

ESSENTIAL REFERENCE PAPER A

3/12/1150/FP – Demolition of garages and clearance of associated land, construction of affordable housing, 1x4 bed detached house, 4 x3 bed semi-detached houses and 3 x 2 bed bungalows on garage site to the rear of 17-28 Grass Warren, Tewin, Herts, AL6 0JJ for Riversmead Housing Association

Date of Receipt: 09.07.2012

Type: Full – Major

Parish: TEWIN

Ward: HERTFORD – RURAL SOUTH

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Three year time limit (1T12)
2. Approved Plans (2E10):1477/001, 1477/100A, 1477/101, 1477/102, 1477/103 , 1477/120, and JN1236-NWK-006.
3. Boundary walls and fences (2E07)
4. Materials of construction (2E11)
5. Materials arising from demolition (2E32)
6. Sustainable Drainage – Surface water management (2E43)
7. No development shall commence on site until details of the construction and surfacing of the access roads, turning areas, parking areas and footpaths commensurate with the buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the roads, parking/turning areas and footpaths shall be retained at all times as shown on the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure that adequate and appropriate vehicular and pedestrian access is provided to serve the development in accordance with policies ENV1 and TR2 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007

8. No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the

3/12/1150/FP

construction period. The Statement shall provide for:

1. Methods for accessing the site;
2. The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
3. Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
4. Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
5. The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
6. Wheel washing facilities;
7. Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction.

Reason: To ensure that the construction works and associated activity are acceptable in terms of amenity of the area in accordance with policy ENV1 of the Local Plan and highway safety.

9. Tree Protection: fencing (4P07)
10. Landscape design proposals (4P12) (a, c, d, h, l, j, k and l)
11. Landscape works implementation (4P13)
12. Retention of landscaping (4P21)
13. Construction hours of working plant and machinery (6N07)
14. Refuse disposal facilities (2E24)

Directives:

1. Other Legislation (01OL)
2. Street numbering (19SN)

Summary of Reasons for Decision

The proposal has been considered with regard to the policies of the Development Plan (East of England Plan May 2008, Hertfordshire County Structure Plan, Minerals Local Plan, Waste Local Plan and the saved policies of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007, in particular policies

SD1, OSV1, HSG1, HSG6, HSG7, ENV1, ENV2, ENV3, TR2, TR7 and IMP1). The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies and Sections 6, 7, 8 and 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework is that permission should be granted.

_____ (115012FP.SD)

1.0 Background:

- 1.1 The application site consists of two parcels of land owned by Riversmead Housing Association to the south of the village of Tewin. The eastern parcel of the site is currently occupied by two banks of garages which are accessed via Grass Warren to the south. To the north west of the garages the access road turns into a footpath that links onto a residential green fronting Grass Warren to the west. There is a plot of land adjacent to the footpath which forms part of the application site.
- 1.2 The western parcel of the application site lies opposite the green on the other side of Grass Warren and comprises an open area of land.
- 1.3 The proposal envisages the redevelopment of the site, and the erection of 8 residential dwellings. These would comprise 1 x 4 bed detached dwelling (sited on the plot of land adjacent to 14 Cannons Meadow); 4 x 3 bed semi-detached dwellings on the site of the two garage blocks and 3 x 2 bed bungalows on the plot of land between 16 and 17 Grass Warren.
- 1.4 All 8 dwellings comprise affordable housing, with on-site parking provision, to be managed by the Riversmead Housing Association. Access to the eastern part of the site would be provided via the existing garages site between properties 26 and 27 Grass Warren.
- 1.5 The application site is located within the boundaries of the Category I Village of Tewin as shown on the attached OS extract.

2.0 Site History:

- 2.1 The relevant planning history for the application site is as follows:

Land adjacent to 16 Grass Warren:

- 3/58/0031/FP – Erection of bungalow by Hertford Rural District Council – Approved.

3/12/1150/FP

- 3/71/4045/FP – Four x 2bed flats, for HRDC – Approved.
- 3/79/0783/OP – Three single storey 3x bed old person's dwellings for East Herts Council – Approved.
- 3/81/1410/FP – 3 or 4 x three bed houses with garages for East Herts District Council – Approved.

