



Council Offices, Kiln Road,
Thundersley, Benfleet,
Essex SS7 1TF.
Tel. No: 01268 882200
Fax No: 01268 882455



David Marchant LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) CEng FICE FCMI
Chief Executive

AGENDA

Committee: DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Date and Time: Tuesday 1st July 2014 at 7.30 p.m.

Venue: Council Chamber

N.B. This meeting will be webcast live on the internet.

**Membership: Councillors Ladzrie (Chairman), Smith (Vice Chairman),
Anderson, Barrett, Blackwell, Burch, Cross, Hart, Mrs King,
Varker, Mrs Wass, N. Watson and Wood**

Canvey Island Town Councillors : Acott and Greig

**Officers attending: Steve Rogers – Head of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Fiona Wilson – Head of Legal Services
Kim Fisher – Chief Development Control Officer**

Enquiries: Cheryl Salmon, Ext. 2454

PART I (Business to be taken in public)

1. Apologies

2. Members' Interests

3. Minutes

A copy of the Minutes of the meeting held on 6th May 2014 is attached.

4. Public Speakers

The Chairman will announce the names of those persons who wish to speak in support /objection under Agenda Item No. 5 (if any).

5. Deposited Plans

Report of the Head of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods is attached.

	Application No.	Address	Page
1.	CPT/9/14/FUL	14 Albion Road, Benfleet (Appleton Ward)	1
2.	14/0131/FUL	14 Albion Road, Benfleet (Appleton Ward)	6
3.	14/0050/FUL	8 Borrowdale Road, Benfleet (St Peter's Ward)	12
4.	14/0061/FUL	Water Tower, 335 Benfleet Road, Benfleet (Boyce Ward)	17
5.	14/0062/LBC	Water Tower, 335 Benfleet Road, Benfleet (Boyce Ward)	21
6.	14/0155/FUL	72 Roseberry Avenue, Benfleet (St Peter's Ward)	26
7.	14/0159/FUL	74 Roseberry Avenue, Benfleet (St Peter's Ward)	32

Agendas and Minutes can be viewed at www.castlepoint.gov.uk
Copies are available in larger print & audio format upon request
If you would like a copy of this agenda in another language or alternative format:
Phone: 0207 520 1431 or email translations@languageline.co.uk

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

6th MAY 2014

PRESENT: Councillors Brunt (Chairman), Ladzrie (Vice-Chairman), Anderson, Barrett, Blackwell, Cross, Mrs Govier, Hart, Mrs Liddiard, Skipp, Smith and Canvey Island Town Councillor Greig.

Councillors S. Cole, Harvey, Stanley, Tucker and N. Watson also attended.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs King and Canvey Island Town Councillor Ms Swann.

40. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

There were none.

41. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 1st April 2014 were taken as read and signed as correct.

42. DEPOSITED PLANS

- (a) CPT/602/13/FUL – LAND ADJACENT TO FELSTEAD ROAD AND BOWERS ROAD, BENFLEET, ESSEX (BOYCE AND APPLETON WARDS) – 178 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, INFRASTRUCTURE AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, TO INCLUDE FORMATION OF COMMUNITY WOODLAND – REDROW HOMES LTD AND THE LANDOWNERS**

This application sought full planning permission for 178 dwellings with associated access, infrastructure and public open space, including the provision of community woodland areas.

Residential development of the site had been identified as inappropriate development in the Green Belt however it could exceptionally be justified by the existence of very special circumstances. In this instance, the site had been identified as forming part of the Council's five year housing land supply and this was considered to amount to the very special circumstances needed to justify otherwise inappropriate development. This factor alone however did not outweigh the objections raised to the proposal on the basis of overdevelopment of the site as demonstrated by the poor layout, provision of inadequate isolation spaces, poor setting in the streetscene, the consequent cramped urban appearance and domination of the proposed development by car parking. The

proposal also failed to adequately mitigate the impact of the development on a protected species.

It was considered that the proposal was too focused on achieving the greatest number of dwellings on the site and good design and layout had been sacrificed to achieve an inappropriate quantum of development. The proposal was therefore recommended for refusal

Essex County Councillor Bayley spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Thornton, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

During discussion Councillors stated that the proposal represented unacceptable overdevelopment of the site. Concerns were raised regarding the lack of space between properties, lack of parking provision, poor design and that the proposal failed to demonstrate full consideration of ecological implications.

Following detailed discussion the Committee agreed with the Planning Officer's recommendation and it was therefore -

Resolved – That the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal represents unacceptable overdevelopment of the site as demonstrated by the poor layout, provision of inadequate isolation spaces, inadequate private amenity depths, poor setting in the streetscene, provision of inadequate amenity areas, the consequent cramped urban appearance and the domination of the proposed development by car parking contrary to Policies EC2 and H9 of the Council's Adopted Local Plan, RDG2, RDG3, RDG5, RDG6 and RDG12 of the Residential Design Guidance and National Guidance as contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and Guidance .
2. The proposal fails to create feature dwellings, designed to turn corners, on corner locations within the site. The proposed dwellings on corner plots fail to provide adequate interest and articulation in all the elevations facing the public realm. The proposal is considered to present a poor and confusing layout, lacking distinguishing and distinctive townscape features contrary to Policy EC2 of the adopted Local Plan, RDG4 of the Residential Design Guidance and Government Guidance as contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and Guidance.
3. The proposal, by virtue of its relationship with the neighbouring dwellings to the south at Nos. 6 & 7 The Chimes and No 20 Kale Road would be likely to lead to undue dominance of these properties to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers thereof, contrary to Policy EC2 of the adopted Local Plan, RDG3 of the Residential Design Guidance and Government Guidance

as contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and Guidance.

4. The proposed development fails to adequately address boundary treatments on corner plots resulting in long stretches of boundary walls/fences along the return frontages in many locations. It is considered that this results in an obtrusive and unattractive form of development detrimental to the character of the streetscene contrary to Policy EC2 of the Council's Adopted Local Plan, RDG10 of the Residential Design Guidance and Government Guidance as contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and Guidance.
5. The proposal fails to provide adequate affordable housing on site contrary to Policy H7 of the Council's Adopted Local Plan and the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document.
6. The proposed provision of car parking spaces to the front of dwellings in some instances result in the blocking of the entrance doors. It is considered that this situation is likely to dissuade the occupiers of these dwellings from parking in that location, leading to increased parking on the highway, to the detriment of the amenity of the adjoining residents and the safety and convenience of the other highway users contrary to Policy EC2 of the Council's Adopted Local Plan.
7. The proposed development fails to provide adequate unallocated visitor parking spaces within the development. It is considered that this would lead to vehicles being left on the highway, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the estate and the amenity of adjoining residents and to the danger and inconvenience of other road users, contrary to Policies EC2 and T8 of the Council's Adopted Local Plan and RDG12 of the Residential Design Guidance.
8. The proposal, by virtue of the provision of shared spaces and the non-availability of alternative means to navigate by, fails to ensure accessibility to the site to some disabled people contrary to Policy H11 of the Council's Adopted Local Plan.
9. The proposal, by virtue of the absence of clear and adequate details in respect of the surface water disposal and identification of the culvert identified by the Environment Agency fails to demonstrate that flood risk would not be increased on the site, contrary to Government guidance as contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. The proposal by reason of the limited landscaping proposals fails to adequately promote the site as a development in a woodland setting and by virtue of very limited landscaping within

the scheme and along Bowers Road results in a stark and urban form of development, in conflict with the original woodland concept for the development of the site and detrimental to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy EC2 of the Council's Adopted Local Plan and RDG11 of the Residential Design Guidance.

11. The proposal fails to demonstrate full consideration of the ecological implications of the development or provide appropriate mitigation of the impact of the proposed development on a protected species, contrary to Policy EC13 of the adopted Local Plan and Government Guidance as contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and Guidance.

43. QUARTERLY ENFORCEMENT UPDATE

Members were informed of all formal planning enforcement action and investigations undertaken by the Council's Planning Enforcement Officer.

The Chairman and Members of the Committee took the opportunity to ask questions on some of the enforcement cases, which were answered by the Chief Development Control Officer.

The Chairman thanked the Enforcement Team for their hard work in dealing with these cases.

44. VOTE OF THANKS TO THE CHAIRMAN

Resolved – That a vote of thanks be accorded to Councillor Cliff Brunt for his service as Chairman of the Development Control Committee.

Chairman

ITEM 1

Application Number:	CPT/9/14/FUL
Address:	14 Albion Road Benfleet Essex SS7 5PU (Appleton Ward)
Description of Development:	Garage Conversion And Ramp To Front
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Peake
Case Officer	Mrs Sophie Adams

Summary

The application seeks permission to convert the semi-integral garage to living accommodation and to install a front ramp. The works are required to provide wheelchair access to the property and essential facilities. The proposal will result in the property being reliant on the front garden of the site to provide for the parking needs of the dwelling. The front garden is of insufficient size to provide adequate parking facilities and would therefore be likely to result in cars being parked on the highway or partially on the site and partially on the highway, to the detriment of highway safety, and to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area, contrary to policies EC2 and T8 of the adopted Local Plan. The application is therefore recommended for **REFUSAL**.

