DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 21 JUNE 2017

| Application Number | 3/16/1253/FUL |
|-----------------------|--|
| Proposal | Erection of 27 no retirement apartments (Category II sheltered housing) with associated facilities, car parking and landscaping. |
| Location | Land North of Park Farm Industrial Estate, Ermine Street, Buntingford. |
| Applicant | McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyle Ltd. |
| Parish | Cottered |
| Ward | Buntingford |

| Date of Registration of Application | 10 th June 2016 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Target Determination Date | 9 th September 2016 |
| Reason for Committee | Major Planning Application |
| Report | |
| Case Officer | Nicola Mckay |

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to a legal agreement and the conditions set out at the end of this report.

1.0 <u>Summary</u>

- 1.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 27 No retirement apartments with associated works.
- 1.2 The site is located within the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt and represents a departure from Local Plan Policy GBC3. However, substantial weight must be attached to the extant Outline planning permission (Ipa reference 3/16/0471/VAR) which allows for the construction of a 50-60 bedroom care home within the site together with 180 dwellings on the adjoining land to the north and sheltered housing to the west.
- 1.3 Having regard to a number of changes that have been made to the proposal during the course of the application, including reductions made to the number of units and therefore the size and scale of the building and other amendments to the building design, Officers consider that the proposal would have an acceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

1.4 Negotiations have taken place with the applicant in respect of the financial contribution that can be made towards affordable housing and the applicant has now confirmed that they are able to make a total Section 106 contribution, of £468,000 which accords with the independent advice received on behalf of the Council.

2.0 <u>Site Description</u>

2.1 The site lies to the north of Buntingford and comprises former agricultural land located in the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt. To the east of the site lies Ermine Street and to the north, west and south is former agricultural land which has the benefit of planning permission for residential development. Construction work has recently commenced on the land to the north for a housing development for Redrow Homes. The land to the south and west has planning permission for retirement bungalows which has not commenced at this stage. Further south of the site is Applewood, a new residential development comprising of 6 dwelling houses and Park Farm Industrial Estate.

3.0 Background to Proposal

- 3.1 Full planning permission was granted under lpa reference 3/13/1375/OP for the construction of 180 dwellings, amenity land for community uses, access works, and the provision of amenity space and associated infrastructure on the wider development site to the north of Buntingford with Outline permission with all matters reserved granted for a 50-60 bed care home and sheltered accommodation. A subsequent application for variations to the approved general residential element of the development approved under lpa reference 3/16/0471/VAR in December 2016.
- 3.2 In July 2016 permission was granted for the reserved matters for 25 retirement bungalows at the adjoining site to the west under lpa reference 3/16/0959/REM.
- 3.3 The current application relates only to the area shown on the previously approved schemes for a care home.
- 3.4 The current proposal is for the construction of 27 retirement apartments. Following concerns raised by Officers and feedback from the Town Council and Conservation and Heritage Advisor amended plans were submitted in March 2017 and the proposal was reduced from 37 to 27 units. The proposal now comprises of 13No. 1 bed

apartments, 8No. 2 bed apartments and 6No. 2 bed retirement cottages.

- 3.5 The proposal is for an 'L-shaped' building that would front onto Ermine street, however, maintaining a set back of approximately 11-12 metres to the vehicular highway itself. The building would extend along the northern boundary of the site adjacent to the Redrow housing site that is currently under construction. Parking and areas of soft landscaping are provided to the south and west of the building. A total of 29 parking spaces are proposed.
- 3.6 The building is designed with pitched roofs, with two central areas of flat roof that would be below and screened by the surrounding roof pitches. The building would be 3 storeys in height along the east and northern corner of the site, reducing to 2 storeys as the building progresses towards the south and west.

4.0 Key Policy Issues

4.1 These relate to the relevant policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the pre-submission East Herts District Plan 2016 and the adopted East Herts Local Plan 2007:

| Key Issue | NPPF | Local Plan policy | Pre- submission District Plan policy | Neighbourhood Plan policy |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| The principle of residential development within the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt. | Paragraph 14 | GBC 3 | GBR 2 | HD1, HD7 |
| Affordable Housing | Section 6 | HSG 3, HSG 4 | HOU 3 | HD7 |
| Design, layout and scale | Section 7 | ENV 1 | DES 3 | HD2, HD4 |
| Parking provision | Section 4 | TR 7 | TRA 3 | T1 |

- 4.2 The Buntingford Community Area Neighbourhood Plan has now been adopted and therefore forms part of the Development Plan.
- 4.3 Other relevant issues are referred to in the 'Consideration of Relevant Issues' section below.