Land adjacent to 17 Grass Warren:

- 3/56/1058/FP – Four x 2 bed bungalows and 4 old people's bungalows for Herts Rural District Council – Approved.

Garage site:

- 3/58/0031/FP – Erection of Bungalow by Hertford Rural District Council – Approved.
- 3/63/2001/FP – Three x 2 bed bungalows for Herts Rural District Council – Approved.
- 3/67/0934/FP – Site for 2 houses Herts Rural District Council – Approved.

- 2.2. The principle of some residential development on all the parcels of land has historically been considered appropriate.

3.0 Consultation Responses:

- 3.1 The Environment Agency comments that the main flood risk issues at the site, which is in Flood Zone 1, would be the management of surface water run-off ensuring that drainage from the development is appropriately managed and does not increase the flood risk either on-site or elsewhere. They recommend that sustainable surface water management is achieved as part of the development.
- 3.2 The Council's Landscape Officer initially commented that, in the absence of a tree survey for the application site and the potential for a number of off-site trees to be affected by the development along the boundary between the garages and the school playing field, the recommendation would be to refuse the application. A tree survey was, however, subsequently submitted with additional comments by the applicant's agent responding to the Council's Landscape Officer's

- concerns. No objections have been received from the Council's Landscape Officer as a result.
- 3.3 However, a full tree survey and Arboricultural Report by R W Green was subsequently submitted on the 15 October 2012. The Council's Landscape Officer comments that the details of the report show that the trees on the three areas of the application site and within the boundary of the Tewin Cowper Primary School are generally of a poor quality considered to be of a C category under the BS 5837 (amended 2005) assessment. The trees are either Horse Chestnuts suffering from Canker; Oaks that have been reduced where vigorous re-growth has weakened the branches; Field Maples and Hollies which have become multi-stemmed at ground level; Hawthorns that are ivy clad and failing; or standing dead or dying Elms.
- 3.4 The area of land to the west side of Grass Warren is composed of mainly young elm trees in various states of decline. There is one notable mature Ash tree (T17) which is located outside the site which will need to be protected during construction due to the proximity of the Root Protection Zone. This tree also has fungal growth and will eventually demise but in concert with other multi stemmed hollies contributes to the public amenity and character of the edge of a rural village.
- 3.5 None of the trees meet the criteria for serving Tree Preservation Orders but do contribute to the local amenity, and their removal will result in the loss of habitats for wildlife.
- 3.6 The landscape officer's view, however, is that significant native replacement tree planting throughout the site and woody shrub planting will satisfactorily mitigate for the loss and will reflect the rural location of the development. This planting can be secured by condition and the Officer recommends approval of the proposed scheme on this basis.
- 3.7 Hertfordshire Constabulary recommended that further consideration be given to the fencing to the rear of the proposed terrace of three bungalows wherein the originally proposed rear boundary fence would have allowed access into adjacent gardens as the footpath was common to all three properties increasing the opportunity for crime and possible conflict with neighbours. This matter has, however, been addressed within the amended layout plan.
- 3.8 The Council's Environmental Health Officer advises that any permission which the Planning Authority may give should include conditions for construction hours of working and soil decontamination.

- 3.9 The County Highways Officer comments that, in traffic generation terms, the general day to day movements associated with this residential development will be comparable to the traffic generation that could be generated if the existing garages were fully utilised. The officer comments:

In terms of parking, I am content that sufficient provision has been made for the new development and that in the event of any overspill the strategic highway network would not be affected. I appreciate however that your considerations of the proposal may lead to a different conclusion with regard to the amenity and environmental implications of further on-street parking outside of the site.

I acknowledge the concerns of the Parish Council and local residents in respect of the access route and concur with the view that it is far from ideal and had this been proposed as an access to a green field site the highway authority would require amendments to the width and alignment. However, in view of the existing use of the land and associated traffic movements, a traffic generation based reason for refusal is difficult to substantiate. Furthermore, I note that the Fire Service is content that the site is accessible for their vehicles. Refuse collection from the new dwellings is not an issue for the highway authority to consider and unless the parking and loading/unloading of vehicles associated with general delivery, furniture removal and other service provisions is undertaken in such a manner that highway safety is compromised the ability to get near to dwellings is again not an issue that would give a highway reason to object. In this case vehicles could stand on Grass Warren or Cannons Meadow and whilst it would be inconvenient it would not be a safety hazard significant enough to justify a highway refusal.

