

PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision**Item 6.2****1.0 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION DETAILS**

Ref: 19/01837/FUL
 Location: 78 Higher Drive, Purley, CR8 2HG
 Ward: Kenley
 Description: Demolition of existing detached dwelling and erection of a three/four storey building to provide a total of 9 units as well as associated refuse and cycle stores, landscaping, vehicular access and car parking.
 Drawing Nos: P1, P2(H), P3(F) and P4(E)
 Applicant: Mr Andrew Lillistone
 Agent: Mr Paul Webster
 Case Officer: Tim Edwards

	studio	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
Existing				1	
Proposed flats		2 (2 x 2 person)	3 (1 x 4 person 2 x 3 person)	4 (1 x 4 person 1 x 5 person 2 x 6 person)	

All units are proposed for private sale

Number of car parking spaces	Number of cycle parking spaces
9	16

- 1.1 This application is being reported to Planning Committee because the Ward Councillor (Councillor Steve O'Connell) and adjoining Ward Councillor (Simon Brew) have made representations in accordance with the Committee Consideration Criteria and requested Planning Committee consideration and objections above the threshold in the Committee Consideration Criteria have been received.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Planning Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission
- 2.2 That the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport has delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions

1. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings and reports except where specified by conditions
2. Details of materials to be submitted
3. Hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatment and retaining walls to be submitted
4. Details of children's play-space to be provided
5. Details (final position, materials, height) of access enclosure to bin and bike store to be agreed

6. Obscure gazing to windows in south eastern flank elevation serving the bathroom and bedroom of flat 5 (first floor) and the bathroom and lounge of flat 2 (upper ground floor).
7. Details of terrace screening to be agreed
8. Car parking and vehicle access provided as specified
9. Enter into any relevant agreements to close existing access, provide new access, relocate telegraph pole and make any footpath modifications as required.
10. Details of electric vehicle charging point to be submitted
11. Construction Logistics Plan to be submitted
12. Secure visibility splays
13. 19% Carbon reduction
14. 110 Litre Water usage
15. Details of site specific SuDS to be submitted
16. Trees - Accordance with the Arb Report and Tree Protection Plan
17. Time limit of 3 years
18. Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport

Informatives

- 1) Community Infrastructure Levy
 - 2) Code of practise for Construction Sites
 - 3) Wildlife protection
 - 4) Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport
- 2.3 That the Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3.0 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

- 3.1 The proposal includes the following:
- Demolition of existing house
 - Erection of a three/four storey building to create 9 residential units including 4 x 3 bed flats, 3 x 2 bed flats and 2 x 1 bed flats.
 - Provision of communal external amenity space including children's play space
 - Provision of 9 off-street parking spaces (3 blue badge)
 - Provision of associated refuse and cycle stores
- 3.2 During the course of the application amended plans have been received to provide a blue badge parking space at the rear of the site, relocate cycle stores, simplification of front elevation, oriel windows provided on the south flank elevation at first floor level and a more defined private outdoor space for the lower ground floor flat.

Site and Surroundings

- 3.3 The site is located on the south-western side of Higher Drive and currently comprises a 2-storey detached house with an attached garage to the side of the dwelling. The site slopes steeply down from the street frontage and there is some terracing within the rear garden. The site has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 1b.

- 3.4 Development at the adjoining property (76 Higher Drive) is underway for the demolition of the existing house and erection of a part 2, part 3 storey building comprising 9 flats (LBC ref 17/01641/FUL).



Fig 1: Aerial street view highlighting the proposed site within the surrounding street-scene

Planning History

- 3.5 19/00138/PRE New Build Residential – Demolition of existing house and erection of 9 flats.

Neighbouring site - 76 Higher Drive

- 3.6 On 7th July 2017, planning permission was granted for the demolition of existing house: erection of two/three storey building with accommodation in roof-space comprising 6 two bedroom, 2 three bedroom and 1 one bedroom flats: formation of vehicular access and provision of associated parking (LBC Ref 17/01641/FUL).

4.0 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The principle of the development is acceptable given the residential character of the surrounding area.
- The design and appearance of the development is appropriate, respecting the character of the surrounding area.
- The living conditions of adjoining occupiers would be protected from undue harm subject to conditions.
- The living standards of future occupiers are satisfactory and Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS) compliant.