5.0 <u>Emerging District Plan</u>

- 5.1 The District Plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State for examination. The view of the Council is that the Plan has been positively prepared, seeking to ensure significantly increased housing development during the plan period. The weight that can be assigned to the policies in the emerging plan can now be increased, given it has reached a further stage in preparation. There does remain a need to qualify that weight somewhat, given that the Plan has yet to be examined.
- 5.2 It is noted that the District Plan proposes to enclose the site, together with the housing site to the north within the boundary of the built up area of Buntingford and therefore removing the site from the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt.

6.0 <u>Summary of Consultee Responses</u>

- 6.1 <u>HCC Highway Authority</u> comments that it does not wish to restrict the grant of permission and that the proposal would not have a severe impact upon the safety and operation of the highway network.
- 6.2 The <u>EHDC Environmental Health Advisor</u> comments that any permission granted should be subject to a condition relating to contaminated land.
- 6.3 <u>Lead Local Flood Authority</u> initially objected due to the lack of an acceptable surface water drainage strategy then later commented that it had no objections on flood risk grounds and sufficient detail had been provided to demonstrate that there is feasible drainage for the site. However, following re-consultation on the amended plans submitted for the building, the Lead Local Flood Authority has subsequently advised that they require information on how the applicant will manage surface water and suggests that a revised drainage strategy is sought.
- 6.4 The <u>Environment Agency</u> has no comments on the proposal.
- 6.5 <u>EHDC Engineering Advisor</u> has commented that they have been in discussion with the developers consultant and have suggested some new/ improved arrangements for SuDS at this site which have been submitted in a revised drawing. They have now confirmed that the drainage proposals for the site are acceptable.

- 6.6 <u>Thames Water</u> has no objections in respect of sewer capacity and advise that surface water drainage is the responsibility of the developer and recommend that petrol/oil inceptors are fitted in all car parks.
- 6.7 The EHDC Conservation and Heritage Advisor initially recommended refusal. They commented that the proposed height was inappropriate for this location, and the resulting building would appear unduly prominent and bulky in the street scene. The architectural approach was not considered to be of sufficient quality, and more effort needed to be put into the design of the elevations and the architectural detailing. The proposed building lacked character, and needed to be more memorable in order to aide legibly in this new area. Following the submission of amended plans they now recommend approval and comment that the revised proposal is of a far superior design and has now addressed their previous concerns.
- 6.8 The <u>EHDC Landscape Advisor</u> recommended refusal based upon the initial proposal. They commented that sufficient planting was proposed along Ermine Street, however, the design of the proposal did not respond positively in landscape terms to the existing or future local character in terms of the amount of development, layout, scale and appearance. The car park left insufficient scope for planting, there was insufficient space is left for planting to the northern boundary, the scheme did not respond well to the approved adjacent bungalows in terms of height, scale and mass and the building would appear unduly prominent in this gateway location.
- 6.9 In respect of the amended Landscape Masterplan, they have commented that the scheme design responds less negatively in landscape terms to the existing or future local character in terms of layout, scale and appearance. The car park layout has slightly improved scope for boundary planting although the overhang of cars along the western boundary of the car park means the provision of a low tubular steel knee rail (or similar) to protect the boundary hedge will be needed. The scope for the planting of trees outside the north boundary needs to be explored. A high close boarded fence is unacceptable along the northern site boundary post and rail fence or e.g. railings on top of a low (3 or 4 course) brick wall etc. such that views in/out are maintained for future residents is suggested.
- 6.10 <u>Herts Ecology</u> has no objections.
- 6.11 <u>HCC Development Services</u> has requested a financial contribution towards library services.

- 6.12 <u>EHDC Environmental Services</u> comments that suitable provision for waste collection should be made and request that kerb is lowered to allow suitable access into the car park.
- 6.13 <u>Herts Fire and Rescue Service</u> comments that appropriate provision should be made for fire hydrants and the access and turning for Fire and Rescue Service vehicles.
- 6.14 <u>HCC Historic Environment Advisor</u> comments that the site has already undergone extensive archaeological investigation and consequently no further work is required in this case.