In terms of construction vehicle movements I would propose that a method statement be conditioned and that any temporary measures to allow access for construction vehicles be removed upon completion of the development.

Segregated pedestrian access to the proposed houses is provided at the northern end of the site which will provide the most convenient and obvious route to reach the village centre facilities and school.

In conclusion, whilst the highway authority acknowledge the deficiencies with the access, on balance, given the likely traffic generation when compared against the existing and previous use, a highway objection is not justified. As such I hereby recommend inclusion of the following conditions should you be minded to

recommend that planning permission should be granted for: full engineering details of the junction and access route reconstruction; provision of continuous link footpath between the site Grass Warren and Cannons Meadow: provision of area of access road, all vehicular areas surfaced, identified areas provided for construction parking and storage; wheel cleaning facility provided at all site exits and the details of construction vehicle movements and access arrangements to be agreed prior to demolition of the existing buildings.

- 3.10 Hertfordshire Fire Service, Safety Officer originally commented that, as regards access and water supplies for fire fighting, that the access for a fire appliance is considered to be satisfactory. However, as the access is in excess of 20m a turning circle or hammer head would be required and the access route must be capable of taking a weight of 18 tons. A fire hydrant is also required to be provided within 90m of an entry point to a building.
- 3.11 Following those comments, the applicants submitted amended drawings 1477/100/A and JN1236-NWK-006(by Morgan Tucker) on 25 August 2012, showing two solutions for the required turning head. The Fire Safety Officer commented on 30 August that Option 2 with the hammer head was the preferred fire appliance turning arrangement.

4.0 Parish Council Representations:

- 4.1 Tewin Parish Council initially commented in a lengthy consultation response dated 10 August 2012 which can be summarised as follows:
1. The proposal to gain access via the existing track between 26 and 27 Grass Warren is widely regarded with complete dismay. Most of the plans only show the track down as far as 26/27, and ignore the fact that it extends as far again before it actually joins the road off Grass Warren. It is a curved single track. (See view 1 in section 2 of the Design and Access statement.) Cars entering at each end cannot see each other.
 2. The views of the emergency services should be sought about a number of aspects of this development.
 3. There is barely room for a pedestrian and a car to pass each other on this access track. Certainly no room for a pedestrian to get past a delivery lorry. There is no space for a safe footway. It is unrealistic to assume that all pedestrian access is via the north end of the site.

3/12/1150/FP

4. The track requires rebuilding as it already has persistent potholes.
5. The roadway appears very tortuous and there is a potential for delivery lorries etc to block the access or have to reverse all the way out.
6. Parking provision is inadequate.
7. The distance of the bungalows from their associated car parking is excessive and doesn't accord with Lifetime Homes standards. There needs to be a path across the central grass area between the bungalows and their parking spaces.
8. Parking provision for existing bungalows at 17,18,19,20 Grass Warren within the site is queried and comments made about the provision of spaces for vans.
9. The proposal will increase parking congestion in Grass Warren and surrounding area.
10. The Design and Access Statement reports that at the pre-planning consultation held by Riversmead, residents were not in favour of a suggestion that the central grass area was removed to provide a through road between Cannons Meadow and Grass Warren. But no mention is made of the fact that there was an alternative suggestion to remove some of the grass area but retain a barrier between Cannons Meadow and Grass Warren. This could provide a better access to this new development as well as providing improved parking and access for existing residents both in Cannons Meadow and Grass Warren. There have been a number of incidents where residents have removed bollards to get their vehicles onto the grass area to get closer access to their homes. Options for the grass area need to be seriously examined, and the right solution would probably have the backing of the majority of residents.
11. A significant number of residents referred to over-development of the site. No mention is made of whether the dwellings are going to be all social rented or whether there will be any part-ownership.
12. Design could be improved.
13. The Parish Council recommends that EHC ensures that the views of the waste collection department are sought about a number of aspects of this development.

