



PLANNING, DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE TO PROVIDE 8 FLATS

169 JOEL STREET, PINNER, HA5 2PD

JUNE 2022

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Site Description
- 3.0 Site Designations
- 4.0 Relevant Planning History
- 5.0 Description of Proposal
- 6.0 Relevant Planning Policies
- 7.0 Planning Considerations
 - 7.1 Overlooking from Balconies
 - 7.2 Outlook from Ground Floor Flats
 - 7.3 Parking
- 8.0 Conclusion

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Statement is written in support of a planning application for demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of a part one, part two, and part 3-storey building comprising 8 flats (1 x studio, 5 x 1 bed 1 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed) with 4 parking spaces accessed off Joel Street, Pinner.

1.2 It follows on from two earlier applications; one for 9 flats with 4 parking spaces that was refused at appeal (Planning Ref: 22642/APP/2020/3181); and another for 8 flats with 4 parking spaces that was refused at Committee (Planning Ref: 22642/APP/2021/1965).

1.3 The revised proposal addresses all outstanding issues and includes the following drawings and reports:

- Architectural Plans by PAC Design:

DPR/P21/01	Location Plan
DPR/P21/02	Topographic Survey
DPR/P21/03	Existing Block Plan
DPR/P21/04 Rev 1	Proposed Block Plan
DPR/P21/05 Rev 1	Proposed Site Layout
DPR/P21/06 Rev 1	Proposed Ground Floor Plan
DPR/P21/07 Rev 1	Proposed First Floor Plan
DPR/P21/08 Rev 1	Proposed Second Floor Plan
DPR/P21/09 Rev 1	Proposed Roof Plan
DPR/P21/10 Rev 1	Proposed West Elevation (To Joel Street)
DPR/P21/11 Rev 1	Proposed East Elevation (To Garden)
DPR/P21/12 Rev 1	Proposed Side Elevations
DPR/P21/13 Rev 1	Proposed Street Scene Elevation
JSP/P21/20	Existing Floor Plans
JSP/P21/21	Existing Elevations
- Transport Statement dated June 2022 by Paul Mews Associates;
- Addendum to Sunlight and Daylight Assessment dated 17 May 2022 by Herrington Consulting;
- 5 x existing site photos;
- The Planning, Design & Access Statement dated June 2022 by Maven Plan Limited.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 The site lies to the east of Joel Street just south of its intersection with Middleton Drive, Pinner. It has an area of 1,100sqm with an approximate width of 20m and a depth of 60m and is currently occupied by a two-storey dwelling with front parking court and landscaped garden to the rear. The house is a more recent addition to the street scene than the properties either side and has a different character and appearance albeit the materials are similar comprising a brick and render façade with a clay tile roof.

2.2 Most of the houses along this part of Joel Street follow an established building line with the exception of the application site which is set well back from the road and creates a noticeable break in the street scene. The house also occupies a much larger plot, being approximately twice the width of the neighbouring properties and of substantial depth, such that it's roughly 2 to 3 times the size of other plots in the immediate vicinity.

2.3 The site is surrounded by:

- The side boundary of No. 167 Joel Street and the rear boundaries of No. 1 and 1a Middleton Drive to the north. No. 167 is a two-storey semi-detached house with forecourt parking; No. 1 is a bungalow, and No. 1a is two-storey house;
- The side boundary of No. 171 Joel Street to the south, a two-storey semi-detached house with forecourt parking;
- Joel Street to the west, on the other side of which are two-storey semi-detached and terrace houses

separated by a pedestrian footway which leads to some school playing fields further to the west;

- The rear garden of No. 3 Middleton Drive to the east.

2.4 The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2 with 0 being the lowest and 6b the highest, being approximately 100m from bus stops on both sides of Joel Street and 750m from Northwood Hills Underground Station (Metropolitan Line). However when the 2021 PTAL forecast is applied this rises to 3, mainly due to the improved frequency of Metropolitan Line services to Northwood Hills Underground Station.