- The level of parking and impact upon highway safety and efficiency is considered acceptable.
- Sustainability aspects can be controlled by conditions.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

- 5.1 The views of the Planning Service are expressed in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section below.

6.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 The application has been publicised by 8 letters of notification to neighbouring properties in the vicinity of the application site. The number of representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application are as follows:

No of individual responses: Objecting: 34 Supporting: 0 Comment: 0

- 6.2 Representations have been made from the following local groups/societies:

- Foxley Resident's Association (Objected)
- Hartley and District Resident's (Objected)

- 6.3 The following issues were raised in representations. Those that are material to the determination of the application, are addressed in substance in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section of this report:

Objection	Officer comment
<i>Design and appearance</i>	
Overdevelopment of the site / too close to street	Addressed in paragraphs 8.5 – 8.10
Layout, siting, scale, density, bulk, massing, design and cumulative impact out of keeping/character with street/obtrusive	Addressed in paragraphs 8.5 – 8.10
Height and footprint excessive	Addressed in paragraphs 8.5 – 8.10
<i>Impact on amenities of neighbouring properties</i>	
Loss of light to neighbouring properties	Addressed in paragraph 8.16 – 8.19
Overlooking and loss of privacy for neighbours	Addressed in paragraph 8.16 – 8.19
Visual intrusion / Exceeds 45 degree line	Addressed in paragraph 8.16 – 8.19
Loss of view	This is not a material planning consideration

General pollution and noise from the development and noise / light pollution from access / parking.	This is a residential development and there is no evidence or reason to suggest that the proposal would result in extra pollution or noise that is not associated with a residential area. The vehicles parked at the rear of the garden would be well removed from houses for the lights to be significantly harmful.
<i>Landscape/Trees</i>	
Loss of trees and hedgerows, vegetation and natural habitat	Addressed in paragraph 8.28 – 8.30
Harm to special character of the area of wooded hillsides and ridges	This relates to an old saved policy (Wooded Hillsides and Ridges) in the Unitary Development Plan, which has now been superseded by the Croydon local Plan 2018. This policy does not exist anymore.
Development is situated in an area where there is a high propensity for a number of protected species. Impact from this.	Addressed in paragraph 8.30
<i>Transport and parking</i>	
Design / location of parking spaces unacceptable	Addressed in paragraph 8.17
Increase in traffic on busy road	Addressed in paragraph 8.23
Inadequate parking provision. Cars parked on road will cause extra parking stress which his already a problem.	Addressed in paragraph 8.21 – 8.22
Access/Parking ramp too steep	Addressed in paragraph 8.23
Adverse impact on highway safety	Addressed in paragraph 8.23
Due to Root Protection Area some of driveway will be grass.	The access and parking areas will be a hard surface. The 'green area' on the tree protection plan, covering much of the access and parking area is not 'grass', but where new hard surfacing will be constructed using a 'No Dig' surfacing situated entirely above the existing soil

	surface and where needed using a proprietary cellular confinement system.
Unsuitable site for construction vehicles	Addressed in paragraph 8.33
Insufficient storage refuse and not ideally located.	Addressed in paragraph 8.25
<i>Other matters</i>	
Lack of supporting infrastructure	Addressed in paragraph 8.31
Does not meet M4(3) and M4(2) accessibility requirements	Addressed in paragraph 8.13 – 8.14
Unsafe / small play area	Addressed in paragraph 8.12
No affordable housing	Policy requires affordable housing to be secured on schemes with ten or more dwellings. This threshold is not triggered with this application.
Missing / incomplete information (Parking stress survey / section drawing showing neighbour / Tree protection plan / Design and Access statement / Ecology survey / Health Impact assessment / transport statement / Demolition-Construction Logistics Plan).	<p>The Councils validation requirements do not require a parking stress survey to be provided.</p> <p>The submitted drawings are sufficient to determine the application.</p> <p>The proposed side elevations and site sections provide clarity in regards to how the building would sit within the site.</p> <p>A Tree protection plan has been submitted.</p> <p>A Design and Access statement is found on the drawings.</p> <p>Ecology surveys are required for sites where there may be possible impacts on wildlife and biodiversity. Whilst representations state that this is an area where protected species are found there is no evidence of any on the site. Whilst some trees will be lost, replacement planting would be secured by condition.</p>

	<p>Moreover, these trees are not of any great value.</p> <p>The Councils validation requirements do not require a Health Impact assessment to be provided. None the less, with parking under the maximum requirement and good outdoor communal/play space the scheme would help improve health and promote healthy lifestyles by promoting walking.</p> <p>Transport assessments are only required for major applications. The planning statement includes a simple outline of the transport aspects of the application, which is acceptable for assessment for this scale of development.</p> <p>Demolition/Construction Logistics Plans are required for major developments, but would be secured by condition in the event of an approval.</p>
Stop application being processed.	This is not a material planning consideration.

