

JEREMY PETER ASSOCIATES
Planning and Development Consultants

21 Britten Road

Penarth, Cardiff

CF64 3QJ

Tel: 02920 703619

Mob: 07879 626401

Email: info@jeremypeterassociates.co.uk

Website: www.jeremypeterassociates.com

**ERECTION OF DETACHED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND
CROSSOVER ONTO GROVE ROAD**

AT

LAND TO THE REAR OF 18 MOOR PARK ROAD, NORTHWOOD, HA6 2DN

**PLANNING, DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF
APPLICATION**

June 2020

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This planning statement has been prepared in support of a planning application relating to the erection of a detached dwelling at land to the rear of 18 Moor Park Road, Northwood HA6 2DN. The application site comprises part of the rear garden of 18 Moor Park Road.
- 1.2 This application is a revised proposal that has been submitted following the refusal of planning permission for the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, together with the formation of two new vehicle crossovers at the same site (application ref: 74971/APP/2019/3169). This application addresses the concerns that were raised with that application and in doing so proposes a development that would not have the same impacts, thus rendering this development as acceptable.
- 1.3 The documents submitted with the application are:
- Planning, Design and Access Statement
 - Arboricultural Report
 - J3745-D-OS - Location Plan
 - J3745-D-00 - Proposed Site Plan
 - J3745-D-01A – Proposed Ground Floor Plan
 - J3745-D-02 – Proposed First Floor Plan
 - J3745-D-03 – Proposed Loft Floor Plan
 - J3745-D-04 – Proposed Roof Plan
 - J3745-D-05 – Proposed Front and Rear Elevations
 - J3745-D-06 – Proposed Side Elevations
- 1.4 It is considered that this revised proposal is a markedly different proposal to that was previously refused because of the significant reduction in scale and impact. It is a similar infill form of development to that of the dwelling

opposite, 1a Grove Road that was granted permission in 2017. Therefore it is considered this development, similar to that opposite, would not have any detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area; would create a dwelling that would be similar in scale and proportion with the dwelling opposite that was granted permission in the past; would provide adequate parking and manoeuvring that would not cause harm to public and highway safety; would not have a detrimental impact on nearby trees; and would provide sufficient amenity space for prospective and existing occupiers.

- 1.5 Land use planning policies emphasise the desirability of achieving sustainable development. The considered view is that the proposal amounts to sustainable, acceptable development that accords with relevant national and local planning policies. It should therefore be granted planning permission and it is hoped the Council will agree.

2 Site Location and Surroundings

- 2.1 The application site comprises part of the rear garden of 18 Moor Park Road. The site is located on the eastern side of Grove Rd and is bordered to the north by two Grove Rd and to the east by the rear garden of 16 Moor Park Road. The character of the area is residential with 2 storey detached dwellings. Opposite the site is a 1a Grove Road which comprises a two storey detached dwelling on an infill plot that was granted planning permission under ref: 14379/APP/2017/1592 in 2017 and was subsequently built.
- 2.2 The site is not in a Conservation Area or adjacent any other designated heritage assets of importance.

3 Description of Proposed Development

- 3.1 The proposal is for a two storey detached 5 bedroom dwelling, utilising the roof to provide additional accommodation. The accommodation layout is shown on the submitted plans. It is also proposed to provide parking for at least 2 vehicles to the front and a rear garden amenity area of approximately 178 sqm. at the rear. Also proposed is a vehicular crossover to Grove Road. The proposed dwelling in this application is similar to the infill dwelling opposite now known as 1a Grove Road in terms of proportionality of size relative to the plot. It would be constructed of similar finishing materials.
- 3.2 An arboricultural report is submitted with this application that demonstrates that the trees to be removed to facilitate the development are not of a quality that merits retention, and that the development would not cause a harmful effect on adjacent trees in neighbouring properties because of appropriate screening and mitigation during development and after. Appropriate boundary treatments would also be undertaken comprising new tree planting, landscaping and fencing that would ensure the new dwelling blends into its surroundings.

4 Relevant Planning History

- 4.1 The planning history that is relevant is that of the previously refused application for *"The erection of a new pair of semi-detached dwellings, together with the formation of two new vehicle crossovers onto Grove Road."* (ref: 74971/APP/2019/3169). This was refused for 5 reasons relating to the harmful impact to the development on the character and appearance of the area, the lack of parking/manoeuvring that would prejudice highway safety; the lack of a tree assessment that could result in harm to trees on and adjacent

the site; and the lack of sufficient amenity space for existing and future occupiers.