The proposal is presented to the Development Control Committee at the request of Councillor Skipp in order for the committee to assess the effect of these proposals on car parking provision at the site and on-street car parking in the surrounding area.

A further application has been submitted for this site (Reference: 14/0131/FUL) and is presented under Agenda Item 2.

Introduction

The application site is located on the northern side of Albion Road some 12m west of its junction with Elounda Court and some 33m east of its junction with St Clements Road. The application site is of a regular shape with a frontage of some 11m and a depth of some 25.5m.

A detached, four bedroomed house with semi-integral garage occupies the site. The front of the site is hard surfaced with a 1m high wall to the front boundary. There is a vehicular crossover with a width of some 4m to the front of the property enabling vehicular access to the garage.

The street consists of detached houses of similar design.

Site Visit

It is recommended that Members visit the site prior to determination of the application.

The Proposal

The applicant seeks consent to convert the garage to living accommodation and install a front ramp.

The proposal will replace the garage door with a flush 1.2m by 1.95m window and brickwork to blend with the existing.

A front ramp, some 1m deep and 5.7m wide, is proposed along the front of the property eastwards from the property's main entrance. The ramp then slopes in two directions one to the front boundary and one along the side of the property towards the rear amenity area. The front ramp is some 3.3m deep and 1m wide. The rear ramp is some 1m wide and 2.4m deep. The ramp would have a total height of 0.3m. A hand rail is proposed along the ramp to height of some 0.9m.

There are also two steps proposed to allow access from the hard surface to the ramp in front of the property's main entrance.

The proposal will necessitate the replacement of an existing front bow window with a flush window, to allow wheelchair access.

The works are required to meet the needs of a physically impaired person.

Additional Documentation

No additional planning documentation has been provided.

Planning History

14/0131/FUL – Garage conversion with bow window to front, alterations to front boundary wall, installation of ramp, decking area to rear and external alterations. This application was submitted by a different agent after the submission of the current application and includes works beyond that required for the physically impaired member of the household. This application will also be considered at this Committee, under Agenda Item 2.

CPT/564/86 – Two detached, four bedroomed houses with garages – Approved 17th June 1986 subject to conditions. Condition number 6 states:

The garage(s) shall be retained solely for that use and not converted into living accommodation.

REASON: To retain adequate on site garaging provision.

Local Plan Allocation

Residential

Relevant Policies and Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

Castle Point Adopted Local Plan (Adopted November 1998)

EC2	Design
H17	Housing Development – Design and Layout
T8	Parking Standards

Residential Design Guidance (Adopted January 2013)

RDG3	Building Lines
RDG5	Privacy and Living Conditions
RDG6	Amenity Space
RDG8	Detailing

Public Consultation

No statutory consultation was undertaken and no responses have been received to the neighbour consultation exercise.

Evaluation of Proposal

Visual impact

Policy EC2 of the adopted Local Plan states that a high standard of design will be expected of all alterations and extensions to existing buildings. Policy H17 states that in assessing the design aspects of proposals for housing, the Local Planning Authority will have regard to its adopted design guidelines (RDG). These policies are considered to be in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

RDG8 states that the provision of detailing elements must be consistent with the overall architectural approach of the dwelling, and their design and siting should be an integral part of the dwelling. The design of all development should result in well proportioned and balanced properties.

The proposed new windows are considered to have a limited detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the property. The change to the windows is also likely to have a limited impact within this street scene. The proposed ramp would be brick built with a 0.9m high handrail. The ramp is considered unlikely to enhance the character and appearance of the dwelling, however any adverse impact is not considered so significant as to justify a recommendation of refusal. No objection is therefore raised to these elements of the proposal.

RDG3 states that in all cases projections into building lines which face the public realm must make a positive contribution but if there is a distinct pattern of development which creates an exceptionally strong building line development must not result in a disruption to this pattern.

The proposed ramp would project in front of the dwelling. Albion Road is considered to have an exceptionally strong building line and the ramp would project into the building line and face the public realm. The proposed ramp would have a limited height, of some 0.3m, but would be provided with a hand rail to a height of 1.3m. This structure would be clearly visible in the street scene, but given the nature of its form it is considered unlikely to significantly disrupt the building line. No objection is therefore raised to the proposal under RDG3.

Highway Implications and Parking

Policy EC2 also states that all modes of movement must be made safe and convenient.

Policy T8 requires adopted parking standards to be taken into account. In this case, the current standards are the adopted vehicle parking standards, which require the provision of two car parking spaces, each having a size of 5.5m by 2.9m, for dwellings having two or more bedrooms. This provision is consistent with paragraph 39 of the NPPF which requires local planning authorities to set such standards reflecting local circumstance.

The proposal will result in the removal of the garage. The proposal would also increase the number of bedrooms from four to five. The extended dwelling would require the provision of two car parking spaces and would be reliant on the front forecourt to provide such spaces.

The existing garage is set back from the road, providing a forecourt of some 6.1m deep and 4m wide. This is sufficient to provide one car parking space.

The whole of the front garden serving the property is currently hardsurfaced. Following the installation of the proposed ramp an area of some 3.6m deep, with a width of 5.1m would be retained. This area is inadequate to provide a second car parking space to the appropriate standard.

Furthermore, it is considered that this area would fail to provide a safe and convenient parking space, the area available being difficult to access. As a consequence it is considered that occupiers of the dwelling would be dissuaded from using the space, even if it were of a suitable size and as a consequence would be likely to park on the highway, to the danger and inconvenience of other road users.

The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy EC2 and T8 of the adopted Local Plan and the current adopted parking standards.

The adopted parking standards do state that for main urban areas a reduction in the parking requirement may be considered. A main urban area is defined as those having frequent and extensive public transport and cycling and walking links, accessing education, healthcare, food shopping and employment. The application property is within a residential area and is in close proximity to both secondary and primary schools. However the site is a considerable distance from the town centres of Tarpots and Benfleet. Whilst there are facilities within walking distance; the application site cannot be described as having access to frequent and extensive facilities and the occupiers of the dwelling are therefore likely to be reliant on the use of motor vehicles. Under the circumstances it is not considered appropriate to reduce the parking requirement.

It is acknowledged that the works resulting in the parking deficiency are required to provide for specific personal circumstances of the occupiers of the site. Whilst the Planning Authority may have sympathy with the applicant's situation it is not considered that the circumstances of the individual concerned are so limited in their propensity to occur as to provide sufficient justification to overcome the long term harm that would be caused by the inadequate parking provision on this site.

Furthermore it is considered that the parking of vehicles on the highway would result in visual clutter, detracting from the character and appearance of the area.

The application property is not within a sustainable urban location and the proposal will reduce the amount of useable parking within the site to a substandard level resulting in a lack of safe and convenient parking on the site and detriment to highway safety, contrary to policies T8 and EC2 of the adopted Local Plan. An objection is raised accordingly.

Other issues

RDG5 deals with privacy and living conditions. The proposal will increase the ground level of the site to the front, by reason of the provision of the ramp. However, from the ramp it would only be possible to view the front gardens of the adjoining properties and the public highway. Under these circumstances the proposal is considered unlikely to lead to any significant loss of privacy.

RDG6 states that amenity space should cater for the outdoor needs of all occupiers and that development involving individual dwellings should be provided with at least 15m² amenity space per habitable room. The proposal would increase the number of habitable rooms from seven to eight resulting in a requirement of 120m² amenity area. The size of the amenity area is some 96m², which is unchanged by the proposal. Whilst deficient the space is a useable shape and is some 10m by 9.6m which would still allow for a range of functions, for example drying laundry,

sitting out, storage of refuse and play area. Under the circumstances it is not considered that a reason for refusal based on the inadequate size of the amenity area could be sustained on appeal.

Conclusion

The visual impact of the garage conversion and new ramp is considered unlikely to result in significant detriment to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene. The proposal would not result in a loss of privacy. The dwelling has access to a substantial sized amenity area which, whilst deficient of the standards, is considered capable of catering for all outdoor needs of the occupiers of the dwelling.

The dwelling is not considered to be in a sustainable urban location and the proposed garage conversion and front ramp will unacceptably reduce the space available for the provision of adequate safe and convenient on-site parking. This is considered likely to result in vehicles being parked on the highway to the detriment of highway safety contrary to Policies T8 and EC2 of the adopted Local Plan.

Furthermore it is considered that the parking of vehicles on the highway would result in visual clutter, detracting from the character and appearance of the area.

Whilst the personal circumstances of the applicant are noted, it is considered that the proposed works are likely to remain for a considerable period and are therefore likely to have a significant long term adverse impact on highway safety which cannot be justified by the applicant's current needs.

