inappropriate development in the rural area, and harm to the Conservation Area. The appeal was dismissed on the grounds that the development would dominate views from the High Street and alter the feeling of spaciousness to the west of the road to the detriment of the character and appearance of this part of the village, as well as the lack of visibility giving rise to increased traffic hazards, and that improvement works might be damaging to the appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 2.2 There is no other relevant planning history related to the site.

3.0 Consultation Responses

- 3.1 The Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to conditions. They comment that the application is acceptable in a highways context. The highway boundary stops at a point 4.5m into Walnut Close so they recommend a condition to require tarmac surfacing for that land to ensure there is a suitable surface to the main road junction. They concur with the submitted Transport Statement that there will not be a significant impact on the highway network, and request that the developer promotes and implements a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to restrict waiting at any time on Tower Hill at the junction of Kettle Green Lane. They consider that appropriate visibility splays can be achieved and a suitable level of parking and turning space, and road widening, is included in the proposal.

- 3.2 The Conservation Officer comments that the principle is considered acceptable in massing, layout and design. They recommend that the road surfacing materials are high quality, and advise that boundary treatments are also important in this case. The fence that has been erected along the boundary with Yew Tree House is wholly inappropriate. They raise concern over dividing ownership of the boundary with the Grade I listed wall to the east. They recommend a covenant to ensure future responsibility and maintenance of this wall. The developer should also carry out repair work to the wall in

3/15/1011/FUL

accordance with a schedule of work to be submitted.

3.3 Thames Water raises no objection.

3.4 The Landscape Officer recommends approval subject to conditions. He comments that the site layout and indicative landscape proposals are acceptable, although he does raise concerns over the potential visual impact along the western side of Tower Hill and suggests that the ridge heights of Plots 5 and 6 should be no higher than the existing properties on the opposite side of the road. The existing hedge along the top of the retaining wall on Tower Hill should be retained or a new one planted in order to give a reasonable boundary treatment and screen to the proposed development.

3.5 The Historic Environment Unit comment that the proposal is likely to impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest. A condition to secure a programme of archaeological work is therefore recommended.

3.6 The Environment Agency raises no objection but comment that their prior consent is required for works within 8m of the top of the Fire Station Ditch to the north and east, and the developer should investigate the use of water efficiency measures.

3.7 Environmental Health raises no objection subject to conditions.

3.8 The Council's Housing Team have agreed the affordable housing mix of 1 rental unit and 1 shared ownership with the developer.

3.9 Herts Ecology comment that they do not hold any records of protected species on site but suggest conditions for a reptile mitigation strategy, control of rhododendron, and a badger walkover.

4.0 Parish Council Representations

4.1 Much Hadham Parish Council object to the proposals for the following reasons:

- Inappropriate development in the Conservation Area, detrimental to the street scene and will not enhance or improve the Conservation Area;
- The height, scale and number of dwellings represents an over-intensive development of the site;

3/15/1011/FUL

- The site is in the curtilage of a Grade II* listed building, the garden is in the curtilage of the listing, and is bounded by a Grade I listed wall.
- Additional traffic will be generated at the Kettle Green Lane/High Street junction, which will seriously conflict with existing traffic movements.

5.0 Other Representations

5.1 The application has been advertised by way of press notice, site notice and neighbour notification.

5.2 10 no. letters of representation have been received which can be summarised as follows:

- Traffic safety concerns due to hazardous access and limited visibility. A previous appeal was dismissed for this reason and traffic has increased since then;
- Walnut Close is a narrow private road and cannot be widened;
- Concern over pedestrian safety as no footpath is provided to Tower Hill;
- Concern over proximity of Plots 1 and 2 to Orchard Lodge and difficulties with access and reversing out. These plots should be accessed from the development not direct from Walnut Close;
- Parking and traffic movements have been underestimated in the Transport Statement;
- Harm to the setting of Yew Tree House (Grade II* listed) due to loss of the garden and views from the High Street;
- Concern over protection of the ancient Grade I listed wall that runs along the eastern boundary;
- Loss of trees and wildlife;
- Overdevelopment – 7 houses is excessive and would double the existing number of houses;
- Existing residents are responsible for maintaining Walnut Close;
- Harm to the character and appearance of the area – the special character of Walnut Close must be maintained;
- A previous Inspector concluded that 8 houses would obstruct the open prospect of the undeveloped western frontage of the High Street, and would alter the feeling of spaciousness.