2.5 Nearby public open space can be found at Haydon Hall Park approximately 400m to the south and Wylchin Close Playground approximately 500m to the west. There are also a range of shops and services around Northwood Hills Underground Station around 750m to the north so the site can be described as having good access to public transport, open space and local shops and services.

3.0 SITE DESIGNATIONS

3.1 This site lies within an established residential area and has no formal designations on the Hillingdon Local Plan Policies Map (2020). It's also not within a conservation area and there are no listed buildings on or close to the site.

3.2 In terms of flood risk, the site lies within Flood Zone 1 of the Environment Agency Flood Map, indicating a low (less than 1 in 1,000 year) annual probability of flooding.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Application Site

4.1 In March 2020 planning permission was refused for a part one, part two, and part three-storey building comprising 9 flats (3 x 1 bed, 5 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed) with 4 parking spaces under Planning Ref: 22642/APP/2020/3181. The reasons for refusal were:

1. *The proposed development, by reason of the glazing at roof level and its width, proximity to neighbouring boundaries and forward position, would result in a poor, incongruous and overly dominant form of development that would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the site, the street scene and the wider area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2019).*
2. *The proposal would result in the provision of windows to habitable rooms that would be obscure glazed and there would be no outlook from these bedroom windows resulting in harm to the amenity of future occupants. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2019).*
3. *The proposed development, by virtue of its poor external layout would fail to provide an adequate level of external amenity for future residents in accordance with the Council's standards to the detriment of the amenity of future occupants. The development is therefore contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2019).*
4. *The proposal would result in the provision of several habitable rooms facing towards the side elevations of both of the neighbouring properties resulting in loss of or perceived loss of privacy to the occupants of those dwellings harmful to their residential amenity. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020).*
5. *The lack of an internal lift to provide adequate access to all users of the development would*

constitute a substandard form of development, harming the residential amenity of future occupants. The development would therefore be contrary to DMHB 11 and DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy D5 of the London Plan (2021).

6. *The proposed development fails to provide sufficient off-street parking, and therefore the development is considered to result in substandard car parking provision, potentially leading to undue on-street parking to the detriment of public and highway safety contrary to Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 & DMT 6 of the Local Plan: Part 2 Development Plan (2020) and Policies T6 and T6.1 of the London Plan (2021).*

4.2 The application was subsequently dismissed at appeal in March 2022 (Ref: APP/R5510/W/21/3275081) with the Inspector making the following positive and negative comments about the scheme:

Positive

- There is no in-principle objection to the redevelopment of the site for flats;
- The proposal would follow the established building line of neighbouring properties;
- The double gable frontage would be of similar design to adjacent properties;
- The height would not be out of scale with its surroundings;
- The third floor is not visually imposing or an incongruous in the street scene;
- Although the gaps between the building and site boundaries would be less than neighbouring properties, it would not be unacceptable or result in a terracing effect;
- Overall, the height, design and siting of the building would not be visually imposing or out of character with the street scene;
- The proposed building would not have an imposing or harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in terms of loss of outlook or daylight;
- The provision of two wheelchair accessible units on the ground floor with the upper floor flats served by a staircase rather than lift is acceptable;
- The communal garden at the rear is large enough to provide each flat with sufficient amenity space if the balconies at the rear were to be removed.

Negative

- The proposed balconies at first and second floor level result in unacceptable overlooking to the rear gardens of neighbouring houses (paragraph 13);
- The provision of obscure glazing to the kitchen and bedroom windows of flats 1-4 on the ground floor would result in unacceptable outlook (paragraph 14);
- The 4 parking spaces for the 9 flats would not meet the reduced provision of 0.5 spaces per unit and would therefore result in some roadside parking (paragraph 18-20).

4.3 In December 2021, prior to the abovementioned appeal decision being issued, a revised application for 8 flats (1 x studio, 4 x 1 bed, 2 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed) with 4 parking spaces was refused at Committee under Planning Ref: 22642/APP/2021/1965. The single reason for refusal was:

1. *The proposed development, by reason of its size, design, scale and massing would result in a poor, incongruous and overly dominant form of development that would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the site, the street scene and the wider area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).*

4.4 The Committee report for the application made the following observations of relevance to this scheme:

- The provision of one 3-bed family unit to replace the existing family house would be acceptable (Section 7.01);
- The provision of 4 parking spaces for 8 flats is acceptable and would not discernibly exacerbate congestion or parking stress (Section 10.01).