I have taken all other matters raised by interested parties into consideration, but none are sufficient to outweigh the considerations that led to the recommendation.

My Recommendation is Refusal for the following reason:

- 1 The proposed development would result in the loss of the site's only garaging provision and would fail to provide appropriate compensatory safe and convenient on-site parking provision to meet the needs of the occupiers of the dwelling. If approved the proposal would be likely to lead to vehicles being parked on the highway in Albion Road, to the danger and inconvenience of other road users and resulting in an unattractive appearance to the streetscene, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies T8 and EC2 of the adopted Local Plan.

Informative

- 1 The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

ITEM 2

Application Number:	14/0131/FUL
Address:	14 Albion Road Benfleet Essex SS7 5PU (Appleton Ward)
Description of Development:	Garage conversion with bow window to front, alterations to front boundary wall, installation of ramp, decking area to rear and external alterations.
Applicant:	Mr And Mrs Peake
Case Officer	Mrs Sophie Adams

Summary

The application seeks permission for the conversion of the semi-integral garage to living accommodation, incorporating the installation of a bow window to front elevation and the installation of a front ramp, the alteration of the front boundary wall, the construction of a decked area to the rear and external alterations.

The proposal will result in the property being reliant on the front garden of the site to provide for the parking needs of the dwelling. The front garden is of insufficient size to provide adequate parking facilities and would therefore be likely to result in cars being parked on the highway or partially on the site and partially on the highway, to the detriment of highway safety, contrary to policies EC2 and T8 of the adopted Local Plan. The application is therefore recommended for **REFUSAL**.

The proposal is presented to the Development Control Committee at the request of Councillor Skipp in order for the Committee to assess the effect of these proposals on car parking provision at the site and on-street car parking in the surrounding area.

A further application has been submitted for the site (Reference: CPT/9/14/FUL) and will also be considered at the Development Control Committee under Agenda Item 1.

Introduction

The application site is located on the northern side of Albion Road, some 12m west of its junction with Elounda Court and some 33m east of its junction with St Clements Road. The application site is of a regular shape with a frontage of some 11m and a depth of some 25.5m.

A detached, four bedroomed house with semi-integral garage occupies the site. The front of the site is hard surfaced with a 1m high wall to the front boundary. There is a vehicular crossover with a width of some 4m to the front of the property enabling vehicular access to the garage.

The street consists of detached houses of similar design.

Site Visit

It is recommended that Members visit the site prior to determination of the application.

The Proposal

The applicant seeks consent to convert the garage to living accommodation with a bow window to front, to alter the front boundary wall, install a front ramp, create a decking area to the rear of the dwelling and undertake external alterations.

The proposal will replace the garage door with a brick wall and bow window. The bow window would project 0.445m in front of the garage wall and would be 2.627m wide and 2.2m high.

The proposal would reduce the width of the front boundary wall from 6.6m to 3m. There are two timber posts proposed to the front. The rear patio doors would be replaced with a larger width bi-folding aluminium doors. The proposal will provide two new ground floor windows to the eastern elevation.

The proposed rear decking area is some 0.3m high, 4m deep and 5.8m wide. This decked area would be accessed by two external steps from the rear amenity area and would be tiled.

The proposal intends to remove the front bow window to the dwelling and move the main entrance door to this position with a new solid timber front door and full length side light.

The concrete access ramp would have a height of 0.3m with a 1m handrail above and a maximum width of some 4m and a depth of some 1m. It would run eastwards from the new front door to the flank elevation whereupon one ramp would be formed towards the front boundary and one along the side of the property towards the rear amenity area.

The front ramp would be 2.576m deep and 1m wide. The rear ramp would be 1m wide and some 1.65m deep.

Two steps are proposed to allow access from the front hard surface to the ramp in front of the properties main entrance.

Internal works would result in the rearrangement of the ground floor accommodation, moving the staircase, porch, WC and front entrance and providing a fifth bedroom with en-suite, an open plan kitchen, dining and sitting area and a cloakroom/cupboard.

The works are, in part, required to meet the needs of a physically impaired person.

Additional Documentation

No additional planning documentation has been provided.

Planning History

CPT/9/14/FUL – Garage conversion and ramp to front – Pending Consideration

These works have been submitted as a member of the household is physically impaired and is unable to gain wheelchair access to the property and essential facilities within the property. This application was submitted by a different agent prior to the submission of the current application and is limited to works required for the physically impaired member of the household. This application will also be considered at this Committee, under Agenda item 1.

CPT/564/86 – Two detached, four bedroomed houses with garages – Approved 17th June 1986 subject to conditions. Condition number 6 states:

The garage(s) shall be retained solely for that use and not converted into living accommodation.

REASON: To retain adequate on site garaging provision.

Local Plan Allocation

Residential

Relevant Policies and Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

Castle Point Adopted Local Plan (Adopted November 1998)

EC2	Design
H17	Housing Development – Design and Layout
T8	Parking Standards

Residential Design Guidance (Adopted January 2013)

RDG3	Building Lines
RDG5	Privacy and Living Conditions
RDG6	Amenity Space
RDG8	Detailing

Essex County Parking Standards (Adopted June 2010)

Public Consultation

No statutory consultation was undertaken.

No responses have been received to the neighbour consultation exercise.

Evaluation of Proposal

Visual impact

Policy EC2 of the adopted Local Plan states that a high standard of design will be expected of all alterations and extensions to existing buildings. Policy H17 states that in assessing the design aspects of proposals for housing, the Local Planning Authority will have regard to its adopted design guidelines (RDG). These policies are considered to be in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

RDG8 states that the provision of detailing elements must be consistent with the overall architectural approach of the dwelling, and their design and siting should be an integral part of the dwelling. The design of all development should result in well proportioned and balanced properties.

The proposed bow window is considered to be of good design which would harmonise with both the new works and the existing dwelling. These changes are likely to have a limited impact within the street scene and no objection is raised to this element of the proposal.

The proposed ramp would be concrete but would be partially hidden by the front boundary wall. The ramp is considered unlikely to enhance the character and appearance of the dwelling, however any adverse impact is not considered so significant as to justify a recommendation of refusal. No objection is therefore raised to this element of the proposal.

RDG3 states that in all cases projections into building lines which face the public realm must make a positive contribution but if there is a distinct pattern of development which creates an exceptionally strong building line development must not result in a disruption to this pattern.

The proposed ramp, bow window and timber posts would be in front of the dwelling. Albion Road is considered to have an exceptionally strong building line and the ramp would project into the building line. However given the nature of its form it is considered unlikely to significantly disrupt the building line. No objection is therefore raised to this element of the proposal.

The garage is set back behind the front elevation of the dwelling, and the bow window would project in front of the garage but not the forwardmost elevation of the dwelling. The bow window and timber posts would provide interest elements to the front of the dwelling. These are considered to provide a positive contribution.

No objection is therefore raised to the proposal under RDG3.

Highway Implications and Parking

Policy EC2 also states that all modes of movement must be made safe and convenient.

Policy T8 requires adopted parking standards to be taken into account. In this case, the current standards are the adopted 2009 vehicle parking standards, which require the provision of two car parking spaces, each having a size of 5.5m by 2.9m, for dwellings having two or more bedrooms. This provision is consistent with paragraph 39 of the NPPF which requires local planning authorities to set such standards reflecting local circumstance.

The proposal will result in the removal of the garage. The proposal would also increase the number of bedrooms from four to five. The extended dwelling would require the provision of two car parking spaces and would be reliant on the front forecourt to provide such spaces.

The existing garage is set back from the road, providing a forecourt some 6.1m deep and 4m wide in front of the garage (as measured on site). The installation of a bow window would reduce the depth of this space to 5.6m. This retained space would be sufficient to accommodate one parking space.

The whole of the front garden is currently hardsurfaced. Following the installation of the proposed ramp the remainder of this surface would be reduced to a depth of some 3.35m and width of 5.2m. This area is inadequate to provide a second car parking space to the appropriate standard.

Furthermore, it is considered that as a consequence of its relationship with the highway, this area would fail to provide a safe and convenient parking space, the area available being difficult to access. As a result it is considered that occupiers of the dwelling would be dissuaded from using the space, even if it were of a suitable size, and as a consequence would be likely to park on the highway, to the danger and inconvenience of other road users.

The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy EC2 and T8 of the adopted Local Plan and the current adopted parking standards.

The adopted parking standards do state that for main urban areas a reduction in the parking requirement may be considered. A main urban area is defined as those having frequent and extensive public transport and cycling and walking links, accessing education, healthcare, food shopping and employment. The application property is within a residential area and is in close proximity to both secondary and primary schools. However the site is a considerable distance from the town centres of Tarpots and Benfleet. Whilst there are facilities within walking distance;

the application site cannot be described as having access to frequent and extensive facilities and the occupiers of the dwelling are therefore likely to be reliant on the use of motor vehicles for their daily needs.

Under the circumstances it is not considered appropriate to reduce the parking requirement.