6.0 Policy

6.1 The relevant saved Local Plan policies in this application include the following:

HSG3	Affordable Housing
HSG4	Affordable Housing Criteria
HSG6	Lifetime Homes
HSG7	Replacement Dwellings and Infill Housing Development
ENV1	Design and Environmental Quality
ENV2	Landscaping
ENV11	Protection of Existing Hedgerows and Trees
ENV16	Protected Species
TR2	Access to New Developments
TR7	Car Parking – Standards
BH1	Archaeology and New Development
BH2	Archaeological Evaluations and Assessments
BH3	Archaeological Conditions and Agreements
BH6	New Developments in Conservation Areas

6.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) are also material considerations in determining this application.

7.0 Considerations

Principle of Development

7.1 The site lies in the built-up part of Much Hadham, a Category 1 Village, wherein there is no objection in principle to limited small-scale and infill housing developments subject to the criteria set out in policy OSV1. Limited small-scale housing is defined as up to 15 houses and therefore this proposal for 7 units is policy compliant. Much Hadham has a range of services and facilities, and given the location of this site in relation to the village, I consider it to represent a sustainable form of development. The presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF therefore applies.

7.2 Policy OSV1 requires housing development to include affordable housing provision in accordance with policy HSG3, to ensure that proposals would not be significantly detrimental to amenity, that the site does not represent a significant open space or gap important to the form or setting of the village, that the proposal does not block important views or detract from the appearance of the village, and that the proposal is sensitively designed and satisfactorily integrated into the village. These issues are discussed in the relevant sections below.

Scale and Design

3/15/1011/FUL

- 7.3 The scheme has been designed with the 5 detached market dwellings fronting onto a shared access drive, with the 2 affordable units fronting onto Walnut Close. The detached market dwellings are all two storeys in height with a mix of gable pitched and hipped roofs with some dormer windows and detached garages. The market dwellings are large properties and range from 8.2m to 8.8m in height. The design is considered to be of a high quality with bay windows, brick detailing, chimney stacks, profiled timber barge boards, stone lintels, timber fenestration, and modest sized dormer windows. A mix of materials including brick, timber frame with render panels, and plain clay tiles are proposed. Full details would be secured by condition to ensure a high quality development in the Conservation Area.
- 7.4 Overall, Officers consider that, although the buildings are large, the massing has been suitably broken up by the roof design, and the high quality use of materials and detailing would ensure that no harm arises to the character of the surrounding area.
- 7.5 The buildings are proposed on spacious plots which ensures that the site does not appear overdeveloped, and respects the pattern of development in the surrounding area. Adequate frontage landscaping is proposed, and although some trees will be removed, additional tree planting is proposed across the site and could be secured by condition.
- 7.6 The buildings are appropriately set back from the eastern boundary and will therefore respect the building line in Tower Hill. Views from the surrounding area will be further restricted by the difference in land levels, and vegetation screening along the eastern boundary.
- 7.7 In a previous appeal decision for 8 dwellings on the site (see history above), the Inspector stated that the development would not intrude into the countryside and would “not be widely seen because of the rising land and woodland to the north and existing development to the south.” Views from the Conservation Area are discussed in more detail below.