190 Joel Street

4.2 No. 190 Joel Street is approximately 150m to the south of the application site and has been granted planning permission for 6 flats following a protracted planning process as summarised below.

4.3 In September 2018, an application was made for demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of a 3-storey building to create 6 x 2 bed flats with associated parking and amenity space (Planning Ref: 16589/APP/2018/3310). An appeal against non-determination was made in November 2018 and the main issues considered at appeal were:

- (i) *the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and*
- (ii) *the level of parking provision.*

4.4 The Inspector concluded the proposal would harmonise with the street scene and complement the character of the area. He also accepted the parking survey findings and considered that 4 parking spaces for 6 units was adequate given the availability of on-street parking and the sites proximity to public transport. The appeal was therefore allowed in March 2019.

4.5 In April 2019, planning permission was granted for a revised application for demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of a 3-storey building to create 6 x 2 bed flats with associated parking and amenity space (Planning Ref: 16589/APP/2019/316). The scheme was similar to the appeal scheme but with minor design changes at roof level and along the northern elevation.

4.6 In October 2019, a subsequent planning application was submitted for a 3-storey building with habitable basement accommodation to create 2 x studio flats and 6 x 2 bed flats with associated parking and amenity space (Planning Ref: 16589/APP/2019/3395). A written representations appeal was submitted in December 2019 against non-determination and was dismissed some 14 months later on the 3 March 2021 with the Inspector concluding the following:

- *The proposed basement accommodation would result in an unacceptable risk of flooding given the inadequacy of the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the application;*
- *The provision of 4 parking spaces for 8 flats (2 x studio and 6 x 2 bed) would be acceptable given the findings of the parking survey and observed on-street parking and highway conditions along Joel Street;*
- *The proposal would fail to provide step free access from the site frontage into the flats so would not provide suitable living conditions, particularly with regard to the provision of accessible dwellings.*

4.7 At the time of writing no subsequent application has been made.

5.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

5.1 The proposal involves demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a part one, part two and part three storey building comprising 8 flats (1 x studio, 5 x 1 bed, 1 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed) with 4 parking spaces accessed off Joel Street.

5.2 On the ground floor there would be 4 x 1 bed flats; 2 facing the street and 2 facing the rear, each with their own private garden ranging between 26 and 60sqm. A central corridor would run through the middle of the building from front to back allowing access to a communal garden of 475sqm at the rear.

5.3 On the first floor there would be one 2-bed and one 3-bed flat each extending from front to rear.

5.4 On the second floor there would be 2 flats; a studio flat on the southern side and a one-bed flat on the northern side, each extending from front to rear, served by roof lights and dormers.

5.5 At the front would be 4 parking spaces served by a central, repositioned crossover off Joel Street. The parking court would include a disabled parking bay while the tracking drawings in the Transport Statement demonstrate all cars can enter and exit the site in forward gear.

5.6 Along the northern boundary would be a pedestrian footway providing access to the rear garden and a covered cycle store (14 spaces) in the approximate position of the existing garden sheds. Two short stay spaces and a refuse and recycling enclosure would also be provided at the front at the site adjacent to the pedestrian path and screened by the existing 1.8m high fence along the northern boundary.

5.7 The existing front boundary wall would be replaced by a new wall of similar height and design but in a colour that matches the neighbouring properties either side. The upper part of the fence (above 0.6m) would be transparent to provide the necessary pedestrian and vehicular visibility splays to the public highway.

5.8 In terms of layout, the building would be positioned further forward than the existing house to repair the existing break in the street scene and align with the houses to the south. Although it would project beyond the rear building line it would be less overbearing than the existing house which is positioned well beyond the rear elevation of the two adjacent properties. It would also be tapered in at the upper levels, and in footprint, to ensure a 45-degree outlook is achieved from the rear facing windows of these properties.