It is acknowledged that the works resulting in the parking deficiency are required to provide for specific personal circumstances of the occupiers of the site. Whilst the Planning Authority may have sympathy with the applicant's situation it is not considered that this provides sufficient justification to overcome the long term harm that would be caused by the inadequate parking provision on this site.

Furthermore it is considered that the parking of vehicles on the highway would result in visual clutter, detracting from the character and appearance of the area.

The application property is not within a sustainable urban location and the proposal will reduce the amount of useable parking within the site to a substandard level resulting in detriment to highway safety contrary to policies T8 and EC2 of the adopted Local Plan. An objection is raised accordingly.

Other Issues

RDG5 deals with privacy and living conditions. The proposal will increase the ground level of the site to front, by reason of the provision of the ramp. However, from the ramp it would only be possible to view the front gardens of the adjoining properties and the public highway. Under these circumstances the proposal is unlikely to lead to any significant loss of privacy.

The proposed rear decking area would be some 0.3m above ground level. The side boundaries to No.12 and No.16 are 1.8m and 1.9m high respectively. The rear boundary fence is approximately 2.5m high. Whilst the decked area would be 0.3m above natural ground level, the boundaries would still be a minimum of 1.5m above the decked area. The use of the proposed deck is therefore considered unlikely to result in a significant loss of privacy to the adjoining neighbours. No objection is therefore raised to this element of the proposal under RDG5.

RDG6 states that amenity space should cater for the outdoor needs of all occupiers and that development involving individual dwellings should be provided with at least 15m² amenity space per habitable room. The proposal by reason of the rearrangement of the ground floor would provide six habitable rooms resulting in a requirement of 90m² amenity area. The size of the amenity area is some 96m². No objection is therefore raised to the proposal under RDG6.

Conclusion

The visual impact of the garage conversion, new ramp, bow window and timber posts is considered unlikely to result in detriment to the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene and the host dwelling. The proposal would not result in any significant loss of privacy. The dwelling benefits from an adequate sized amenity area to serve the outdoor needs of the occupiers of the dwelling.

The proposed garage conversion and front ramp will reduce the space on-site available for parking. The dwelling is not within a sustainable urban location. The retained front hard surfaced area is inadequate in size to provide sufficient parking to meet the needs of the dwelling, which will result in detriment to highway safety and visual clutter, detracting from the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies T8 and EC2 of the adopted Local Plan.

I have taken all other matters raised by interested parties into consideration, but none are sufficient to outweigh the considerations that led to the recommendation.

My Recommendation is Refusal for the following reason:

The proposed development would result in the loss of the site's only garaging provision and would fail to provide appropriate compensatory safe and convenient on-site parking provision to meet the needs of the occupiers of the dwelling. If approved the proposal would be likely to lead to vehicles being parked on the highway in Albion Road, to the danger and inconvenience of other road users and resulting in an unattractive appearance to the streetscene, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies T8 and EC2 of the adopted Local Plan.

Informative

- 1 The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.
-

ITEM 3

Application Number:	14/0050/FUL
Address:	8 Borrowdale Road Benfleet Essex SS7 3HD (St Peter's Ward)
Description of Development:	Construction of single storey side and front extension
Applicant:	Ms Jane Fessey
Case Officer	Mrs Sophie Adams

Summary

The proposal seeks to construct a single storey side and front extension to a detached dwelling at No.8 Borrowdale Road. The extension is of an acceptable design and meets the criteria as set out in the Residential Design Guidance.

The application is being reported to the Development Control Committee as the applicant is a close relative of a member of staff.

The proposal is recommended for **APPROVAL**.

Site Visit

It is not considered necessary for Members to visit the site prior to determination of the application.

Introduction

The application site is located on the eastern side of Borrowdale Road, some 55m north of its junction with Church Road and some 22m south of its junction with Borrowdale Close. The site is a regular shape with a frontage of some 9.5m and a depth of approximately 46.5m.

A detached, gable roofed, four bedroomed bungalow occupies the site. The dwelling has been previously extended with single storey side and rear extensions.

There is a mixture of semi-detached houses and detached bungalows within the street scene with some similar in design to the application dwelling, including No.6 Borrowdale Road, the dwelling immediate to the south.

Submitted Documentation

No additional documentation has been submitted.

The Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a single storey, side and front extension.

The proposed extension would wrap around the south western corner of the dwelling, and would be between 0.85m and 5.5m wide, and between 1.7m and 8.5m deep. The roof would be part pitched and part flat with a maximum height of some 3.6m.

The front elevation and part of the northern side elevation of the dwelling would be rendered and the roof would be finished with plain tiles.

The proposal would move the main entrance to the property from the side elevation to the front elevation and provide a semi-integral garage.

Planning History

CPT/430/07/FUL – Single storey side and rear extensions – Approved 9th August 2007

Local Plan Allocation

Residential

Relevant Local Plan Policies and Government Guidance

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan (Adopted November 1998)

EC2	Design
H17	Housing Development – Design and Layout
T8	Car Parking Standards

Residential Design Guidance (Adopted January 2013)

RDG2	Space around Dwellings
RDG3	Building Lines
RDG5	Privacy and Living Conditions
RDG6	Amenity Space
RDG8	Detailing

Essex Parking Standards (Adopted September 2009)

Consultation

No statutory consultations were undertaken and no responses have been received from adjoining residents.

Evaluation of Proposal

Visual Impact

Policy EC2 of the adopted Local Plan states that a high standard of design will be expected of all alterations and extensions to existing buildings. Policy H17 states that in assessing the design aspects of the proposals for housing, the Local Planning Authority will have regard to its adopted Residential Design Guidance (RDG). These policies and guidance are considered to be in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Guidance RDG8 states that all extensions visible in the street scene, must have a pitched roof where the existing dwelling has one, and reflect the roofscape of the host dwelling unless it is reflecting a specific design feature of the dwelling. Furthermore the design of all development

should result in well proportioned and balanced properties. The materials used for detailing elements should integrate with or complement primarily the dwelling, but also those present in the surrounding street scene.

The extension is of a reasonable scale and design to complement the host dwelling. The roof of the proposed extension has a pitch to the front and flat towards the rear. By virtue of the location of the dwelling relative to the highway, the flat roof is unlikely to be visible within the street scene and will not therefore adversely impact on the character and appearance of the area.

The pitched roof over the front of the garage is lower than the roof to the main property but has a similar pitch to the existing side extension and would not therefore appear incongruous or inappropriate in the street scene. No objection is therefore raised to this element of the proposal.

The southern neighbour, No.6 Borrowdale Road, is a detached bungalow of similar design to the application property. This neighbour has a garage which projects to the front and side and has a mock pitch to the front, similar in pitch to that proposed. It is clear that the appearance of the proposed extension has been influenced by the neighbours' extension and is consequently acceptable in its context.

The applicant intends to tile the pitched roof in red plain tiles. The existing dwelling has brown pantiles. The proposed roof tile is unlikely to help the proposed extension integrate with the dwelling. It is therefore considered necessary to ensure the roof tile of the extension harmonises with the dwelling, and a condition will be attached to any approval granted to ensure that tiles of a similar style and colour to that used on the main roof are used.

The proposal includes the provision of render to the front elevation of the extension and to the existing front and northern elevation of the dwelling. The front of the dwelling is currently partly clad in white PVC panels and partly finished in red brick. Whilst the proposed use of render will result in a significant change in the appearance of the dwelling, there are elements of render within the street scene and in this context the use of render is not considered inappropriate.

Subject to conditions regarding the materials, no objection is raised to the proposal under RDG8.

RDG2 is concerned with the space around buildings and requires new development to reflect the prevailing character of the area.

The proposed extension would extend the dwelling with the garage located 30mm from the southern boundary. The southern neighbour, No.6, is a similar designed bungalow with a side extension incorporating a garage tight to their southern boundary other properties within the street exhibit a similar setting. Under such circumstances the lack of substantial isolation distance to the side of the dwelling is considered to have a nominal impact within this street scene. No objection is therefore raised under RDG2.

RDG3 states that in all cases projections into building lines which face the public realm must make a positive contribution but if there is a distinct pattern of development which creates an exceptionally strong building line development must not result in a disruption to this pattern.

The proposed extension would project in front of the dwelling by a maximum of 2.6m. The building line within Borrowdale Road is set by the adjacent dwellings. The southern neighbour, No.6, is located in a similar position as the application dwelling, although this dwelling has a front/side extension which extends some 1.8m forward of the main front wall of the dwelling. The northern neighbour, No.10, is set some 2.9m further forward within its plot. The proposed extension would therefore extend to a depth in between these neighbours and is considered

therefore unlikely to disrupt the building line within Borrowdale Road. No objection is therefore raised under RDG3.

Highway Implications and Parking

Policy EC2 also states that all modes of movement must be made safe and convenient.