14. Details of fencing need to be considered.
 15. We support the comments from Landscape about the need for a proper tree survey to accompany the application.
 16. We object to the proposal to store bins in front of the bungalows. The central pair of three bedroom houses has no bin storage indicated.
 17. There is some speculation amongst the local residents, that the foul water drains design will not work. Various comments about problems with the existing drains.
 18. Given the topology of the site, bringing in heavy construction equipment is going to present challenges. A planning condition should be the agreement of a plan for access to the site during the construction phase.
 19. Residents are aggrieved that they are losing garage space and the new houses are being provided with parking and access which has long been denied to themselves.
- 4.2 Following the submission of amended plans Tewin Parish Council commented further as follows:
- 4.3 Tewin Parish Council reviewed the amended drawings at their meeting on the 3 September 2012 and is concerned as it is not clear whether 2 or 5 parking spaces have been lost. They would also like to know how Riversmead are going to ensure that the turning circle is not used for parking. The plans have not been updated to show that the development site includes the section of access road immediately adjacent to Grass Warren which will need to be rebuilt to handle 18 ton fire appliances. They continue to have concerns about the low quality of the tree survey.

The Parish Council wish to maintain the same objections as raised in our previous letter on this application dated 10 August 2012, at the meeting of Riversmead on 21 August 2012 and reiterated by parishioners and Councillors at the Parish meeting on 3 September 2012. These are also clearly articulated in the second submission to East Herts Council on 4 September 2012 on behalf of 14 Cannons Meadow.

5.0 Other Representations:

3/12/1150/FP

- 5.1 The application has been advertised by way of press notice, site notice and neighbour notification.
- 5.2 18 letters of representation have been received which can be summarised as follows:
- There will be a degree of overlooking to existing houses
 - There will be security issues
 - Insufficient parking and loss of garages still in use
 - The wooden cladding is unattractive, out of keeping with existing houses
 - Will the contractors use the access from Cannons Meadow
 - Has existing drainage and sewage capacity been checked
 - The access is narrow with no passing places, can the fire engines and refuse lorry and ambulance get up the access.
 - If the grassed area is removed it will create a rat run for parents
 - Loss of trees and habitats
 - The rear building line of the detached house does not match 14 Cannons Meadow
 - The BRE Assessment for daylighting and sunlight is flawed
 - The design of the houses is out of keeping with existing properties
 - Fails to give due regard to policy OSV1
 - Noise and disturbance to occupiers of properties adjacent to the access
 - There is no vehicular access to the proposed bungalows and excessive distances to parking spaces
 - The quality of the tree survey is poor, trees 3 and 4 next to 14 Cannons Meadow have not been surveyed
 - The site adjacent to 14 Cannons Meadow is not included in the Council's Housing Capacity Study
 - There are no elevational plans or scalable drawings available
 - There should be no street lighting
 - The access road is narrow at 3.7m with pinch points
 - 28 Grass Warren would look directly into rear garden of proposed new properties
- 5.3 A petition of 137 signatures objecting to the proposed development was received on 16 August 2012.
- 5.4 A copy of a response to local residents from Oliver Heald MP was received on the 6 September 2012 commenting that planning is a District Council responsibility and the representations he received would be forwarded to East Herts Planning Department.

5.5 A further letter of representation was received on the 4 October 2012 raising the following highway issues:

- The application site will generate more traffic movement
- The access drive is not suitable to serve the proposed development and believe that Highway reasons for not objecting due to the scheme not compromising highway safety is short sighted taking into account that they consider the access being “far from ideal” and “acknowledge the deficiencies of the access”
- Car parking layout is unacceptable.

6.0 **Policy:**

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

SD1	Making Development more Sustainable
OSV1	Category 1 Villages
HSG1	Assessment of Sites not allocated in this Plan
HSG6	Lifetime Homes
HSG7	Replacement dwellings and infill development
ENV1	Design and Environmental Quality
ENV2	Landscaping
ENV3	Planning out Crime
TR2	Access to New Developments
TR7	Car Parking Standards

6.2 Sections 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework are also a material consideration in relation to this application.