- 4.2 Also considered to be relevant and significant planning history is the grant of planning permission for the redevelopment of 1A Grove Road. This permission which has already been undertaken, involved the demolition of an existing bungalow and the redevelopment of the site to provide a 2 storey detached dwelling (ref: 14379/APP/2017/1592).

5 Planning Policy

- 5.1 Planning applications have to be determined in accordance with the adopted development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The adopted local plan is the Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (adopted November 2012) and the Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (adopted 16 January 2020). Also part of the adopted plan is the London Plan 2016. Relevant policies will be referred to when considering the issues in relation to this application.
- 5.2 A material consideration is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 as is the accompanying guidance Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The NPPF states that purpose of the planning system is to contribute to achievement of sustainable development. Three overarching objectives, economic, social and environmental, are endemic to this goal that are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways. It is made clear that they are not criteria against which every decision can or should be judged. Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions whilst taking into account local circumstances, so as to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of

each area. Again relevant policies from the NPPF will be considered in relation to the issues set out below.

- 5.3 Another relevant material consideration is supplementary planning guidance. Reference is made in the London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016) in one of the reasons for refusal.

6 Planning Issues

- 6.1 Whilst this is a planning application for a single dwelling, the planning issues in relation to this application are to be considered arise from the reasons for refusal relating to the previous application for the development for two semi-detached dwellings, particularly as this application for a single dwelling seeks to address the concerns arising from that application. From an assessment of those reasons for refusal and the officers report into that application it is considered that the following planning issues arise:

- a) The principle of the proposed development
- b) Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- c) Impact on public and highway safety
- d) Impact on trees
- e) Impact on the residential amenity of existing and neighbouring residents

Each issue is considered in turn below:

- a) The principle of the proposed development

- 6.2 The officer's report into the previous application noted that whilst the application site was located in a "developed area" where development would normally be permitted, as the proposal involved the development of a garden

land, there was a policy presumption against such development. London Plan policy 3.5 was cited which it is claimed suggests a presumption against their loss where it can be locally justified. Policy DMH6 is also mentioned which also has a presumption against the loss of gardens except in exceptional cases. The officer's report goes on to conclude on this issue that:

"The proposal involves development of a garden site in a residential area characterised by family housing with large undeveloped rear gardens being a prevailing characteristic and the issues relating to its siting and impact on character and thus the principle of development are discussed below, suffice to say that the proposal constitutes an unacceptable form of garden development. The loss of what is a residential rear garden and the impact of the proposed dwelling on the immediate locality is considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. The infilling of the gap which at present provides an important break in the built form would appear out of character with a pattern, scale and form of development within the surrounding area. The proposal is thus unacceptable in principle."

- 6.3 The NPPF at para. 122 states that planning policies and decisions should support development that make sufficient use of land taking into account a number of factors, one of which is the desirability of maintaining prevailing character and setting, including that provided by residential gardens.

- 6.4 Policy BE1- Built Environment - is the overarching strategic policy. This policy requires new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment through a number of ways, such as achieving a high quality in design in all new buildings; being appropriate to that identity and context of the area ; and not resulting in the inappropriate development of gardens that erodes the character and biodiversity of suburban areas.
- 6.5 Policy DMH6 – Garden and Backland Development - of the Local Plan Part 2 deals specifically with proposals to develop in gardens. It states that whilst there is a presumption against loss of gardens due to the need to maintain local character, amenity space and biodiversity, in exceptional cases, a limited scale of backland development may be acceptable, subject to the following criteria:
- i) neighbouring residential amenity and privacy of existing homes and gardens must be maintained and unacceptable light spillage avoided;
 - ii) vehicular access or car parking should not have an adverse impact on neighbours in terms of noise or light. Access roads between dwellings and unnecessary long access roads will not normally be acceptable;
 - iii) development on back land sites must be more intimate in mass and scale and lower than frontage properties; and
 - iv) features such as trees shrubs and wildlife habitat must be retained or re-provided.
- 6.6 It is contended that firstly, the application site is not a typical backland development of a rear garden. It is possible to provide a frontage onto Grove Road. In that way, it is contended that it is an exceptional case that warrants consideration on its own merits, in the same way that the development opposite was determined and considered acceptable. Whilst acknowledging that the development of 1a Grove Road did involve the demolition of an existing bungalow, nonetheless the officer report into that application (ref:

14379/APP/2017/1592), noted that in respect of the principle of development, the site lay within an established residential area where there was no objection in principle to the intensification of the residential use of the site, subject to other material planning considerations being acceptable. As such that redevelopment conformed with the NPPF as regards effective use of land by reusing land, as well as policies within the London Plan that promote the optimisation of housing output within different types of location and encouraging the provision of a wide range of housing to take account of the various different groups who require different types of housing.