7.0 <u>Town/Parish Council Representations</u>

- 8.0 The <u>Cottered and Throcking Parish Council</u> has no objections.
- 8.1 The <u>Buntingford Town Council</u> initially commented that it objects to the introduction of 3 storey development particularly in this sensitive and rural location. It comments that the design and bulk was far too prominent and would have significant adverse impacts upon the landscape views from the north, east and the approach from Throcking. The plans incorrectly show existing trees to the north and additional planting would be required for screening purposes. It raises concerns that there would be an under provision of parking within the site and comments that the cumulatively effect of all of the new access points onto Ermine Street and the impact upon pedestrian safety should be considered.
- 8.2 Following the submission of amended plans it asks that the applicant revisits the number of parking spaces provided as the proposal equates to one space per apartments regardless of its size and makes no provision for staff or visitor parking. It has also commented that the information submitted by the applicant in respect of car ownership at similar developments does not take into account the poor transport links to Buntingford and are likely to be based upon larger towns.

9.0 <u>Summary of Other Representations</u>

- 9.1 2 <u>representations</u> have been received, 1 in objection and 1 in support which can be summarised as follows:
 - Buntingford has ample care and sheltered housing and this is unnecessary development within this rural setting;
 - Public transport and water supply and sewerage facilities are not explained sufficiently;

• There is a great increasing need for retirement living development such as this that allow for retired people to downsize.

10.0 Planning History

10.1 The following planning history is of relevance to this proposal:

| Ref | Proposal | Decision | Date |
|---------------|--|----------|-----------------|
| 3/16/0859/REM | Reserved Matters approval for the erection of 25 Bungalows of 'Retirement Living' (Category II Sheltered Housing) and associated parking and landscaping. | Granted | July 2016 |
| 3/16/0471/VAR | Variation of Condition 14 (approved plans) of planning permission 3/13/1375/OP: Amendments to the layout, mix, and design of the approved general residential development part of the site. | Granted | October 2016 |
| 3/13/1375/OP | Full permission for the erection of 180 homes, amenity land for community uses, the creation of one new access onto the A10 and closure of an existing access onto the A10 north of the site, creation of four new accesses onto Ermine Street and the upgrading of one access onto Ermine Street, and the provision of amenity space and associated infrastructure, and in outline with all matters reserved a 50-60 bed care home and sheltered accommodation. | Granted | October 2015 |

11.0 <u>Consideration of Relevant Issues</u>

Principle

- 11.1 Whilst the application site lies within the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt, Outline planning permission has been granted for development on this site and therefore Officers do not consider there to be any justifiable ground to raise an objection in principle to the proposed development. Furthermore, some weight should be attached to the proposal within the District Plan to include the site within the built up part of Buntingford, therefore removing it from the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt. It is also noted that the site falls within the Buntingford Settlement Boundary that is defined within the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 11.2 The Outline planning permission granted permission for a care home within this part of the site, however, the current proposal is for sheltered housing, hence the submission of an application for Full planning permission as opposed to Reserved Matters. However, it is noted that there is no policy requirement for the provision of a specific housing type within this site and furthermore, the NPPF encourages the provision of a mix of housing types and sizes in developments. Officers consider that the proposal would make a valuable contribution towards housing delivery together with the approved housing to the north of the site and the retirement bungalows to the west.

Affordable Housing

- 11.3 Whilst it is acknowledged that the Outline planning permissions granted for the wider site made a provision for affordable housing within the Redrow housing site, with those applications, a care home was proposed for this part of the site. An affordable housing contribution would not have been expected from a care home as this does not form standard housing (C3 use) and instead is classed as a residential institution (C2 use). As the current proposal is for sheltered housing that does fall within a C3 use class, an affordable housing contribution is expected.
- 11.4 The proposal is for warden supported elderly persons accommodation, and in such circumstances the provision of on-site affordable housing would not be appropriate due to difficulties with sharing the site between the two types of residential use, the different requirements in terms of parking provision and management difficulties. However, a financial contribution towards the provision of off-site affordable housing is considered necessary and appropriate in order for the proposals to represent a sustainable form of development. Accordingly, during the

course of the application a Viability Assessment (VA) was submitted to determine the level of contribution towards off-site affordable housing.

11.5 The initial VA submitted by the applicant identified that a total Section 106 contribution of £199,371 could be made. Following an independent assessment instructed by the Council, negotiations have taken place with the applicant and they have now agreed to the recommended figure from the Council's advisors of £468,000 for Section 106 contributions. This is a considerable increase in the contribution originally offered and will enable a significant increase in the affordable housing that can be delivered as a result of the proposal. Having regard to the independent advice received on this matter Officers consider that the affordable housing contribution made is now acceptable.