6.4 Councillor Simon Brew (Purley & Woodcote) has made the following representations referring the application to Planning Committee (Objecting):

- Non-Viability of on-site parking (access too steep, especially in icy/wet conditions)
- Parking plan shows grass rather than paving
- Light pollution from parking at rear
- Inadequate disability access
- Inadequate bin store
- Overlooking
- Front building line too close to road
- Site worse than PTAL 1b due to steepness

6.5 Councillor Steve O'Connell (Kenley Councillor and GLA Member Croydon Sutton) has made the following representations referring the application to committee (Objecting):

- Inappropriate access and parking incline.
- Too large for plot.
- Detrimental effect on amenity of neighbouring properties.
- Too near to pavement and road.
- Missing documents.

7.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

7.1 In determining any planning application, the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of its Development Plan so far as is material to the application and to any other material considerations and the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Council's adopted Development Plan consists of the Consolidated London Plan 2016, the Croydon Local Plan 2018 and the South London Waste Plan 2012.

7.2 Government Guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), issued in February 2019. The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, requiring that development which accords with an up-to-date local plan should be approved without delay. The NPPF identifies a number of key issues for the delivery of sustainable development, those most relevant to this case are:

- Promoting sustainable transport;
- Making effective use of land;
- Achieving well-designed places;
- Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change.

7.3 The main policy considerations raised by the application that the Committee are required to consider are:

7.4 Consolidated London Plan 2016

- 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- 3.4 Optimising housing potential
- 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
- 3.8 Housing choice
- 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.12 Flood risk management
- 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- 5.16 Waste net self sufficiency
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.2 An inclusive environment
- 7.3 Designing out crime
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.21 Woodlands and trees

7.5 Croydon Local Plan 2018

- SP2 - Homes
- SP6.3 - Sustainable Design and Construction
- DM1 - Housing choice for sustainable communities
- SP4 – Urban Design and Local Character

- DM10 - Design and character
- DM13 - Refuse and recycling
- DM16 – Promoting healthy communities
- SP6 – Environment and Climate Change
- DM23 - Development and construction
- DM25 – Sustainable drainage systems and reducing floor risk
- SP7 – Green Grid
- DM27 – Biodiversity
- DM28 – Trees
- SP8 – Transport and communications
- DM29 - Promoting sustainable travel and reducing congestion
- DM30 - Car and cycle parking in new development

7.6 There is relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance as follows:

- London Housing SPG March 2016
- Croydon Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document April 2019

8.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the Planning Committee are required are as follows:

1. Principle of development
2. Townscape and visual impact
3. Housing quality for future occupiers
4. Residential amenity for neighbours
5. Access and parking
6. Sustainability and environment
7. Trees and landscaping
8. Other matters

Principle of Development

- 8.2 The London Plan and Croydon Local Plan identify appropriate use of land as a material consideration to ensure that opportunities for development are recognised and housing supply optimised. It is acknowledged that windfall sites, which might be able to facilitate sensitive renewal and intensification of existing residential areas, play an important role in meeting the need for larger properties in the capital, helping to address overcrowding and affordability issues. The application is for a flatted development providing additional homes within the borough which the Council is seeking to promote. The site is located within an existing residential area and as such, providing that the proposal respects the character and appearance of the surrounding area and there are no other impact issues, the principle is supported.
- 8.3 Policies seek to prevent the net loss of 3 bedroom homes (as originally built) or homes less than 130m² and to seek to deliver the strategic target that 30% of new homes should be suitably sized for family occupation. The existing building on site is a 3 bedroom house and 4 x three bedroom units are proposed, resulting in 44% family sized units and a significant uplift in family accommodation. The proposal therefore provides a net gain in family accommodation and contributes towards the Council's goal of achieving a strategic target of 30% three bedroom plus homes.