Considerations:

7.1 The determining issues in this case relate to:

- The principle of the use of the site for infill housing
- The scale, design, layout, massing and detailed appearance of the proposed development
- Whether parking provision and access arrangements are adequate and appropriate, and the loss of the garages is acceptable.
- Whether the form of the development respects neighbour amenity, privacy and outlook
- Whether the proposed development makes provision for sustainable management in terms of energy efficiency, materials of

construction, surface water management and renewable energy.

Principle of Development

- 7.2 The proposed development sites are located within the boundary of a Category 1 Village. As such, in accordance with policy OSV1 of the Local Plan, there is no objection in principle to limited small scale and infill housing development provided that:
- (a) There is no unacceptable loss of housing, employment, open space or community facilities
 - (b) Proposals for housing development make provision for up to 40% affordable housing in accordance with relevant policies and comply with HSG7.
 - (c) The proposal would not be significantly detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining area of nearby occupiers
 - (d) The site does not represent a significant open space or gap important to the form of the village.
 - (e) The proposal doesn't block views or vistas within the village or of open countryside.
 - (f) The proposal is sensitively designed, respecting the character, visual quality and landscape of, and is satisfactorily integrated into, the village or the surrounding area.
- 7.3 Policy HSG7 states that proposals for infill housing development within Category 1 Villages will be permitted where the proposed development meets the provisions of the policy. In this instance the proposed areas of development are well sited in relation to the surrounding properties and do not appear obtrusive or over intensive, or result in the loss of important landscape features. The proposed terrace of three bungalows is on a site that had historically been approved for housing but left vacant. It continues the form and pattern of the existing adjacent development in Grass Warren, complimenting the character of the local built environment and having regard to local distinctiveness.
- 7.4 As regards the site of the 4 semi-detached dwellings, these are sited in a position that respects the amenities of adjoining properties, providing a sympathetic form and layout with a good separation of 30m from the rear of the existing dwellings at 17-20 Grass Warren. The southern flank elevation of the nearest proposed dwelling would be some 25m from the rear elevation of No 27 and 28 Grass Warren, which is considered to be acceptable and respects the existing distances and separations in the locality.
- 7.5 The proposed detached 4 bed dwelling is sited adjacent to No 14

3/12/1150/FP

Cannons Meadow in keeping with the character of the street pattern and would be of a design and layout that would respect the surrounding properties in terms of scale height and siting.

- 7.6 The form of the development proposed on the three sites compliments the surroundings and have, where appropriate, regard to the pattern of landscaped open space which is a distinctive feature of the existing built environment, in accordance with relevant policy provisions.
- 7.7 Officers therefore consider that the principle of the development is acceptable and would accord with policies OSV1 and HSG7 of the Local Plan.

Design and Layout

- 7.8 As mentioned above, the layout of the proposed dwellings generally respects the layout, form and grain of surrounding development.
- 7.9 The terrace of three bungalows to the west of the Grass Warren broadly respects the existing built form of adjacent properties in terms of height, and design, reflecting the external character and appearance of the existing built form. The proposed terrace does extend further to the rear than the adjacent existing bungalows, although some of that rear projection is at single storey level only. It is not considered that this siting would have any significant impact on the adjoining properties in terms of outlook, privacy, loss of light, or overshadowing.
- 7.10 The ridge height of the proposed bungalow terrace is 1.0m higher than the adjacent bungalows but the plot is sited next to a two storey dwelling and officers consider that the development relates well to the street scene as a link form between the heights of the two existing adjacent properties. The additional roof height is for the provision, if needed, for an additional second bedroom or, in the case of elderly persons, provision for live-in carers.
- 7.11 The fenestration on the front elevation of the three units delivers good natural daylight provision and, in terms of privacy, it is not considered that the full length windows will adversely impact on the occupants. The modern fenestration design, although an alternative design to surrounding properties, would not detract from the character and appearance of the locality. The properties have reasonable front and rear garden amenity space with pedestrian access provided to existing and new parking areas.
- 7.12 Both the single 4 bedroom dwelling and the four three bedroom semi-

detached properties make provision for adequate sized plots with landscaping to the front of the site. The contemporary design is considered appropriate in this location although, in terms of external finishes, a stronger reference could be made to the existing surrounding properties. A condition is suggested to ensure that details of the materials to be used are agreed with Officers prior to construction. Generally, however, the form of the dwellings and design compliment and do not detract from the locality.