Design, layout and scale

- 11.6 The building would be 3 storeys in height along the north east corner of the site, reducing to 2 storeys as the building progresses towards the south and west. The height and scale of the building has been substantially reduced since the original submission which was for a full 3 storey building. The resulting building would appear far more sympathetic to the neighbouring developments, which as approved will comprise of a 3 storey residential block within the Redrow site to the north and a 1 ½ storey bungalow to the south and will provide a suitable transition of building heights between the sites.
- 11.7 The building is designed with gabled projections, pitched roof dormer windows within the eaves, chimneys and the materials of construction are shown to be a mix of brick and render with red clay tiles for the roof. A mix of balconies are also proposed which add interest to the elevations and also provide some additional amenity space for residents. The resulting building design has significantly improved from the original submission made and would now appear more in keeping with and comparable to the approved appearance of the housing development to the north.
- 11.8 The current landscape masterplan shows a proposal for a 1.8 m closed boarded fence to the northern site boundary. Officers have raised concerns with this proposal to the applicant and have suggested that a lower and more open fence would be more appropriate in the interests of the appearance of the site and the outlook for the residents. It is anticipated that an amended plan will be submitted prior to the Committee meeting, however, if necessary this could be dealt with by condition.

- 11.9 Following the concerns raised by the Landscape Advisor the Landscape Masterplan has been amended to include larger areas of soft landscaping within the site and an improved car parking layout. Their concerns raised in respect of the layout, scale and appearance of the development have been overcome by the reductions made to the proposal and the improved building design as outlined above. In respect of the concerns raised relating to landscaping to the north, the applicant has confirmed that the land to the north of the site is owned by Redrow and that tree planting within this area does form part of the approved landscape plans for the adjoining site.
- 11.10 Having regard to the amendments made to the plans during the course of the application and the comments received form the Conservation and Heritage Advisor, Officers consider the current proposal to be of an acceptable standard of design and layout and would be of an overall scale and appearance that would now appear sympathetic to the surrounding area.

Parking Provision

- 11.11 The adopted and draft East Herts parking standards for sheltered residential accommodation recommends a provision of between 13.5 and 27 parking spaces for the proposed development. The proposal would provide 29 parking spaces which exceeds these recommended standards. It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan sets out higher parking standards for residential development than those within the existing and proposed East Herts Plans, however, the Neighbourhood Plan does not identify any specific parking standards for sheltered housing.
- 11.12 The outstanding concerns raised by the Town Council in relation to the car parking provision made are noted and in response to these concerns the applicant has provided some further information. The applicant states that recent parking surveys have shown that car ownership declines significantly with age, with ownership declining from 100% of residents between the ages of 65 and 69 to 53.8% at 70-74, declining to 49.2% at 75-79 and to 26% or less over the age of 85. They comment that the average age of the occupiers of their sheltered housing is 78.
- 11.13 In respect of other McCarthy and Stone developments within this District it is noted that in the case of the existing site within Stansted Road, Bishop's Stortford the Council agreed to the provision of 22 parking spaces to serve 45 apartments and in the case of the former

Charvill Garage site in Ware, 15 parking spaces were approved to serve 39 apartments. It is acknowledged that Bishop's Stortford and Ware are far more sustainable locations than Buntingford with better access to services and public transport, however, the parking provision currently proposed does significantly exceed that at these other sites.

11.14 Having regard to the type of housing that is currently proposed Officers consider that the parking provision is acceptable. It is noted that the applicant has offered a sum of £30,000 towards the Buntingford local Hopper bus service which they intend to offer on behalf of both this site and the adjoining bungalow site. In the case of the Reserved Matters application for the adjoining bungalow site, it was determined that as a contribution towards this service was not included within the extant Outline planning permission granted under reference 3/13/1275/OP, it would not be appropriate to require a planning obligation to deal with this matter in that case. Officers are concerned that the need for such a contribution to make the current proposal acceptable has not been demonstrated and that quantifying the payment that would be necessary for this part of the larger site would be difficult. Officers recommend that the agreement remains between the developer and the Town Council for a contribution which would be beneficial as it would enable the residents to benefit from this service and therefore do not recommend that this forms part of the Section 106 requirements in this case.