Policy T8 requires adopted parking standards to be taken into account. In this case, the current standards are the adopted vehicle parking standards, which require the provision of two car parking spaces, each having a size of 5.5m by 2.9m, for dwellings having two or more bedrooms. For garaging to be included within the assessment of parking provision the internal dimensions must be a minimum of 7m x 3m. This provision is consistent with paragraph 39 of the NPPF which requires local planning authorities to set such standards reflecting local circumstance.

The application dwelling has four bedrooms and would require a minimum of two parking spaces. The proposed garage measures some 3.2m by 5.1m internally. The garage is considered deficient of the standard and therefore cannot be considered to provide a parking space. The dwelling is therefore reliant on its front forecourt to provide its parking needs. The front forecourt has a depth of some 6.1m and sufficient width to provide two safe and convenient parking spaces perpendicular to the highway. No objection is therefore raised under Policies T8 and EC2 of the adopted Local Plan on parking grounds.

Other Issues

RDG6 provides guidance on the amenity areas to dwellings. The proposal would not create any additional habitable rooms or decrease the amenity area for the dwelling. It therefore has no implications for the provision of amenity area.

RDG3 also states that development which would result in excessive overshadowing or dominance to any elevation of an adjoining property will be refused.

The proposed extension would not extend in front of the northern neighbour, but would extend in front of part of the southern neighbour. This projection is some 2.6m at a maximum height of 3.6m. Given the limited size of the extension and the relative orientation of the adjoining dwelling, the proposed extension is considered unlikely to result in excessive overshadowing or dominance to this neighbour.

All other properties are considered too remote to be affected by overshadowing or dominance. No objection is therefore raised under RDG3.

RDG5 provides guidance on living conditions and states that primary windows should be located on the principal elevations of dwellings, these include flank walls on corner dwellings. All windows should be designed and be of a size which provides for adequate natural light and ventilation to enter the room they serve.

The proposal would result in the rearrangement of the accommodation, moving bedroom two from the front of the dwelling to the side. A primary window is therefore being moved from a principal elevation to a non-principal elevation. It is noted that two of the other bedrooms within the property already rely on windows on non-principal elevations; however, this arrangement of accommodation occurred prior to the adoption of the current guidance. The relocated window to Bedroom 2 would face the southern neighbours' side elevation with a 1m isolation distance to the boundary fence. The southern neighbour is a bungalow with a pitched roof that angles away from the window. It is considered in this instance that whilst the window is not located on a principal elevation the room it serves would not be provided with such a low level of natural light and ventilation that a reason for refusal on this basis could be defended on appeal.

Conclusion

The proposal seeks to construct a single storey side and front extension to a detached dwelling at No.8 Borrowdale Road.

The proposed works are of an acceptable design and satisfy the criteria as set out in the Residential Design Guidance.

I have taken all other matters raised by interested parties into consideration, but none are sufficient to outweigh the considerations that led to the recommendation.

My Recommendation is Approval subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun on or before the expiration of five years beginning with the date of this permission.

REASON: This condition is imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 The pitched roof of the extension hereby approved shall be finished in materials to harmonise with the existing dwelling.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development that complements the existing dwelling and the properties within the street scene.

- 3 The proposed extension and alterations to the dwelling hereby approved, with the exception of the roof tiles, shall be finished in accordance with the materials shown on the approved drawing number P-67 Revision B dated 22/05/2014.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development that complements the existing dwelling and the properties within the street scene.

- 4 Where forecourt parking spaces are provided on the site these facilities shall be retained solely for that use and for no other purpose whatsoever without the formal consent of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure the retention of adequate on site car parking facilities to meet the Councils adopted standards for the amount of accommodation to be provided on the site.

Informatives

- 1 The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 In undertaking the works hereby approved you are advised to satisfy yourself of your obligations to occupiers of adjoining properties in accordance with the Party Wall etc. Act 1996, details of which can be inspected at these offices or you may obtain details free of charge from the Planning Portal website (www.planningportal.gov.uk) under Building Regulations.

ITEM 4

Application Number:	14/0061/FUL
Address:	Water Tower 335 Benfleet Road South Benfleet, Essex (Boyce Ward)
Description of Development:	Installation of 1 No. 900mm and 1 No. 600mm diameter transmission dishes
Applicant:	Aviat Networks
Case Officer	Mr Keith Zammit

Summary

The proposed development involves the installation of new telecommunications apparatus to an existing water tower.

It is not considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the building and the wider area and it is recommended that permission be **APPROVED**.

An application for Listed Building Consent is at Item 5 of this agenda.

Site Visit

It is not considered necessary for Members to visit the site prior to determination of the application.

Introduction

The application relates to the Benfleet Water Tower, which no longer serves the purpose of water supply infrastructure and now hosts business uses and telecommunications apparatus.

The structure is located at the junction of Benfleet Road and Essex Way. It is a Grade II Listed Building, and located within the Green Belt.

The Proposal

Permission exists for the installation of two new 600mm diameter dishes to the roof of the Water Tower. One dish would be located at the north western corner of the roof of the Tower and the other would be located on the southern side, about a quarter of the way from the western end. The dishes would be mounted on poles set approximately 900mm from the edge of the roof.

Permission is now sought to increase the size of the proposed dish on the southern side of the tower roof to 900mm diameter.

Supplementary Documentation

The application was accompanied by the following supplementary documentation:

- a design and access statement and

- a statement of conformity with ICNIRP public exposure guidelines.

All of which have been and are available to view on the Councils website.

Planning History

There is an extensive history of applications for telecommunications apparatus on this building, much of which is of no relevance to this case. It is worth noting, however, that two proposals for planning permission and listed building consent for the installation of antennas and equipment cabinets (CPT/467/05/FUL, 468/05/LBC, 442/06/FUL and 443/06/LBC) were refused and then subsequently dismissed on appeal, for eroding the building's special interest and being harmful to the openness, character and appearance of the landscape and the visual amenity of the surrounding area. In these cases the proposals included the provision of equipment on the face of the building and added considerably to the visual clutter of communications equipment on the structure which was considered unacceptable.

In January 2012, planning permission and listed building consent were granted for the replacement of 3 No. existing pole-mounted antennas with 3 No. new pole-mounted antennas and ancillary works, on the basis that the proposed installation would not have a significantly different visual impact on the area than the existing structure.

In April 2012, planning permission and listed building consent were refused for the replacement of 3 pole mounted antennas with 6 new pole mounted antennas and ancillary works, due to the detrimental impact on the special architectural interest of the water tower and the wider area.

In June 2012, planning permission and listed building consent were granted for a 600mm dish that was installed in place of what should have been a 300mm diameter dish. It was considered that the change from a 300mm to 600mm diameter dish did not give the tower or the equipment on it significantly greater prominence.

In April 2013, planning permission and listed building consent were refused for the replacement of three antennas with six antennas and the installation of a new 600mm diameter dish due to the detrimental impact on the special architectural interest of the water tower and the wider area.

In June 2013, planning permission and listed building consent were refused for the installation of 1 No. 1.2m diameter dish and 1 No. 0.6m diameter dish at a height of 30m and internal equipment cabinet (CPT/157/13/FUL, CPT/159/13/LBC) and granted for replacement of three antennas and installation of an internal equipment cabinet (CPT/186/13/FUL, CPT/187/13/LBC)

In December 2013, planning permission and listed building consent were granted for the installation of two 600mm diameter transmission dishes (CPT/550/13/FUL, CPT/551/13/LBC) subject to the condition that equipment identified on the application drawings was removed from the structure prior to installation of the approved equipment.

From the recent history it can be seen that proposals which have sought to increase the amount of equipment on the Tower have been resisted, whilst proposals for the replacement of equipment were generally considered acceptable, where the proposal had no greater impact on the character and appearance of the Tower. The Council's most recent decision also shows that proposals which included the removal of redundant equipment were likely to be considered more favourably.

Relevant Government Guidance and Local Plan Policies

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paras 42-46

Current Local Plan

CF16 – Telecommunications

Consultation

No statutory consultation undertaken

Public Consultation

No responses received to neighbour notification, press and site notices.

Evaluation of Proposal

The main issue for consideration is the visual impact of the proposed installation, taking into account the site's location within the Green Belt.

Comment will also be made in respect of the health implications of the proposal.

Consideration of the implications of the proposal on the listed building can be found in the report attached to application 14/0062/LBC (item 4 on this agenda).

Visual impact

Paragraph 42 of the NPPF states that advanced, high quality communications infrastructure is essential for sustainable economic growth. The development of high speed broadband technology and other communications networks also plays a vital role in enhancing the provision of local community facilities and services.

Paragraph 46 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for the telecommunications system or determine health safeguards if the proposal meets International Commission guidelines for exposure.

Local Plan Policy CF16 states that in considering such proposals the Council will have regard to the visual impact of the structure on adjacent land uses, the impact on the landscape and the availability of alternative sites. Consideration will be given to the provision of large masts shared by several operators that would avoid the need for the erection of a multiplicity of smaller structures. This is generally consistent with paragraphs 43 to 46 of the NPPF.