Impact on Heritage Assets

- 7.8 The development will be located to the rear of the Grade II* listed Yew Tree House and adjacent to the Grade I listed wall that runs along the eastern boundary. There are a number of other Grade II listed buildings to the south and east of the site. Adequate distances are retained to these heritage assets and Officers consider the overall scale and high quality design to respect this important setting. No objection has been raised by the Conservation Officer in respect of listed buildings and the Conservation Area. He has raised concerns over the future repair and

3/15/1011/FUL

maintenance of the Grade I listed wall and suggested a covenant to secure this. The applicant has confirmed that ownership of the wall would fall to the future owners of Plots 5 and 6 which sit adjacent to the wall, and they would take on responsibility for its future maintenance. It is not for the planning process to apply covenants; however it is recommended that the repair and future maintenance of this wall be secured through a planning condition. Officers do not consider that the sub-division of ownership to three separate owners would compromise the future of this Grade I listed heritage asset as, of course, the local planning authority has control over works to the listed wall in any event.

7.9 A number of concerns have also been raised over the loss of part of the rear garden of the Grade II* listed Yew Tree House, which has already been subdivided. The Conservation Officer raises no objection in terms of this setting and Officers are satisfied that sufficient space will remain to the rear of Yew Tree House to preserve its setting. No harm would therefore arise to the significance of this heritage asset.

7.10 A new boundary fence with hedging is proposed to form the boundary with Yew Tree House. A close boarded fence has been erected without planning permission, abutting the Grade I listed wall, and was considered by Officers to be harmful. Officers have discussed alternative options with the developer, and a 1.8m high willow hurdle panel fence is now proposed with beech hedging adjacent. An area of holly planting is proposed in between the end of the fence and the Grade I listed wall to address issues over the proximity of the fence to the wall. Officers consider this to be an acceptable solution and full details of boundary screening can be secured by condition.

7.11 In terms of the Conservation Area, the site will be largely screened from Tower Hill due to the difference in land levels (the site is approximately 1m higher than the road), the set-back of the buildings, and the presence of the Grade I listed wall with mature hedging that will be retained and protected. In dismissing the previous appeal in 1991, the Inspector stated that

“one of the notable features of this part of the High Street is its largely undeveloped western frontage contrasting with the closely built up frontage opposite and with the built up nature of the street and the village to the north and south. The proposed development would turn its back upon and present a wall of buildings to High Street and obstruct the open prospect.”

7.12 He went on to state that the development *would “alter the feeling of spaciousness west of the road”*, and *“would be damaging to the*

3/15/1011/FUL

character and appearance of this part of the village and would not assist in its preservation.” In comparing the previous scheme with that currently proposed, Officers note that the proposed development would now sit even closer to Tower Hill than that previously dismissed, but has not been designed to ‘turn its back’ to the road. The proposed development will sit ‘side on’ to Tower Hill and has been designed as a much more spacious development than the previous 8 dwellings that were proposed on a smaller plot. Vegetation has also matured significantly since the previous appeal 24 years ago and will be maintained and protected by condition.

- 7.13 Officers have also had regard to the Much Hadham Conservation Area Appraisal which does not identify the site as an important area of open space for the village, and other than identifying a few trees along the eastern boundary as important, makes no other observations on the site.
- 7.14 The concerns raised by the Landscape Officer in respect of the heights of Plots 5 and 6 are noted. A section drawing has been submitted which shows the relationship of the proposed development to existing buildings on Tower Hill, and shows that Plots 5 and 6 will have ridge lines approximately 1m higher than the existing buildings on the east side of Tower Hill. Given the gap of some 18m separating these buildings Officers do not consider this additional height to result in a significant or harmful visual impact.
- 7.15 Therefore although Officers acknowledge that there will be some visual impact through developing the site, which currently remains open and spacious, it is your Officers’ opinion that the proposed development has been designed to respect this openness and would not appear unduly prominent or harmful in views from the High Street. The Conservation Officer has not raised an objection in this respect and Officers are therefore satisfied that no harm would arise to the setting or significance of the Much Hadham Conservation Area as a heritage asset, in accordance with policy BH6 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.
- 7.16 The site also lies in an Area of Archaeological Significance and an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment has been submitted. The Historic Environment Unit has requested a condition to secure a programme of archaeological work which is considered to be reasonable and necessary in accordance with policies BH1, BH2 and BH3 of the adopted Local Plan.