- 6.7 Although it is the applicant's view that this application proposal should be viewed in similar terms, it is considered that the proposed development would also comply with the respective policy criteria of DMH6. Firstly, in regard to criterion i), there is at least 15m between the boundary of the proposed new house and the rear of the existing dwelling at No.18. It is considered that this distance more than ensures ample residential amenity and privacy would be afforded to the existing home and garden. The orientation of the proposed dwelling combined with the proposed distance between No.18 and the proposed dwelling would mean that any unacceptable light spillage would be avoided.
- 6.8 Secondly in relation to criteria ii) the siting and orientation of the vehicular access and car parking would not cause any adverse impact on neighbours by way of excessive noise and light. The point about access roads between dwellings is not applicable which serves to demonstrate that this is not a typical backland form of development.
- 6.9 In regard to iii) the lower density of the current proposal can be viewed as more intimate in mass and scale that would be more in keeping with the typology of the properties that already exist in the area.

6.10 With regard to criterion iv) only low quality trees will be removed and additional trees and landscaping would be provided.

6.11 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would comply with all the criteria listed in the policy. On that basis, the application development is considered, in principle, to be acceptable garden development, subject to other material planning considerations being acceptable.

6.12 It is noted that the officer report into the previously refused application considered the gap provides an important break in the built form on this side of Grove Road. However, it is contended that the proposal complies with policy as demonstrated above and that there is still plenty of gaps around the development as to maintain the overall openness of the area.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

6.13 The officer's report into the previously refused application noted that a semi-detached development was not typical of the character of the area which was characterised by large detached houses. It was also considered that the development would appear as an isolated form along the eastern side detrimentally altering the appearance of the street scene. Moreover it was alleged it would establish an unwelcome precedent in the area, which would erode its well defined character and appearance. The reasons for refusal mention conflict with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 and policies DHMB 11 and DHMB12 of the Local Plan Part 2.

6.14 Policy BE1 – Built Environment - requires new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment. Policy DMHB11 – Design of New Development –requires all new development to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design including, where relevant to this application, harmonising with the local context by taking into account

the surrounding scale of development; as well as aspects of architectural composition and quality of detailing. Policy DHMB 12 – Streets and Public Realm – states that development should be well integrated with the surrounding area and accessible.

- 6.15 It is considered that this application complies with policy because it comprises a detached house which is typical of the typology of the dwellings in the area, particularly with regard to the development at 1a Grove Road. The detailing and finishing materials would be similar to that development as would proportionality of plot size and scale of development. This being the case, it is considered that the impact of this proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and its integration with the public realm would be similar to that of the dwelling at 1a Grove Road that was granted permission in 2017. In that context, it would also be acceptable in terms of impact on the character and appearance of the area and the public realm.

Impact on parking and highway safety

- 6.16 One of the reasons for the refusal of the was the substandard car parking provision that would lead to on street parking and queuing to the detriment of public and highway safety, contrary to Policies DMT2 and DMT6 of the Local Plan Part 2.
- 6.17 Policy DMT2 deals with highway impacts. Amongst other things, development must ensure that there is safe and efficient vehicle access to the highway network in accordance with council standards; there is no deterioration of air quality, noise or local amenity or safety for all road users and residents; safe and secure convenient access and facilities for cyclists and pedestrians are satisfactorily accommodated. Policy DMT6 concerns pedestrians and cyclists. Development proposals will be required to ensure safe direct and inclusive access for pedestrians and cyclists is provided on the site connecting to the

wider network including amongst other things the provision of appropriate cycle parking.