- 8.4 Careful consideration has been given to whether the proposal provides sufficient units within the proposed overall quantum of development, given the size of the units proposed. A reduction in the size of some units could lead to an increase in the number of units (potentially one or two units) leading to development (defined as “major” in characteristic). Whilst this would have triggered a number of other considerations including the provision of affordable housing, it is inevitable that such a development would not have been able to accord with the level of family unit provision required for “major” developments (70% of units in this location). A number of other considerations would have also applied (including zero carbon requirements) which would have also affected overall scheme viability. This is without factoring appropriate living conditions for future occupiers. As such, officers are satisfied that the unit mix proposed appropriately maximises the development potential of this site.

Townscape and Visual Impact

- 8.5 The existing dwelling does not hold any significant architectural merit and therefore there is no objection to its demolition. Whilst most properties in the area have traditional forms (two storeys with pitched roofs) there are a variety of house types and styles in the vicinity.
- 8.6 Policy DM10.1 states that proposals should achieve a minimum height of 3 storeys and the proposal is for a three storey building with the third floor accommodation contained in the roof-space, plus half an additional lower floor to the rear. Whilst the ridge line finishes noticeably higher than both neighbouring buildings this would not create a visually harmful impact and would be in line with guidance contained within the Suburban Design Guide. The SDG suggests appropriate ways of accommodating a third floor in differing scenarios. In the case of a site flanked by semi-detached properties (which this is to one side) it suggests that a full-width third floor can be provided partially within the roof, with a raised eaves line. Whilst the proposal does not fully follow this approach, it does include a significant amount of accommodation within a third floor roof level, sensitively accommodating additional floorspace similar to the SDG example below, whilst respecting the surrounding townscape.



Figure 2.10e: Where surrounding buildings are semi-detached homes in a planned estate, new developments should seek to accommodate a full third storey partially contained within the roof space to ensure the characteristic scale of the buildings along the street is maintained.

- 8.7 The new building would have a traditional form comprising two full storeys (from the front) with a pitched roof. From the frontage the building would have the appearance of a large detached dwelling with a front door, hipped roof and bay feature commonly found in this area. The building would have traditional external materials of red brick, hanging tile and plain roof tiles which would ensure the development would sit comfortably in the street scene and would represent an acceptable interpretation of the sympathetic and faithful approach endorsed by the SDG.



Figure 2: Plan of proposed frontage within the street scene

- 8.8 Whilst the building would have a greater footprint than the current house, given the layout of the buildings in this row and the spaces between them, the impact on the appearance of the area would not be harmed. Whilst it is acknowledged that the depth of the proposed built form would be significantly greater than the adjacent property (78A Higher Drive) it would be similar to that of the neighbouring flats under construction. Moreover, the proposed mass would not be readily apparent from any public vantage points. Crucially, the space between buildings would allow for adequate daylight and sunlight, which is a key indicator in the SDG for acceptable massing.
- 8.9 Whilst large areas of hard landscaping for forecourt parking are common in the area, the proposed side access and rear car parking is not a prevalent feature. However, due to the land sloping steeply downwards the parking at the rear would not be readily visible and would provide a creative way of accommodating parking on site with blue badge parking to the lower rear unit. Separated parking areas (front and rear of site) is also supported by the SDG, to balance the impact in the street scene. In terms of the frontage area, two parking spaces are proposed with the remaining area landscaped, which would be a 'softer' appearance than many buildings in the immediate vicinity and thereby in keeping with the general street scene.
- 8.10 The site is a suburban setting with a PTAL rating of 1b and as such, the London Plan indicates that the density levels ranges of 150-200 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha) would be appropriate. The proposal would be in excess of this range at 290 hr/ha. However, the London Plan further indicates that it is not appropriate to apply these ranges mechanistically, as the density ranges are broad, to enable account to be taken of other factors relevant to optimising potential – such as local context, design and transport capacity. The application site is within an established residential area and is comparable in size to other flatted and neighbouring back-land developments approved throughout the borough. As outlined above, the proposal would overall result in a development that would respect the pattern and rhythm of neighbouring area and would not harm the appearance of the street scene. The materials proposed would blend in with the existing area in terms of stock bricks, a tiled roof and casement window treatments which are considered acceptable and a high standard of design. Further details to ensure their compatibility will be required by way of a condition.