- 7.13 Overall, the proposal presents a high quality development that makes the best use of brownfield land (the garage court) and vacant land within the village boundary. It comprises a mixed form of single and two storey scale to respect the character of the locality. The design and layout of the buildings respect the grain of local development; retains the central grass feature of Grass Warren; and emphasises public frontages of the site's and views from outside of the site.
- 7.14 The applicant also indicates that the residential units will achieve high energy efficiency standards; are built to Lifetime Homes Standards and achieve a Code for Sustainability Home Level 3, which will include the use of solar panels on the two storey dwellings proposed.

Parking

- 7.15 The Council's SPD: Vehicle Parking provision at New Developments would require a maximum parking provision of 3 spaces per 4 bed dwelling; 2.25 spaces for each 3 bed dwelling and 1.25 spaces for each of the 3 bed bungalows, making a total maximum requirement of 15.75 spaces overall.
- 7.16 The proposed development does, necessitate the demolition of the two blocks of garages, 19 in total, that are located to the rear of No's 17-28 Grass Warren. The Housing Association comment that of these existing garages 7 are vacant, 8 are being used to store cars, and a tenant is renting out 2 garages.
- 7.17 The proposal originally incorporated 18 spaces for the development and a further 4 informal parking spaces for the existing bungalows, a total of 22 parking spaces. However, in response to neighbours representations regarding the access to the garages site for refuse and emergency services, the applicants amended the parking layout to the proposed scheme to provide, a hammer head turning for emergency vehicles. This has reduced the overall parking provision for the development to 20 spaces. This provision will slightly exceed the maximum car parking standards as required by the Council's SPD

although, given the rural location of the site, this is considered to be acceptable. It will, in Officers' opinion, provide sufficient parking for the new dwellings and adequate compensatory parking for the lost garage provision. It is accepted that some additional on-street parking may occur, but it is considered that this can be accommodated without detriment to highway safety. The County Council's Highways Officer has no objection to the parking provision as shown on the amended drawings.

- 7.18 Officers acknowledge that the nearest parking space for the proposed bungalows are up to 28m from the dwellings, although the existing garages are as far, if not further, from the existing residents in Grass Warren. The spaces are provided adjacent to the proposed detached dwelling without appearing unduly prominent, or compromising the appearance of the central landscaped green. Officers therefore consider this arrangement and layout acceptable.

Access and Servicing

- 7.19 The County Highways Officer comments that, in traffic generation terms, the general day to day movements associated with the proposed residential development would be comparable to the traffic generation that could arise if the existing garages were fully utilised. The Highways Officer is content that sufficient provision has been made for the new development although accepting that there may be some further on-street parking outside of the site.
- 7.20 Officers acknowledge the concerns of the Parish Council and residents in respect of the restricted access to the eastern part of the application site and concur that this is not ideal. However, in view of the existing use of the land and associated traffic movements, it would be difficult to substantiate a refusal on these grounds. The access would remain as existing, utilising the same driveway to the south of the garage site onto Grass Warren. As there would be no material increase in the use of this access, it is not considered that any detrimental impact would arise from the changed nature of the land use.
- 7.21 Furthermore, the Fire Service is content that the site would be accessible for their vehicles. The Council's Environmental Services Officer is also satisfied that, in terms of refuse collection, the additional dwellings can be serviced satisfactorily. Pathway collection for the bungalows, using wheelie bins, can also be accommodated within the existing contract.
- 7.22 The matter of the construction access route and the structural integrity

of the access road to accommodate 18 ton emergency vehicles is something that can be controlled by condition. Overall, it is Officers' opinion that, although there are deficiencies with the access, given the likely traffic generation compared against the existing and previous use, a highway objection is not justified and other matters can be addressed by the inclusion of suitable conditions.