The NPPF is silent on the provision of telecommunications apparatus in Green Belts.

The existing tower is viewed from the nearby highways and the surrounding area and is a prominent feature in the landscape. The proposed two additional dishes would represent new items of telecommunications infrastructure, which would add to 'clutter' on the tower, however following negotiations the applicant has been able to identify antennas and dishes currently located on the tower and the rooftop mast that are redundant and can be removed. This redundant equipment is considered to be more prominently located than the new dishes, even though one new dish would now be larger than previously approved. The dishes would be at parapet level and set back from the roof edge, thereby minimising their prominence when viewed

from street level. Removal of the existing redundant equipment from the roof top will improve the appearance of the building as a whole.

Subject to a condition requiring the removal of the equipment identified as being removed on the submitted drawings, it is considered that the proposal would represent betterment over the existing situation and no objection is raised on visual grounds.

Health

Paragraph 46 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should not seek to determine health safeguards if the proposal meets International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines.

The application is accompanied by certification that the installation is designed to be in full compliance with ICNIRP guidelines. Accordingly, there can be no objection to the proposal on the basis of its perceived health impacts.

Conclusion

The installation of new dishes is required to improve network connectivity in the local area. The proposal will result in a net reduction in the level of telecommunications equipment on the Water Tower and as such would result in an improvement in its appearance. No objection is therefore raised to the proposal on the basis of visual amenity.

I have taken all other matters raised by interested parties into consideration, but none are sufficient to outweigh the considerations that led to the recommendation.

My Recommendation is Approval subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun on or before the expiration of five years beginning with the date of this permission.

REASON: This condition is imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 The equipment identified for removal on drawing numbers SBW-09 rev A and SBW-10 rev A shall be removed from the structure within six months of the installation of the equipment hereby approved.

REASON To prevent an excessive amount of telecommunications equipment being located on the building in the interest of the visual amenity of the area.

Informative

- 1 The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

ITEM 5

Application Number:	14/0062/LBC
Address:	Water Tower 335 Benfleet Road South Benfleet, Essex (Boyce Ward)
Description of Development:	Installation of 1 No. 900mm and 1 No. 600mm diameter transmission dishes
Applicant:	Aviat Networks
Case Officer	Mr Keith Zammit

Summary

The proposed development involves the installation of replacement and additional telecommunications apparatus to an existing water tower.

It is not considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the appearance and special interest of this listed building and it is recommended that listed building consent be **GRANTED**.

An application for planning permission is at item 4 of this agenda.

Site Visit

It is not considered necessary for Members to visit the site prior to determination of the application.

Introduction

The application relates to the Benfleet Water Tower, which no longer serves the purpose of water supply infrastructure and now hosts business uses and telecommunications apparatus.

The structure is located at the junction of Benfleet Road and Essex Way. It is a Grade II listed building and located within the Green Belt.

The Proposal

Listed Building Consent exists for the installation of two new 600mm diameter dishes to the roof of the Water Tower. One dish would be located at the north western corner of the roof of the Tower and the other would be located on the southern side, about a quarter of the way from the western end. The dishes would be mounted on poles set approximately 900mm from the edge of the roof.

Listed Building Consent is now sought to increase the size of the proposed dish on the southern side of the tower roof to 900mm diameter.

Supplementary Documentation

The application was accompanied by the following supplementary documentation:

- a design and access statement and

- a statement of conformity with ICNIRP public exposure guidelines.

All of which have been and are available to view on the Councils website.

Planning History

There is an extensive history of applications for telecommunications apparatus on this building, much of which is of no relevance to this case. It is worth noting, however, that two proposals for planning permission and listed building consent for the installation of antennas and equipment cabinets (CPT/467/05/FUL, 468/05/LBC, 442/06/FUL and 443/06/LBC) were refused and then subsequently dismissed on appeal, for eroding the building's special interest and being harmful to the openness, character and appearance of the landscape and the visual amenity of the surrounding area. In these cases the proposals included the provision of equipment on the face of the building and added considerably to the visual clutter of communications equipment on the structure which was considered unacceptable.

In January 2012, planning permission and listed building consent were granted for the replacement of 3 No. existing pole-mounted antennas with 3 No. new pole-mounted antennas and ancillary works, on the basis that the proposed installation would not have a significantly different visual impact on the area than the existing structure.

In April 2012, planning permission and listed building consent were refused for the replacement of 3 pole mounted antennas with 6 new pole mounted antennas and ancillary works, due to the detrimental impact on the special architectural interest of the water tower and the wider area.

In June 2012, planning permission and listed building consent were granted for a 600mm dish that was installed in place of what should have been a 300mm diameter dish. It was considered that the change from a 300mm to 600mm diameter dish did not give the tower or the equipment on it significantly greater prominence in the local area.

In April 2013, planning permission and listed building consent were refused for the replacement of three antennas with six antennas and installation of new 600mm diameter dish due to the detrimental impact on the special architectural interest of the water tower and the wider area.

In June 2013, planning permission and listed building consent were refused for the installation of 1 No. 1.2m diameter dish and 1 No. 0.6m diameter dish at a height of 30m and internal equipment cabinet (CPT/157/13/FUL, CPT/159/13/LBC) and granted for replacement of three antennas an installation of internal equipment cabinet (CPT/186/13/FUL, CPT/187/13/LBC)

In December 2013, planning permission and listed building consent were granted for the installation of two 600mm diameter transmission dishes (CPT/550/13/FUL, CPT/551/13/LBC) subject to the condition that equipment identified on the application drawings was removed from the structure prior to installation of the approved equipment.

From the history it can be seen that proposals which sought to increase the amount of equipment on the Tower were resisted, whilst proposals for the replacement of equipment were generally considered acceptable, where the proposal had no greater impact on the character and appearance of the Tower. The Council's most recent decision also shows that proposals that included the removal of redundant equipment as part of the proposal were looked upon more favourably.

Relevant Government Guidance and Local Plan Policies

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paras 131, 133, 134 and 140.

Current Local Plan

EC33 – Alterations to Listed Buildings

Consultation

No statutory consultation undertaken

Public Consultation

No responses received to neighbour notification, press and site notices.

Evaluation of Proposal

The NPPF defines a heritage asset as a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage assets include designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).

A designated heritage asset is defined as a World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation.

Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to, or loss of, a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

Paragraph 133 states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to, or total loss of significance of, a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- o the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- o no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- o conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- o the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

Paragraph 134 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

Local Plan Policy EC33 states that additions or alterations to listed buildings will not be permitted if they would adversely affect the character, setting, architectural or historic interest of a listed building. This is generally consistent with paragraphs 131 to 134 of the NPPF.

There is already a significant level of telecommunications apparatus on the roof of this building. Previous decisions by this Authority and appeal decisions have highlighted that the existing telecommunications development on the building has eroded the building's special interest and that it would be undesirable to permit the installation of additional equipment that would further erode that interest.

The proposed two additional dishes would represent new items of telecommunications infrastructure, which would add to 'clutter' on the tower, however following negotiations the applicant has been able to identify antennas and dishes currently located on the tower and the rooftop mast that are redundant and can be removed. This redundant equipment is considered to be more prominently located than the new dishes, even though one new dish would now be larger than previously approved. The dishes would be at parapet level and set back from the roof edge, thereby minimising their prominence when viewed from street level. Provided that the existing redundant equipment is removed from the roof top, the proposal will improve the appearance of the building as a whole.

Subject to a condition requiring the removal of the equipment identified as being removed on the submitted drawings, it is considered that the proposal would improve the appearance of the building and as such no objection is raised to the proposal on the basis of its impact on the building's special interest.

Conclusion

The proposed installation including the removal of existing equipment is considered to result in a less prominent array of telecommunications equipment on the building and therefore would have a positive effect in terms of the building's special interest as an item of water supply infrastructure.

My Recommendation is Approval subject to the following conditions

- 1 The works to which this consent relates must be begun not later than the expiration of five years beginning with the date on which the consent is granted.

REASON: Imposed pursuant to Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

- 2 The equipment identified for removal on drawing numbers SBW-09 rev A and SBW-10 rev A shall be removed from the structure within six months of the installation of the equipment hereby approved.

REASON: To prevent an excessive amount of telecommunications equipment being located on the building in view of its special interest as an item of water supply infrastructure.

- 3 Upon completion of the works hereby approved, any damage caused to the building by the works shall be made good within three months in accordance with a scheme which shall first have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

REASON: In the interest of preserving the historic character of the building in accordance with Policy EC33 of the Borough Local Plan.

Informative

- 1 The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
-

ITEM 6

Application Number:	14/0155/FUL
Address:	72 Roseberry Avenue Thundersley Benfleet Essex SS7 4JG (St Peter's Ward)
Description of Development:	Raise ridge height and form loft conversion with rear dormer and rooflights to front and construction of detached garage
Applicant:	Mr C Hardman
Case Officer	Mrs Ishita Sheth

Summary

The application seeks to raise the ridge of the property, provide two roof lights in the front elevation and a flat roofed rear dormer to a two storey, semi-detached house, in order to create two bedrooms in the roof space.