Other Matters

- 11.15 With regards to surface water drainage, the applicant has followed advice from the Council's Engineers and has submitted amended plans which include proposals for swales, permeable paving and a green roof within the site. These changes to the proposal form benefits to the scheme. In respect of the comments received form the Lead Flood Authority, further consultation has taken place with them in respect of the revised proposals submitted and their comments will be reported to Committee as a late representation.
- 11.16 In terms of neighbour impact, the north elevation of the building would be sited approximately 40 metres away from the rear elevations of the neighbouring houses to the north that are currently under construction. The southern and western flank elevations of the building would be sited approximately 16-19 metres and 22 metres (respectively) from the neighbouring approved bungalows and would be two storeys in height to these parts of the site. Having regard to these distances and the amended size, scale, layout and height of the building, Officers

consider that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

- 11.17 In respect of the future residents of the site, private and shared amenity spaces are provided within the site. Officers consider that the proposal would provide a satisfactory level of amenity for the residents of the site.
- 11.18 The proposal would incorporate a pedestrian access to the land to the north of the site via the north western site boundary which would provide opportunities for the residents to access this area to the north. The Outline planning permissions showed this area of land between the current site and the southern access road to the housing site to the north as forming part of the approved care home site and as such no detailed arrangements for this land was included within the full details agreed for the housing site.
- 11.19 However, as this land appears to be within the ownership of Redrow and has not been sold to McCarthy and Stone it does not form part of the current application site. Whilst Officers consider that the current proposals shown within the current application site are acceptable, there is a risk that the land to the north will be left without a landscaping or management proposal, and preventing the possibility of the creation of a pedestrian link between the site and the land to the north. This would be contrary to the Councils objectives to create connected and cohesive new communities and to encourage trips to be made by walking and cycling and support health and wellbeing objectives.
- 11.20 It would be preferable for McCarthy and Stone and Redrow to have an agreed plan for this area of land. Officers have contacted Redrow to query their proposals for this land. Enforcement action, by way of a breach of condition notice relating to Condition 11 of 3/16/0471/VAR requiring details of reserved matters could be taken if deemed to be necessary at a later stage. Both approaches are not entirely satisfactory and are an indication of the consequences that can occur when sites previously in one ownership and control are subsequently subdivided. This poor design outcome is given negative weight in the overall consideration of matters.

12.0 Conclusion

12.1 Having regard to the policies contained within the Development Plan and the NPPF and the planning history for the site and the adjoining sites, Officers overall consider that the proposed development is acceptable.

- 12.2 The outstanding concerns of the Town Council relating to car parking provision are noted, however, the provision made exceeds the recommendations set out within the East Herts Adopted and Draft policies for this kind of development and Officers do not consider that there would be sufficient grounds to refuse planning permission in respect of this matter.
- 12.3 Officers have worked with the applicant to achieve an improved development in terms of design, scale, layout and drainage proposals and have secured a significant increase in the provision that can be made for affordable housing. So, despite some of the poor layout outcomes, Officers now consider the proposal to be sustainable and acceptable.

Legal Agreement

- £465,085 towards off site affordable housing provision;
- £2,915 towards Library Services.

Conditions/Reasons for Refusal

- 1. Three year time limit (1T12)
- 2. Approved Plans (2E10)
- 3. Samples of materials (2E12)
- 4. The dwellings shall be used as sheltered accommodation for persons over the age of 55 and for no other purpose including any other purpose within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2005 (as amended).

<u>Reason</u>: To ensure that the development, together with the development on the wider Buntingford North site, provides an appropriate and sustainable mix of housing and that contributions sought towards local servcies remain relevant to this proposal in order to meet local needs and support local services in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Details of any external lighting proposed in connection with the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any building works above ground, and no external lighting shall be provided without such written consent. The

development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

<u>Reason:</u> In the interests of the visual amenities of the area, and in accordance with policy ENV23 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007.

6. Prior to the commencement of the development, full details of both hard and soft landscape proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include, as appropriate: (a) Means of enclosure (b) Hard surfacing materials (c) Planting plans (d) Written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment) (e) Schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate (f) Implementation timetables. Thereafter the development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details.

<u>Reason:</u> To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by appropriate landscape design, in accordance with policies ENV1, ENV2 and ENV11 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007.