Residential Amenity

- 7.23 In terms of neighbour amenity, the design, layout and siting of the dwellings relates acceptably to the adjacent and surrounding properties. Overall, neighbour amenity has been given significant consideration with good distances to shared boundaries; the provision of frontage landscaping and generous private rear garden amenity areas. Window openings to flank walls at ground floor in the properties are limited to obscured glazed bathrooms to prevent the loss of neighbour privacy.
- 7.24 As regards the proposed detached property adjacent to No. 14 Cannons Meadow, this follows the building line of the existing street scene. The main two storey element of the proposed dwelling aligns with the neighbouring property, with a single storey element extending the dwelling to the rear by approximately 5.2m. Officers consider that there would be no loss of privacy, outlook or amenity to the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling.
- 7.25 There is one small flank window proposed in the single storey rear element, facing the fenced boundary of No's 14 Cannons Meadow. However, this would be screened by a 2.0m close-boarded fenced boundary between the properties to protect the amenity, privacy and outlook of the neighbours at No's 14 Cannons Meadow. Generally, fenestration at first floor is limited to bathrooms and en-suites to prevent loss of privacy and overlooking.

Sustainability

- 7.26 As regards policy SD1 of the Local Plan, the construction of the residential dwellings/units will achieve a Code for Sustainable Homes at Level 3, incorporating reduced carbon emissions; high levels of insulation; low energy lighting and U value timber double glazed windows and solar panels. The dwellings will all be compliant with Lifetime Housing Standards to achieve adaptable future uses.

Landscaping

- 7.27 The Council's Landscape Officer originally assessed the development

on the basis of limited landscape information being provided with the application and recommended refusal. A subsequent tree survey submitted on the 16 October 2012 was considered to be a comprehensive assessment of the whole site as regards existing trees affected by the development. The majority of the trees on the site are of a diseased, failing, or weakened state such that their long term sustainability is unlikely and they are not worthy of retention or protection with Tree Preservation Orders. The trees do, however, contribute to the local amenity of the rural locality and there would be loss of wildlife habitat.

- 7.28 In light of this, the Council's Landscape Officer recommends that the proposed scheme is approved, subject to a condition for a landscape design proposal to address this loss wherein the detailed landscape proposal will include significant native/indigenous tree and shrub planting to enhance the rural locality if the proposed development is approved.

Other Matters

- 7.29 The Environment Agency has no objection to the proposed development which is located in Flood Zone 1, other than to require that details of the management of surface water run off from the site are submitted, to ensure there is no increase in flood risk on the site or elsewhere. This can be secured by condition.

8.0 Conclusion:

- 8.1 Policies OSV1 and HSG7 of the Local Plan allow for infill development in Category 1 Villages and the development proposed is, in principle, in accordance with the Local Plan. The proposed development also supports the provision of affordable housing in rural areas and villages such as Tewin, in accordance with the Council's Housing Needs Survey.
- 8.2 The site includes a poorly used garage court and vacant areas of land within the settlement boundary where there is a history of previous permission to provide housing. The National Planning Policy Framework encourages effective use of land and is considered to provide policy support for this proposed development.
- 8.3 In terms of siting, scale, height, design, layout, parking provision and neighbour amenity, the proposed development is a sympathetic scheme that respects the character of the surrounding properties, the grain and pattern of street development and responds sensitively to local

3/12/1150/FP

distinctiveness. As such, it would accord with the relevant policies of the Local Plan and NPPF considerations.

- 8.4 Whilst access to the site is constrained, and some parking provision located further from dwellings than usually desirable, this is not considered to be unmanageable or unacceptable in this location. It also enables the retention of a meaningful amount of amenity space to the front of the proposed bungalows so that the new development better integrates into the character of the surroundings.
- 8.5 It is Officers view, in light of the above, that the proposed development is acceptable. The issues raised by the Parish Council and local residents have been fully considered but are not felt to be of such weight that a refusal of planning permission is justified. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted as set out at the head of this report.