It should be noted that a planning application involving the raising of the ridge and the provision of a rear dormer has been received in respect of the adjoining semi detached property which appears at item No. 7 on this agenda.

For the development to be acceptable, it is considered necessary to ensure that the proposed works are carried out to the application dwelling and the adjoining semi detached property simultaneously. It will therefore be necessary to require the applicants to enter into a S106 agreement to ensure that both halves of the pair are sympathetically altered. It is for this reason that the application is presented to Committee for determination.

Subject to the applicant being willing to enter into a S.106 Agreement in order to carry out the proposed works simultaneously with the adjoining semi-detached property at No 74 Roseberry Avenue, the proposal is recommended for APPROVAL.

Site Visit

It is recommended that Members visit the site prior to the determination of the application.

Introduction

The site is located on the eastern side of Roseberry Avenue, approximately 37m north of the junction with Eversley Road. The site is occupied by a semi-detached house with a garage in the rear garden. The area to the front of the site is entirely hardsurfaced.

The site has a frontage of some 9m and a depth of some 38m.

The area is characterised by 2 storey semi detached houses.

The Proposal

The proposal seeks to raise the ridge, provide roof lights in the front elevation and provide a flat roofed rear dormer to a two storey, semi-detached house, in order to create two bedrooms in the roof space. The proposal will raise the ridge height by some 1.3m.

It should be noted that a planning application involving the raising of the ridge and the provision of a rear dormer has been received in respect of the adjoining semi detached property at No. 74.

The rear dormer would exhibit a mock hipped roof and would be some 5.7m wide, 3.4m deep and 2.6m high, rising to 8m above ground level.

The proposal also seeks to provide a replacement garage having a width of 3m, a depth of 7m and a maximum height of 3m and an eaves height of 2.5m to the rear of the dwelling adjacent to the southern boundary.

Submitted Documentation

No additional documentation has been submitted.

Relevant Planning History

The applicant has previously sought advice in respect of a similar proposal to raise the ridge and provide flat roofed front and rear dormers at the property.

In considering this earlier proposal, the provision of a front dormer was considered unacceptable. This has been deleted from the current proposal.

Relevant Government Guidance and Local Plan Policies

The site lies within an area allocated for residential purposes. The following policies and guidance are applicable.

National

- o National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Local Plan

- o EC2 Design
- o H17 Housing Development – Design and Layout
- o T8 Car Parking Standards

Residential Design Guidance

- o RDG3 Building Lines
- o RDG5 Privacy and Living Conditions
- o RDG6 Amenity Space
- o RDG7 Roof Development
- o RDG8 Detailing
- o RDG12 Parking

Consultation

Legal Services

No response received

Neighbours

No neighbour responses received

Evaluation of Proposal

Policy EC2 of the adopted Local Plan states that a high standard of design will be expected of all alterations and extensions to existing buildings.

Policy H17 states that in assessing the design aspects of the proposals for housing, the Local Planning Authority will have regard to its adopted Residential Design Guidelines (RDG). This guidance is considered to be in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

RDG8 requires the provision of detailing elements to be consistent with the overall architectural approach of the dwelling and RDG7 requires roof development to be proportionate to the roof of the existing dwelling and not appear top heavy, prominent or dominant. Fenestration at first and ground floor levels should be vertically and horizontally consistent.

RDG7 states that proposals for any form of roof development which results in the detrimental disruption or loss of symmetry to a pair or group of dwellings both in respect of roof planes and/or roofscape, will be refused.

The proposal seeks to raise the ridge of the dwelling and provide roof lights in the front elevation and a rear dormer.

The area is dominated by two storey development and whilst there is a general consistency in ridge heights in the area, there are also variations. In this context raising the ridge height of a property would not, in itself be objectionable. However, the application site is a semi detached property. Raising the ridge height of one half of the pair would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and ordinarily such a proposal would attract a recommendation of refusal. However, in this case, it should be noted that an application has been received for a similar proposal on the other half of the pair. This proposal is also considered on this agenda. Provided the works were undertaken to both properties simultaneously it is not considered that an increase in the ridge height would be so injurious to the character and appearance of the area that a reason for refusal on this basis could be sustained on appeal.

In order to ensure that the proposed works are carried out to both parts of the structure it will be necessary to require the applicants to enter into a legal agreement to ensure that both halves of the pair are sympathetically altered.

The proposal also seeks to provide a flat roofed rear dormer.

The design of the rear dormer is somewhat rudimentary however, it would be located to the rear of the site and would not therefore be particularly visible in the street scene. As such it is not considered that the rear dormer would cause such harm to the character and appearance of the area that a reason for refusal on this basis could be sustained on appeal. No objection is therefore raised to this element of the proposal.

It is proposed to provide roof lights in the front elevation. It is not considered that this element of the proposal would result in any detriment to the character of the dwelling or the area.

No objection is therefore raised to the proposal under Policy EC2 of the Council's Adopted Local Plan or RDG7 and RDG8 of the Residential Design Guidance.

Policy RDG3 states that proposals which would result in excessive overshadowing or overdominance will be refused.

The proposed replacement garage would extend some 2m beyond the rear wall of the existing garage on the site. However, taking into consideration the single storey nature of the proposed garage and its isolated location and relative orientation it is not considered that this element of the proposal would have an adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining residents. No objection is therefore raised to this element of the proposal.

RDG5 seeks to ensure the privacy of adjoining residents and requires the retention of 15m between any windows at second floor level and the boundaries of the site.

The roof lights in the front elevation would overlook the highway and are considered unlikely to result in any adverse impact on the privacy and amenity of adjoining residents.

The rear dormer is set some 20m from the rear boundary which satisfies the requirement of RDG5. No objection is therefore raised to the proposal on the basis of loss of amenity to adjoining residents.

RDG6 states that amenity space should cater for all the outdoor needs of all occupiers and that development involving individual dwellings should be provided with at least 15m² amenity space per habitable room. The proposal would result in the creation of additional habitable rooms bringing the total number to 7. The enlarged dwelling would therefore require the provision of 105m² of amenity space.

The site provides in excess of this level of amenity space. No objection is therefore raised under RDG6.

Policy T8 requires all development to be provided with the appropriate level of parking provision.

RDG12 states that the size and layout of all forms of parking should reflect current adopted vehicle parking standards. The current proposal seeks to increase the level of living accommodation on the site. Consideration must therefore be given to the provision of parking on the site.

For dwellings with two or more bedrooms two parking spaces are required, each measuring 2.9m by 5.5m.

The plot width provides ample opportunity to accommodate two vehicles within the site and no objection is therefore raised in this respect.

It is noted that the proposal includes the provision of a replacement garage having a width of 3m, a depth of 7m and a maximum height of 3m and an eaves height of 2.5m.

The garage would be located approximately 20m from the front boundary and 12.5m from the rear boundary and would abut the southern boundary of the site.

It should be noted that the Essex parking standards require garages to have internal dimensions of 3m by 7m. The proposed garage would have internal dimensions of some 6.75m by 2.75m and would not be in compliance to the requirements. However, as discussed above, the application site can easily accommodate two car parking spaces within the hardsurfaced forecourt. Subject to a condition requiring the retention of the forecourt and garage spaces, no objection is raised under Policy T8 of the Council's Adopted Local Plan and RDG12 of the Residential Design Guidance.

Conclusion

The application seeks to raise the ridge, provide roof lights in the front elevation and provide a flat roofed rear dormer to a two storey, semi-detached house, in order to create two bedrooms in the roof space.

It should be noted that a planning application involving the raising of the ridge and the provision of a rear dormer has been received in respect of the adjoining semi detached property.

For the development to be acceptable, it is considered necessary to ensure that the proposed works are carried out to the application dwelling and the adjoining semi. It will therefore be necessary to require the applicants to enter into a legal agreement to ensure that both halves of the pair are sympathetically altered.

I have taken all other matters into consideration, but none are sufficient to outweigh the considerations that have led to the recommendation.

My **RECOMMENDATION** is that subject to the applicants entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement requiring the works to be carried out simultaneously with the adjoining property at No. 74 Roseberry Avenue, the Head of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods be authorised to APPROVE the application, subject to the following planning conditions:

- 1 This permission should be read in conjunction with the Section 106 Legal Agreement dated contemporaneously with this permission.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in sympathy with the existing development and the character of the surrounding area.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be begun on or before the expiration of five years beginning with the date of this permission.

REASON: This condition is imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 3 The proposed development shall be finished externally in materials to harmonise with the existing development.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in sympathy with the existing development and the character of the surrounding area.

- 4 Where garage and forecourt spaces are provided on the site these facilities shall be retained solely for that use and for no other purpose whatsoever without the formal consent of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure the retention of adequate on site car parking facilities to meet the Council's Adopted Standards for the amount of accommodation to be provided on the site.