5.9 In terms of appearance, the building has been designed as a 2 ½ storey building with front projecting bays to reflect the scale, character, materials and architectural detailing of the neighbouring houses. Like some of the other properties in the immediate locality, accommodation would be provided in the roof served by dormers and roof lights.

5.10 The building would be finished in white render with brown roof tiles to match the primary materials used on the existing house and properties either side.

5.11 The key changes from the latest 8-unit refusal are:

- The depth of the building at first and second floor level has been reduced by approximately 1.5m;
- The unit mix has changed (from 1 x studio, 4 x 1 bed, 2 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed to 1 x studio, 5 x 1 bed, 1 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed);
- The number of habitable rooms has reduced (from 25 on the appeal scheme down to 19 on the previous scheme and 18 on the current application);
- The rear facing balconies at first and second floor level have been removed;
- The side facing habitable room windows on the ground floor have been removed;
- The windows above the front gables have been removed and replaced by a centrally positioned dormer.

6.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

6.1 The relevant planning policies applicable to the scheme are contained within:

- The National Planning Policy Framework (2021);
- The London Plan (2021);
- The Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies (2012);
- The Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Designations (2020); and
- The Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020).

6.2 A summary of the most relevant policies are set out below:

The National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

- 2.0 Achieving Sustainable Development
- 5.0 Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes
- 8.0 Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities
- 9.0 Promoting Sustainable Transport
- 11.0 Making Effective Use of land
- 12.0 Achieving Well Designed Spaces
- 14.0 Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change and Flooding

The London Plan (2021)

- D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
- D4 Delivery good design
- D5 Inclusive design
- D6 Housing quality and standards
- D7 Accessible housing
- H1 Increasing housing supply
- H2 Small sites
- H4 Delivering affordable housing
- H8 Loss of existing housing
- T5 Cycling
- T6 Car Parking

The Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020)

- H1 Safeguarding Existing Housing
- H2 Housing Mix
- H4 Residential Conversions and Redevelopment
- H7 Provision of Affordable Housing
- MB11 Design of New Development
- HB16 Housing Standards
- HB18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space
- HB14 Trees and Landscaping
- EI2 Reducing Carbon Emissions
- EI10 Water Management, Efficiency, and Quality
- EI14 Air Quality
- CI7 Planning Obligations and CIL
- T1 Managing Transport Impacts
- T2 Highways Impacts
- T6 Vehicle Parking

6.3 Where relevant to the consideration of this proposal the relevant policies are discussed in the main body of the report.

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.01 The proposal has been designed to address the outstanding issues raised by the Inspector and Council as part of the two earlier applications. The key outstanding issues are discussed below.

7.1 Overlooking from Rear Balconies

7.1.1 The Inspector raised concerns about the potential for overlooking from the rear facing terraces and balconies at first and second floor level at paragraph 13 of his report. In particular he noted:

“....I have concerns about overlooking and loss of privacy. The scheme shows that flats 6 and 7 on the first floor and flats 8 and 9 on the second floor would have small terrace/balconies facing rearwards. Although the views from these are shown to be contained to the side by 1.7m high privacy screens, these screens would be unlikely to prevent a person standing on any terrace from looking towards the neighbours in their gardens. Moreover, the terraces would be sited relatively close to the party boundaries and this, combined with the first and second floor height, would give rise to direct overlooking and a loss of privacy in the gardens. The adjoining occupiers would have a clear perception of being overlooked and this would result in harm to the occupiers’ enjoyment of their gardens.”.

7.1.2 He also went on to say (at paragraph 16) that:

“The scheme shows that two of the ground floor flats would have access to private garden spaces while the other flats would share the communal gardens space at the rear of the site. The scheme has tried to give the five units at the rear a private terrace space but this has resulted in a problem of overlooking as described in paragraph 13 above. Nevertheless the communal garden space is large enough to give each flat more than sufficient space to meet the standards set out in Policy DMHB 18....”.