Housing Quality for Future Occupiers

- 8.11 All of the proposed new units would comply with internal dimensions required by the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) and meet the minimum private outdoor space requirements.
- 8.12 A communal garden is provided at the rear of the site which would be of a useable size and shape. The required child play space (22 sq m) for this scheme is shown to be

provided within the communal garden space and full details of this area can be secured by condition.

- 8.13 There is inadequate space to provide a ramped access (of the required gradient to facilitate full wheelchair access within the site) to serve the building. Efforts have been made to provide blue badge spaces to the front and rear, which would allow step free access to the ground and lower ground units from these spaces respectively. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to provide M4(2) compliant units as level access is not available to the building *and* all the communal facilities required to service these. Specifically, the lower ground unit would have step free access to the communal/play space, but not reasonable level access to the refuse store (which needs to be close to the road). Conversely, the ground floor units would not have a reasonable step free route to the rear communal/play area.
- 8.14 The level/step-free access issues have arisen due to the topography of the site and the building being set at a lower level to retain the character of the area. Whilst the inclusion of a lift shaft might well have provided a solution to this matter, it would have had significant impact on viability and would have certainly reduced the number of rooms and/or flats and would have reduced the capacity of the site to optimise the number of units sustainably achievable. In such circumstances, the London Plan advises that units above or below the ground floor should satisfy M4(1), which is achievable. Whilst this flexibility does not apply to ground floor units, in view of the particular site circumstances (steeply sloped) and in order to protect the character of the street scene against the backdrop of housing need, officers are satisfied that the proposed development would be acceptable without providing level access.
- 8.15 The development includes nine units all with adequate amenities and overall provides an acceptable standard of accommodation for future occupiers.

Residential Amenity for Neighbours

- 8.16 The main properties that would be affected by the proposed development are 76 and 78a Higher Drive. The opposing dwelling at 73 Higher Drive is sufficiently removed and on higher land for there to be no detrimental impact to the occupiers amenities. The rear of the site abuts the end of a long garden serving 35 Burcott Road and given this separation distance, the scheme would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of these occupiers.

78a Higher Drive

- 8.17 This semi-detached dwelling is located to the south east of the site and has a garage adjacent to the boundary. Whilst the proposal is significantly deeper within the plot than 78a Higher Drive and would just encroach into the horizontal 45 degree angle from the rear windows the building (at a distance of 16.5m) the property is well removed and the proposed landscaping, parking spaces and the driveway (serving the spaces at the rear) between the buildings further reduce the impact. It proposed development would also be sited due north of 78A Higher Drive and would have no impact on sunlight with a relatively open outlook retained when looking down the garden. As such, the proposal would not be unduly overbearing or cause an unacceptable loss of outlook or light, which is also reflected in the scheme not encroaching the vertical 45 degree line from the rear neighbouring windows. With landscaping between the car parking spaces and the boundary, the location of the cars would not create a significantly harmful impact from noise or lights.



Fig 3: Plan highlighting the relationship with the adjoining occupiers.

- 8.18 All the flank windows on the south facing elevation at or above upper ground floor level beyond the rear elevation of 78a Higher Drive would either be angled away from the neighbouring property or can be obscured (to limit any sense of being overlooked). The rear terrace areas would also be screened up to a height of 1.7m – to limit side on views across rear gardens. Subject to the imposition of suitably worded conditions, there would be no harmful overlooking or loss of privacy.

No.76 Higher Drive

- 8.19 Following a recent planning permission, construction works are currently underway at 76 Higher Drive. The proposed scheme would not project beyond the rear of this neighbouring development, nor encroach a 45 degree line to the front. Given this and that the neighbouring development does not have any flank windows, there would not be a detrimental impact on the light, outlook or privacy of future neighbouring occupiers.

Access and Parking

- 8.20 The site lies within an area with a PTAL rating of 1b, indicating poor access to public transport facilities. The site is located approximately 800m walking distance to Reedham train station and 1.2km walking distance from Purley train station. The site is less than 500m walking distance from a bus stop servicing the 455 bus route.
- 8.21 The London Plan sets out the maximum parking standards, including up to 1.5 parking spaces for 3 bedroom units and less than 1 car parking space for 1-2 bedroom units. Therefore the London Plan specifies up to 11 on-site car parking spaces could be

accommodated for the proposed development – although this is also dependent upon other site circumstances.