Informatives

- 1 In undertaking the works hereby approved you are advised to satisfy yourself of your obligations to occupiers of adjoining properties in accordance with the Party Wall etc. Act 1996, details of which can be inspected at these offices or you may obtain details free of charge from the Planning Portal website (www.planningportal.gov.uk) under Building Regulations.
 - 2 The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
-

ITEM 7

Application Number:	14/0159/FUL
Address:	74 Roseberry Avenue Thundersley Benfleet Essex SS7 4JG (St Peter's Ward)
Description of Development:	Raise ridge height and form loft conversion with rear dormer and rooflights to front
Applicant:	Mr P Andre
Case Officer	Mrs Ishita Sheth

Summary

The application seeks to raise the ridge of the property, provide two roof lights in the front elevation and a flat roofed rear dormer to a two storey, semi-detached house, in order to create two bedrooms in the roof space.

It should be noted that a planning application involving the raising of the ridge and the provision of a rear dormer has been received in respect of the adjoining semi detached property which appears at item No.6 on this agenda.

For the development to be acceptable, it is considered necessary to ensure that the proposed works are carried out to the application dwelling and the adjoining semi detached property simultaneously. It will therefore be necessary to require the applicants to enter into a S106 agreement to ensure that both halves of the pair are sympathetically altered. It is for this reason that the application is presented to Committee for determination.

Subject to the applicant being willing to enter into a S.106 Agreement in order to carry out the proposed works simultaneously with the adjoining semi detached property at No 72 Roseberry Avenue, the proposal is recommended for APPROVAL.

Site Visit

It is recommended that Members visit the site prior to the determination of the application.

Introduction

The site is located on the eastern side of Roseberry Avenue, approximately 45m north of the junction with Eversley Road. The site is occupied by a semi-detached house with a garage in the rear garden.

The site has a frontage of some 11m and a depth of some 37m. The area to the front of the dwelling is completely hardsurfaced.

The area is characterised by 2 storey semi detached houses.

The Proposal

The proposal seeks to raise the ridge, provide roof lights in the front elevation and provide a flat roofed rear dormer to a two storey, semi-detached house, in order to create two bedrooms in the roof space.

It should be noted that a planning application involving the raising of the ridge and the provision of a rear dormer has been received in respect of the adjoining semi detached property at No. 72.

The proposal will raise the ridge height by some 1.3m.

The rear dormer would exhibit a mock hipped roof and would be some 5.7m wide, 3.4m deep and 2.6m high, rising to 8m above ground level.

Submitted Documentation

No additional documentation has been provided.

Relevant Planning History

The applicant has previously sought pre application advice in respect of a similar proposal to raise the ridge and provide flat roofed front and rear dormers at the property.

Relevant Government Guidance and Local Plan Policies

The site lies within an area allocated for residential purposes. The following policies and guidance are applicable.

National

- o National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Local Plan

- o EC2 Design
- o H17 Housing Development – Design and Layout
- o T8 Car Parking Standards

Residential Design Guidance

- o RDG5 Privacy and Living Conditions
- o RDG6 Amenity Space
- o RDG7 Roof Development
- o RDG8 Detailing
- o RDG12 Parking

Consultation

Legal Services

No response received

Neighbour consultations

No neighbour responses received

Evaluation of Proposal

Policy EC2 of the adopted Local Plan states that a high standard of design will be expected of all alterations and extensions to existing buildings.

Policy H17 states that in assessing the design aspects of the proposals for housing, the Local Planning Authority will have regard to its adopted Residential Design Guidelines (RDG). This guidance is considered to be in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

RDG8 requires the provision of detailing elements to be consistent with the overall architectural approach of the dwelling and RDG7 requires roof development to be proportionate to the roof of the existing dwelling and not appear top heavy, prominent or dominant. Fenestration at first and ground floor levels should be vertically and horizontally consistent.

RDG7 states that proposals for any form of roof development which results in the detrimental disruption or loss of symmetry to a pair or group of dwellings both in respect of roof planes and/or roofscape, will be refused.

The proposal seeks to raise the ridge of the dwelling and provide roof lights in the front elevation and a rear dormer.

The area is dominated by two storey development and whilst there is a general consistency in ridge heights in the area, there are also variations. In this context raising the ridge height of a property would not, in itself be objectionable. However, the application site is a semi detached property. Raising the ridge height of one half of the pair would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and ordinarily such a proposal would attract a recommendation of refusal. However, in this case, it should be noted that an application has been received for a similar proposal on the other half of the pair. This proposal is also considered on this agenda. Provided the works were undertaken to both properties simultaneously it is not considered that an increase in the ridge height would be so injurious to the character and appearance of the area that a reason for refusal on this basis could be sustained on appeal.

In order to ensure that the proposed works are carried out to both parts of the structure it will be necessary to require the applicants to enter into a legal agreement to ensure that both halves of the pair are sympathetically altered.

The proposal also seeks to provide a flat roofed rear dormer.

The design of the rear dormer is somewhat rudimentary however; it would be located to the rear of the site and would not therefore be particularly visible in the street scene. As such it is not considered that the rear dormer would cause such harm to the character and appearance of the area that a reason for refusal on this basis could be sustained on appeal. No objection is therefore raised to this element of the proposal.

It is proposed to provide roof lights in the front elevation. It is not considered that this element of the proposal would result in any detriment to the character of the dwelling or the area.

No objection is therefore raised to the proposal under Policy EC2 of the Council's Adopted Local Plan or RDG7 and RDG8 of the Residential Design Guidance.

RDG5 seeks to ensure the privacy of adjoining residents and requires the retention of 15m between any windows at second floor level and the boundaries of the site.

The roof lights in the front elevation would overlook the highway and are considered unlikely to result in any adverse impact on the privacy and amenity of adjoining residents.

The rear dormer is set some 20m from the rear boundary which satisfies the requirement of RDG5. No objection is therefore raised to the proposal on the basis of loss of amenity to adjoining residents.

RDG6 states that amenity space should cater for all the outdoor needs of all occupiers and that development involving individual dwellings should be provided with at least 15m² amenity space per habitable room. The proposal would result in the creation of additional habitable rooms bringing the total number to 7. The enlarged dwelling would therefore require the provision of 105m² of amenity space.

The site provides in excess of this level of amenity space. No objection is therefore raised under RDG6.

Policy T8 requires all development to be provided with the appropriate level of parking provision.

RDG12 states that the size and layout of all forms of parking should reflect current adopted vehicle parking standards. The current proposal seeks to increase the level of living accommodation on the site. Consideration must therefore be given to the provision of parking on the site.

For dwellings with two or more bedrooms two parking spaces are required. Two spaces must therefore be provided within the curtilage of the site, each measuring 2.9m by 5.5m.

The site can easily accommodate two parking spaces within the hardsurfaced area to the front of the dwelling.

Subject to a condition requiring the retention of these spaces, no objection is raised to the proposal under Policy T8 of the Council's Adopted Local Plan and RDG12 of the Residential Design Guidance.

Conclusion

The application seeks to raise the ridge, provide roof lights in the front elevation and provide a flat roofed rear dormer to a two storey, semi-detached house, in order to create two bedrooms in the roof space.

It should be noted that a planning application involving the raising of the ridge and the provision of a rear dormer has been received in respect of the adjoining semi detached property.

For the development to be acceptable, it is considered necessary to ensure that the proposed works are carried out to the application dwelling and the adjoining semi-detached house. It will therefore be necessary to require the applicant to enter into a legal agreement to ensure that both halves of the pair are sympathetically altered.

I have taken all other matters into consideration, but none are sufficient to outweigh the considerations that have led to the recommendation.

My **RECOMMENDATION** is that subject to the applicants entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement requiring the works to be carried out simultaneously with the adjoining property at No. 72 Roseberry Avenue, the Head of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods be authorised to APPROVE the application, subject to the following planning conditions:

- 1 This permission should be read in conjunction with the Section 106 Legal Agreement dated contemporaneously with this permission.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in sympathy with the existing development and the character of the surrounding area.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be begun on or before the expiration of five years beginning with the date of this permission.

REASON: This condition is imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 3 The proposed development shall be finished externally in materials to harmonise with the existing development.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in sympathy with the existing development and the character of the surrounding area.

- 4 Where garage and forecourt spaces are provided on the site these facilities shall be retained solely for that use and for no other purpose whatsoever without the formal consent of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure the retention of adequate on site car parking facilities to meet the Council's Adopted Standards for the amount of accommodation to be provided on the site.

Informatives

- 1 In undertaking the works hereby approved you are advised to satisfy yourself of your obligations to occupiers of adjoining properties in accordance with the Party Wall etc. Act 1996, details of which can be inspected at these offices or you may obtain details free of charge from the Planning Portal website (www.planningportal.gov.uk) under Building Regulations.
 - 2 The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
-