Neighbour Amenity

- 7.17 The main impact arises to existing dwellings in Walnut Close that front onto the development site. Woodside and White Oaks will experience some impact on their outlook due to the siting of Plot 3. However, given that a distance of approximately 20m would be retained, that Plot 3 is designed with only a lower hipped roof facing the dwellings, and that land levels fall away slightly, I do not consider this impact to be harmful. The garage for Plot 3 would be sited on the boundary at a distance of only 15m but would be single storey with the roof pitching away, and would therefore not be harmful to outlook. No first floor flank windows are proposed to Plot 3 so not overlooking would occur.
- 7.18 Orchard Lodge will also experience some impact on outlook as it will face across to Plots 1 and 2 at a distance of only 12m, but given that these units are single storey, Officers do not consider this impact to be harmful. The loss of a view is not a material planning consideration.
- 7.19 No harm would arise to any other neighbouring properties due to the distances retained, and Officers are satisfied that satisfactory relationships are proposed within the development to prevent any harmful loss of light, outlook or overlooking. A condition is recommended to secure obscure glazing for the following windows to prevent harmful overlooking:
- Plot 3 first floor east elevation bathroom window;
 - Plot 4 first floor east and west bathroom windows;
 - Plot 6 first floor west flank bedroom window.

Parking, Access and Highway Network

- 7.20 It is proposed to make use of Walnut Close to access the site, which is a gravelled narrow private unadopted drive that currently serves 8 dwellings. The road will be widened to 4.1m along its length, apart from a small pinch point, and re-surfaced in a suitable and durable material. There is sufficient space to achieve this widening within the applicant's ownership, and a condition is recommended to secure this.
- 7.21 A number of concerns have been raised over increased vehicular movements arising from the development, and safety concerns at the road junctions. In terms of movements, the application is accompanied by a Transport Statement (TS) which estimates that there would be 4 vehicular trips in the morning peak and 5 in the evening peak. The Highway Authority agree with this assessment and Officers are satisfied that the additional movements associated with this development would

3/15/1011/FUL

not be significant. It is acknowledged that the number of houses accessed by Walnut Close would almost double but, given the improvements proposed to the width and surface of the private drive, Officers do not consider this to be harmful. Any maintenance issues for Walnut Close associated with this development would be a civil matter for the residents and landowner.

- 7.22 In terms of safety, the TS identifies restricted visibility at the junction of Kettle Green Lane and Tower Hill due to the Grade I listed wall to the north. It is also noted that was identified as a reason to dismiss the previous appeal. The Inspector stated that the development would *“be likely to give rise to increased traffic hazards and further development in Walnut Close should be limited so as not to occasion the need for improvement works which might be damaging to the appearance of the Conservation Area.”*
- 7.23 However, the junction has been assessed in relation to current standards and no objection has been raised by the Highway Authority in respect of safety. They have, however, requested that the developer promotes and implements a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to restrict on-street car parking opposite the Kettle Green Lane/Tower Hill junction, and this would need to be secured through a Section 106 legal agreement. This will improve safety as southbound vehicles would be able to remain on the southbound side of the carriageway. There is adequate visibility to the south for vehicles heading northbound.
- 7.24 Local residents have referred to accidents, but there are no accident records for the last 5 years within the vicinity of the site. On the basis of the above, Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposal will not result in harm to highway safety, and the restriction of parking on the opposite side of Tower Hill will not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 7.25 In terms of parking provision, adequate provision is provided on site and Officers consider neighbouring concerns over a lack of parking to be unfounded. The garages are a generous size to allow for parking as well as storage, and ample frontage parking is proposed for each unit. 2 additional visitor spaces are proposed to the north of Plot 2 and Officers are satisfied that there would be no overspill onto the private Walnut Close. Adequate space is also provided for the turning of large vehicles which will assist with refuse collections as the vehicle currently has to reverse down Walnut Close.