6.18 The car parking standards at Appendix C to the Local Plan Part 2, requires 2 spaces per dwelling of 3+ bed units. The site plan shows 3 parking spaces, that include a garage, can be satisfactorily accommodated. Vehicles can safely and properly access and egress the highway that is Grove Road. Any bicycle parking can be accommodated in the garage.

6.19 Therefore it is considered the current proposal satisfactorily meets the appropriate standards in this regard as regards acceptable parking/manoeuvring and safe access to the highway. It should not have any detrimental impact on highway safety.

Impact on Trees

6.20 One of the reasons the previous application, was refused because it was considered that in the absence of a tree survey and arboricultural implication assessment undertaken to appropriate standards, the application had failed to demonstrate that the development would safeguard existing trees on or adjoining the site. Moreover, the application failed to demonstrate adequate protection for the long term retention of the trees that remained.

6.21 Submitted with this revised application is a tree survey and arboricultural assessment which makes clear that only poor quality trees would be removed and that with appropriate mitigation measures, as suggested in the assessment, the remaining trees and those on adjoining sites would be safeguarded. Based on this assessment, it is considered that the impact on trees by the proposed development would be acceptable and there is no basis to justify refusing this scheme with regard to this issue.

Impact on the residential amenity of existing and future occupiers

- 6.22 One of the reasons for refusal for the previous semi-detached dwelling scheme was that the Council thought the scheme failed to provide sufficient amenity space of a size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the proposed units. It was therefore considered it would result in an overdevelopment of the site detrimental to the residential amenity of existing and future occupiers contrary to Policy DHMB 18 of the Local Plan Part 2.
- 6.23 The NPPF at para. 127 (f) advises that planning policies and decisions should create places that have, amongst other things, a high standard of amenity for future and existing users.
- 6.24 Policy DHMB 16 – Housing Standards – of the Local Plan Part 2 states that all housing development should have an adequate provision of internal space in order to provide an appropriate living environment. To achieve this all residential development or conversions should meet or exceed the most up to date internal space standards as set out in the accompanying table 5.1. For a 2 storey dwelling, the required internal floorspace standard according to the table is 123 sqm with 4.0m of built in storage space. The proposed dwelling would easily exceed this requirement and so would provide an acceptable internal level of accommodation for prospective occupiers.
- 6.25 Policy DHMB 18 – Private Outdoor Amenity Space – requires all new residential development and conversions to provide good quality and usable private outdoor amenity space in accordance with the standards set out in table 5.3. This table specifies that for a four + bedroom dwelling, a minimum amenity space provision of 100 sqm is required. The proposal would provide 178 sqm of rear garden amenity space, thus easily exceeding the minimum requirement. There would also be sufficient available garden/amenity space for the

occupiers of 18 Moor Park Road so as not to compromise their residential amenity.

- 6.26 Therefore it is contended that this revised proposal overcomes the previous reason for refusal and would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenity of existing and future occupiers.

7 Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 7.1 The proposal is a revised scheme that seeks to address the reasons for refusal for a previous scheme for semi-detached dwellings that was refused for a number of reasons. It is contended that this proposal overcomes those reasons for refusal and in the planning balance, the development should be allowed as the benefits of the proposal outweigh any harm when assessed against national and local planning policy.
- 7.2 Significant weight can be attributed to the fact that there would be no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area nor would there be any harmful impact to neighbouring residential amenity. Significant weight can be attributed to the provision of adequate parking and that there would be no adverse impact on highway safety. Additionally, significant weight can be attributed to the fact that apart from removing some low quality trees to facilitate the development, there would be additional tree planting and remaining trees on the site and on adjoining sites would be protected.
- 7.3 As regards meeting the overarching objectives of sustainable development, in regard to the economic objective, moderate weight can be ascribed to the fact that there will be employment and economic benefits for suppliers and builders during the construction process and spin off returns for nearby shops and services due to the spending of future occupiers.

- 7.4 Moderate weight can also be attributed to meeting the social objective because only one additional dwelling would be provided.
- 7.5 With regard to the environmental objective, significant weight can be attributed to the fact that the proposal can be successfully accommodated without causing significant harm to the built environment; making effective use of land whilst modern construction techniques will ensure that the proposal minimises waste and pollution and adapts to climate change.
- 7.6 Therefore it is considered that the benefits of the proposal far outweigh any adverse impacts and permission should be granted for the proposal. It is hoped the Council will agree and grant planning permission for this revised scheme.

Jeremy Peter MRTPI