- 8.22 The proposal seeks to provide 9 (1:1) on-site car parking spaces which is a suitable ratio and would comply with policy requirements. Concern has been raised within the representation that a parking stress survey has not been undertaken to ascertain the surrounding parking stress levels and the ability of the surrounding streets to accommodate any additional parking. Officers have been to the site and the area a number of times and it is evident that the local roads have plenty of availability for parking. There is also no concern regarding a cumulative impact from neighbouring developments. Policy requires 20% of parking bays should have EVCP with future provision available for the other bays. Details and provision of the EVCP can be secured by condition.
- 8.23 The proposal seek to provide a new vehicular access to the site and it has been demonstrated that vehicles would be able to access and exit the site in forward gear. It is prudent to attach a condition to ensure that the pedestrian visibility splays are secured which should ensure that the existing safety and efficiency of the highway network is suitably protected and maintained. A telephone pole would need to be re-located and a Grampian style condition is recommended so that such works can be secured at an early stage. A number of representations have raised concerns over the steepness of the access – although this is an issue best managed through a Building Regulations process. Notwithstanding this, for a straight ramp the maximum gradient should be 1:6, which also requires a 3m transition area of 1:12 at the top and bottom. The ramp has a 1:12 gradient at the bottom and throughout the initial part of the access (up to where the refuse is located) which would also be acceptable for waste collection. Pedestrians are not reliant on using the whole ramp and cyclists have the option of a dedicated route to the north of the building. 16 cycle parking spaces would need to be provided for the scheme. Space has been made for cycle storage towards the rear of the site, the details of which can be secured by condition.
- 8.25 Ideally, refuse stores should be incorporated within the building footprint. However, in this instance the provision of the refuse store along the side boundary within the front and adjoining the driveway is considered acceptable, given that it would be setback, discreet (due to land levels sloping down) and accessible for both residents and collection. Blocks with 9 units require 1100ltr for general waste, 128 ltrs of dry recycling per flat and 9.6ltrs of food recycling per flat, the refuse area shown accommodates this. A dedicated area is also shown for bulky waste (a minimum of 10sq.m). Final details for refuse collection can be secured by condition.

Environment and sustainability

- 8.26 Conditions can be attached to ensure that a 19% reduction in CO2 emissions over 2013 Building Regulations is achieved and mains water consumption would meet a target of 110 litres or less per head per day.
- 8.27 The site is at limited risk of groundwater flooding and is sloping. Given the areas for landscaping there are opportunities for SuDS to be located in the communal areas. Officers are satisfied that these issues can be dealt with by condition and will reduce local flood risk and enhance the local environment.

Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

8.28 The site is not covered by any Tree Preservation Orders and the table below highlights the existing and proposed situation.

	Trees	Groups	Hedges
Existing	16	4	2
To be removed	8	1	Partial removal of 1

8.29 None of the proposed trees have any particular merit on the site and there is no objection to their removal. The submitted arboricultural method statement report and accompanying tree protection plans (demolition and construction) are acceptable and can be secured by condition. The plans show some replacement landscaping to the site and full details of hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatment will be secured by condition.

8.30 The application site is not near an area of special scientific interest or a site of nature conservation value. Representations have not included any hard evidence of the presence (or likely presence) of protected species on site and from the officer's site visit, there is no evidence to suggest that this is the case. Consequently, further surveys are not deemed necessary. With regard to wildlife, it is recommended for an informative to be placed on the decision notice to advise the applicant to see the standing advice by Natural England in the event protected species are found on site.

Other matters

8.31 The development will be liable for a charge under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This payment will contribute to delivering infrastructure to support the development of the area, such as local schools.

Conclusions

8.32 The principle of development is considered acceptable within this area. The development has been designed to ensure its appearance respects the character of the surrounding area and that there is no harmful impact on the adjacent properties. Given the inclusion of a good number of family units and the general constraints of a sloping site, the amenities of future and neighbouring occupiers and the quality of accommodation would be acceptable. The impact on the highway network and environmental is also acceptable. Thus the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the relevant policies.

8.33 In the event of a permission a condition would secure a Demolition/Construction Logistic Plan before commencement of work so that works are suitably controlled.

8.34 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account.