3/15/1011/FUL

Affordable Housing

- 7.26 Given that the site lies within a Category 1 village and the site area falls just under 0.5 hectares, Policy HSG3 requires a 25% provision of affordable housing. The proposal includes 2 no. single storey 2 bed semi-detached units as affordable housing, which represents 29%, which is therefore acceptable in accordance with this policy. The developer has discussed the proposal with the Council's Housing Team and has agreed the provision of 1 social rented unit and 1 shared ownership unit. This should be secured through a Section 106 Legal Agreement.
- 7.27 15% lifetime homes is also required in accordance with policy HSG6 and equates to 1 unit. This should also be secured by legal agreement.

Trees

- 7.28 There are 37 individual trees, 5 groups of trees and 2 hedges existing on site so a full Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted. This report identifies that the development will result in the loss of 9 trees of low amenity value, and 5 trees of moderate value. The remaining trees will be retained, and adequate spacing is proposed to ensure their future retention. Some ground protection measures are recommended and would need to be secured by condition.
- 7.29 Overall, Officers are satisfied that the trees to be removed are not of significant amenity value, and the development will ensure retention of the more significant trees and will represent a high quality and well landscaped scheme. No objection has been raised by the Landscape Officer. Ample soft landscaping and green frontages are proposed in accordance with policy ENV2 and full details of hard and soft landscaping should be secured by condition.

Ecology

- 7.30 Given that the site is overgrown and undeveloped it has the potential to accommodate protected species. A Great Crested Newt (GCN) survey has been submitted, along with a Reptile Survey. The reports conclude that there is no evidence of GCN in the nearby ponds, and it is unlikely that GCN use the site, and that a single grass snake was identified during one of seven survey visits. No objection has been raised by Herts Ecology subject to conditions for a reptile mitigation strategy, control of invasive species like rhododendron, and to carry out a badger walkover. Officers are therefore satisfied that no harm would arise to protected species or their habitats in accordance with Policy ENV16.

Drainage/Flooding

- 7.31 The site lies in floodzone 1 and will therefore not be at risk of fluvial flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment has nonetheless been submitted and concludes that although the development will result in an increase in impermeable areas, an appropriate drainage scheme can be provided which will prevent any increase in flood risk from surface water drainage. Drainage is proposed to be of SuDS design but it is not considered reasonable to require full details for a development of this scale. The Environment Agency has identified a ditch to the north of the site and an informative is recommended to advise the applicant.

8.0 Conclusions

- 8.1 Overall, there is no objection in principle to infill residential developments within the Category 1 village of Much Hadham, and Officers consider the proposal to amount to a sustainable form of development that will also contribute to the Council's lack of a 5 year housing supply. Although the development will be visible from Tower Hill and will result in the loss of existing spacing on the western side of the street that was identified in a previous appeal decision, Officers are satisfied that this proposal retains a greater level of spacing than the appeal scheme and would not materially detract from the setting and character of the Conservation Area. The development has been well designed to appear spacious and of a high quality.
- 8.2 The overall scale and design of the development is considered to be acceptable and will respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area, but will depend on a high quality palette of materials which should be secured by condition. Officers are also satisfied that no harm would arise to the setting of any listed buildings as a result of this development, subject to a condition to secure a repair and maintenance schedule for the Grade I listed wall.
- 8.3 Although the proposal will result in additional traffic movements, the Highway Authority have not objected to the scheme and have confirmed that visibility and access arrangements are satisfactory subject to a TRO to prevent vehicle parking on Tower Hill.
- 8.4 No other harm would arise to neighbour amenity, heritage assets, ecology or flooding.
- 8.5 The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out above, and the signing of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.