- 7. Landscape works implementation (4P13)
- 8. Prior to the commencement of development a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall include details of:
 - a. Construction vehicles numbers, type, routing;
 - b. Traffic management requirements;
 - c. Areas of construction vehicle parking, storage and delivery of materials within the site;
 - d. Timing of construction activities to avoid school pick up/drop off times;
 - e. Location and details of construction vehicle wheel washing facilities.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To minimise impact of construction process on the local environment and local highway network.

9. Prior to the commencement of the development a Phase 2 investigation report, as recommended in the previously submitted Delta-Simons report dated July 2013 (Ref.13-0458.01) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where found to be necessary by the Phase 2 report, a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall include a plan providing details of how the remediation works shall be judged to be complete and arrangements for contingency action.

<u>Reason:</u> To minimise and prevent pollution of the land and the water environment and in accordance with national planning policy guidance set out in section 11 of the Natonal Planning Policy Framework.

10. Prior to the commencement of the development details of all vehicular access arrangements including visibility splays shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

11. Prior to the occupation of the development a detailed management scheme for the future maintenance of the areas of communal amenity space and the swales shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

<u>Reason:</u> To ensure that the amenity space and swales are suitably maintained in the interests of the character and appearance of the development and in the interests of the management of surface water flows and in accordance with Policies ENV1 and ENV21 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review, April 2007.

- 12. Provision and retention of parking spaces (3V23)
- 13. Prior to any building works above ground, details of facilities to be provided for the storage and removal of refuse from the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

<u>Reason:</u> In the interests of amenity, in accordance with policy ENV1 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007.

14. Provision of the pedestrian access to the north boundary of the site in accordance with plans and to be available on first occupation (Officers delegated to formulate full wording).

Informatives

1. Highway Works (06FC2)

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; the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies and Outline planning permissions submitted under lpa references 3/13/1375/OP and 3/16/0471/VAR is that permission should be granted.

KEY DATA

Residential Development

| Residential density | 90 units/ | 90 units/Ha | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|--|
| | Bed | Number of units | |
| | spaces | | |
| Number of existing units demolished | | 0 | |
| Number of new flat units | 1 | 13 | |
| | 2 | 8 | |
| | 3 | 0 | |
| Number of new house units | 1 | 0 | |
| | 2 | 6 | |
| | 3 | 0 | |
| | 4+ | 0 | |
| Total | | 27 | |

Residential Vehicle Parking Provision

Current Parking Policy Maximum Standards (EHDC 2007 Local Plan)

| Parking Zone | 4 | |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Residential unit size | Spaces per unit | Spaces required |
| (bed spaces) | | |
| Sheltered housing | 0.5-1 spaces per | 13.5 - 27 |
| for the elderly-any | unit | |
| unit size | | |
| Total required | | 13.5 – 27 |
| Proposed provision | | 29 |

Emerging Parking Standards (endorsed at District Plan Panel 19 March 2015)

| Parking Zone | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Residential unit size | Spaces per unit | Spaces required |
| (bed spaces) | | |
| Sheltered housing | 0.5-1 spaces per | 13.5 - 27 |
| for the elderly-any | unit | |
| unit size | | |
| Total required | | 13.5 – 27 |
| Accessibility | | N/A |
| reduction | | |
| Resulting | | 13.5 - 27 |
| requirement | | |
| Proposed provision | | 29 |

Legal Agreement – financial obligations

This table sets out the financial obligations that could potentially be sought from the proposed development in accordance with the East Herts Planning Obligations SPD 2008; sets out what financial obligations have actually been recommended in this case, and explains the reasons for any deviation from the SPD standard.

| Obligation | Amount sought by EH Planning obligations SPD | Amount recommended in this case | Reason for difference (if any) |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Affordable Housing | 40% | £465,085 | Due to nature of the housing proposed a contribution to off site provision is acceptable and the figure recommended follows a viability assessment as detailed within the report above. |
| Parks and Public Gardens | £0 | £0 | |
| Outdoor Sports facilities | £0 | £0 | |
| Amenity Green Space | £0 | £0 | |
| Provision for children and young people | £0 | £0 | |
| Maintenance contribution - Parks and public gardens | £0 | £0 | |
| Maintenance contribution - Outdoor Sports facilities | £0 | £0 | |
| Maintenance contribution - Amenity Green Space | £0 | £0 | |

Application Number: 3/16/1253/FUL

| Maintenance | £0 | £0 | |
|--------------------|----|----|--|
| contribution - | | | |
| Provision for | | | |
| children and young | | | |
| people | | | |
| Community Centres | £0 | £0 | |
| and Village Halls | | | |