7.1.3 The Council also considered the issue of overlooking at Section 7.08 of their Committee report for the most recent 8-unit scheme, concluding that:

“The Committee Report for application reference 22642/APP/2020/3181 raised no objection to the introduction of balconies to the rear elevation of the property, subject to privacy screens being secured by condition. The same stance would have been applied to this application, had it been recommended for approval.”.

7.1.4 Notwithstanding the differing positions of the Inspector and Council in respect of this issue, the proposal has been amended to remove the balconies altogether with resident's relying on access to the rear communal garden. This will limit any overlooking and result in a rear façade that is more in keeping with the character and appearance of neighbouring properties, in accordance with Policy DMHB18 of the Council's Development Management DPD.

7.2 Outlook from Ground Floor Flats

7.2.1 The Inspector also raised concerns about the level of outlook from the proposed ground floor flats, stating:

“In relation to the future residents of the flats themselves, I have concerns that the proposed scheme would not provide a reasonable living environment for some of the flats. Because of the depth of the structure and the need to avoid overlooking from windows on flank walls the windows are all shown to be glazed with obscure glass. This is usual for bathrooms and toilets but the proposed floorplans show that the only window to a bedroom/study of flat 2; a secondary bedroom window to flat 2; and the only kitchen window to flats 1, 3, and 4 would be obscure glazed. I agree with the Council's assessment that these rooms would not be provided with an adequate level of outlook.”.

7.2.2 In order to address this issue the internal layout of the ground and first floor has been amended so there will be no side facing habitable room windows. The only side facing windows that continue to exist are obscure glazed bathroom windows which the Inspector indicated would be acceptable.

7.3 Parking

7.3.1 The Inspector raised concerns about the level of parking provision which proposed 4 spaces for 9 units at a ratio of 0.44 spaces per unit. At paragraph 18 he noted:

"The scheme puts forward 4 parking spaces for the 9 flats while the Council/highway authority says that the adopted standards indicate for flats of the size proposed between 10-12 spaces should be provided on site. This is a substantial under provision and it is likely to result in roadside parking on the classified Joel Street or on neighbouring side streets. I note the appellants' evidence about the low levels of 'on-street parking stress' locally and other inspector's decisions on similar cases, but the appeal scheme would not meet even a very reduced provision of 0.5 spaces per residential unit.".

7.3.2 He then went on to say (at paragraphs 19 and 20) that:

"In terms of whether other forms of travel are reasonably available to the occupiers of the proposed flats to offset the parking needs, I understand that the site at the moment has a PTAL of 2 which is considered to be low resulting in a higher dependency on the ownership and use of car transport.

Considered on its individual merits I find that the proposed scheme would have inadequate parking provision within the site and such under provision would be likely to result in parking pressure on the highway which would not be in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety or the free flow of traffic.".

7.3.3 The same issue was also considered by the Council as part of their assessment of the 8-unit/4 parking space scheme. At Section 7.10 of the Committee Report it states that the maximum parking demand for the proposed mix of units under the London Plan would be 6 spaces while under the Hillingdon Local Plan it was 12 spaces. It then went on to say:

"The concerns raised by neighbouring residents about parking stress have been duly noted. Whilst the proposal would fall short by 2 spaces of the London plan maximum parking requirement, a parking survey has been submitted to demonstrate that the car parking demand generated by the development could be accommodated safely on-street. The Council's Highway Officer has reviewed the parking survey results and has not disputed these findings. The Council is not in possession of any substantive evidence to demonstrate that the future residents choosing to park on surrounding streets would lead to unacceptable levels of congestion or harm highway safety. Moreover, given the site's location within walking and cycling distance of trains and buses, this is likely to reduce future occupants dependence on private motor vehicles (as highlighted by the Inspector in the Appeal Decision letter relating to No. 190 Joel Street).

Taking the above factors into account, it is considered unlikely that the proposal would generate such a significant increase in demand for road parking that its effects would result in harm to highway safety of the efficient working of the local highway network.".

7.3.4 Since the time of the appeal the number and mix of units has reduced from 9 flats (3 x 1 bed, 5 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed) down to 8 flats (1 x studio, 5 x 1 bed, 1 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed), resulting in a reduction from 25 to 18 habitable rooms. The PTAL rating has also risen from 2 to 3 owing to the increased frequency of Metropolitan Line services to Northwood Hills Underground Station.

7.3.5 As a consequence of the above, the site is now more 'accessible' and the maximum parking requirement under the London Plan has reduced from 7.0 spaces down to 6.25 spaces and from 14.0 spaces down to 11.5 spaces under the Hillingdon Local Plan. The theoretical parking generation is therefore now identical to that generated under the 8-unit scheme which the Council found to be acceptable.

7.3.6 Moreover, the Transport Statement submitted with the application shows that in the local area 34% of flats don't have a car, 51% have one car and 15% have two cars. Applying this car or van ownership census data to the scheme, the proposed 8 flats will generate a parking demand for 7 cars. Given that 4 parking spaces will be provided on-site, 3 vehicles are likely to overspill onto the adjoining highway.

7.3.7 Two overnight parking surveys were carried out within a 200-metre radius of the site to ascertain the likely availability of on-street spaces within the study area. These showed that of the 100 unrestricted kerb side parking opportunities within the study area (which included only one side of Joel Street reflective of the

current parking conditions), an average of 58 cars were observed to be parked leaving 42 available spaces. This represents a parking stress level of only 58% which is well below the 90% generally considered to result in high levels of on-street parking stress.

- 7.3.8 Moreover, on Joel Street itself, there were 40 unrestricted kerbside parking spaces with only 8 shown to be parked, leaving 32 spaces available on Joel Street in close proximity to the site.
- 7.3.9 As such, the report concludes that the level of parking provision would be appropriate for the site taking into account the sites improved public transport accessibility, maximum parking requirements under the London Plan and the Council's Local Plan, and the availability of on-street parking within 200 metres of the site.
- 7.3.10 The report also demonstrates that similar conclusions were reached by an Inspector in respect of two schemes at 190 Joel Street approximately 150 metres to the south. The first was for 6 x 2 bed flats with 4 parking spaces which the Inspector found to be acceptable in March 2019 under Planning Ref: 16589/APP/2018/3310. The second relates to a scheme of 8 flats (2 x studio and 6 x 2 bed) with 4 parking spaces which although overturned was found to be acceptable on highway grounds for the same reasons as above (Planning Ref: 16589/APP/2019/3395). This latter parking ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit is identical to the proposed scheme and the site is 150m further from the station.
- 7.3.11 In light of the above, it has been demonstrated that the level of parking provision would be acceptable and not result in any unacceptable highway impacts.

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 Planning permission is sought for demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of a part one, part two and part three-storey building comprising 8 flats (1 x studio, 5 x 1 bed, 1 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed) with 4 parking spaces.
- 8.2 The proposal follows on from two earlier applications; one for 9 flats with 4 parking spaces that was refused at appeal; and another for 8 flats with 4 parking spaces that was refused at Committee.
- 8.3 The current application addresses all outstanding issues raised by the Inspector and Council as part of the earlier applications. These relate to overlooking from the rear balconies; lack of outlook from the side facing habitable rooms, and lack of parking relative to the number and mix of flats proposed.
- 8.4 The overlooking has been addressed by removing the rear facing balconies while ensuring residents have access to a large communal garden at the rear.
- 8.5 The lack of outlook from side facing habitable rooms has been addressed by reconfiguring the ground and first floors to ensure all habitable room windows now face the front or rear with no side facing habitable room windows.
- 8.6 The parking issue has been resolved by reducing the number and mix of units so a parking ratio of 0.5 spaces would be achieved, which the Inspector indicated would be acceptable and the Council found to be acceptable on the most recent 8-unit/4 parking space scheme.
- 8.7 The revised proposal will also continue to sit comfortably within the street scene and reflect the scale, character and architectural detailing of neighbouring houses. The removal of the rear facing balconies will also simplify the rear façade and ensure the proposal is in keeping with the wider character and appearance of the area.
- 8.8 In light of the above the proposal would make the best and most efficient use of this brownfield site in close proximity to public transport, local shops and services. It's therefore respectfully requested that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.