

39 DEEVIEW ROAD SOUTH, CULTS

PROPOSED REPLACEMENT HOUSE

For: Mr Alan Massie

Application Ref.	: P111716	Advert	:
Application Date	: 18/11/2011	Advertised on	:
Officer	: Gareth Allison	Committee Date	: 5 April 2012
Ward: Lower Deeside (M Boulton/A Malone/A Milne)		Community Council	: Comments



**RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to conditions**

## **DESCRIPTION**

The application refers to 39 Deeview Road South, Cults, Aberdeen. The site it refers to features a granite villa set within a large feu, located within an established residential area. Deeview Road South is bounded on the north by the Deeside Walkway, and although access to each property is taken from Deeview Road South, the majority of residences take advantage of the sloping sites with frontages facing south to give views over the Dee Valley. The site is not set within a conservation area and the existing house is not listed. The trees on site are not protected by way of Tree Preservation Order.

## **HISTORY**

There is no planning history relevant to this application.

## **PROPOSAL**

This application for detailed planning permission seeks permission to erect a replacement house within the site with associated access, turning space and landscaping. The northern elevation, which would address Deeview Road South, would be one and a half storey at street level. Ridge lines, wall-head heights and eaves levels would be slightly higher than adjacent properties. The proposed garage would project northward with a hipped roof profile to be located 1 metre from the northern boundary at its closest point. Vehicular and pedestrian access would be provided from the northern boundary with turning space adjacent to the garage and main access doors to the house. Owing to the unique topography and slope of the site, the rear elevation would provide a 3 storey frontage with significant glazing and patio area to face south towards the Dee Valley. External materials would include natural slate, granite, render, and cedar timber linings. The proposed internal space includes an independent, self sustaining unit, with access gained from the north of the site. Following submission of the original plans, amended plans were submitted to include various changes to the proposal including reducing the overall scale of the proposed garage, replacing the proposed kitchen window with 2 No. smaller windows, and screening along the edges of the patio area.

## **REASON FOR REFERRAL TO SUB-COMMITTEE**

The application has been referred due to a formal objection being lodged from Cults Community Council.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

ROADS SECTION –

No objections

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH –

No observations

COMMUNITY COUNCIL –

Cults, Bieldside & Milltimber Community Council have objected on grounds of:

The loss of the existing building;

Proposed materials;

Proposed scale and massing; and

Impact on neighbouring privacy and amenity.

## REPRESENTATIONS

3 No. representations were received from members of the public in addition to the formal objection from Cults, Bieldside & Milltimber Community Council. The main concerns, including that of the Community Council, can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of Granite Building: The application proposes the loss of a traditional granite villa with no plans to re-use the granite in the proposed dwelling.
- Context & Setting: The proposal is out of context with the streetscape and its setting.
- Building Line: The proposal does not respect existing building lines on Deevie Road South. In particular the proposed garage projects to the northern building line and does not respect the northern building line.
- Height: The proposed ridge line is higher than surrounding properties.
- Scale: The dwelling does not complement the scale of other dwellings, is excessive in width resulting in a detrimental visual impact on the character of the street and the amenity of the area.
- Massing: The proposed massing is significantly larger than the existing house, overbearing and out of keeping with other properties within the area.
- Materials: Proposed materials are not considered appropriate for its setting.
- Residential Amenity: The dominating scale of the building would have a dominating affect on the area, whilst the proposed patio areas, elevated walkways, balconies and windows pose a serious threat to neighbouring privacy in terms of overlooking windows and garden ground.
- Daylight and Sunlight: The proposed height and ridgelines will have a detrimental effect on sunlight and daylight levels of adjoining properties, with the potential for overshadowing.
- Light Pollution: Light pollution from the proposed areas of glazing will have a significant impact on neighbouring properties and the valley to the south.
- Landscaping: The proposed development would be out of keeping with the landscape character of Deevie Road South.
- Loss of Trees: The site owner has felled a significant level of landscaping/vegetation/mature trees within the site to accommodate the development.
- Precedent: Approval of such an application would set an undesirable precedent.

The above concerns are addressed in full in the evaluation section below. A further 2 no. objections were submitted from members of the public however these were submitted outwith the neighbour notification period and are therefore not considered as part of the determination of the application.

## PLANNING POLICY

### 1. Aberdeen Local Development Plan Policy

Policy D1 – Architecture & Placemaking: *new development must be designed with due consideration for its context and make a positive contribution to its setting. Factors such as scale, massing, colour, materials, details, the proportions of building elements and landscaping will be considered in assessing this.*

Policy D4 - Aberdeen's Granite Heritage: *the City Council will encourage the retention of granite buildings throughout the City, even if not listed or in a conservation area.*

Policy D6 - Landscape: *development will only be acceptable where it respects landscape character and contributes to local amenity.*

Policy H1 - Residential Areas: *proposals for new residential development will be acceptable where it does not constitute over development; does not have an unacceptable impact on the character or amenity of the surrounding area; or does not result in the loss of valuable and valued areas of open space.*

## **2. Scottish Planning Policy**

Scottish Planning Policy – Housing: *considering the wider context of a proposal is important, with a focus on the character and identity of a locality. Density of development, housing style, materials and siting are just some of the factors which can contribute to a sense of place, and must be carefully considered in relation to the characteristics of an established residential area.*

## **EVALUATION**

The key issue in determining this application is to ascertain whether the proposal is consistent with the Aberdeen Local Development Plan and Scottish Planning Policy, and if not; whether material considerations justify a departure or if any arising issues can be resolved by planning conditions. For the purpose of this assessment, whilst the proposed house is orientated slightly off the north-south axis, the proposed elevations are hereon referred to as the northern, southern, eastern and western elevations. Following a detailed assessment of the site, the submitted plans and all information provided, the subsequent conclusions have been reached.

### Policy D4 - Aberdeen's Granite Heritage

The starting point for this application is to assess the acceptability of the removal of the existing house, and the principle of erecting a replacement house within the site. Policy D4 of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan can be applied in instances where the proposal includes the demolition of an existing granite building.

### D4 - Removal of Existing House

- Policy D4 states that the Planning Authority should encourage the retention of granite buildings within the city.
- However, given the historical use and significant levels of granite construction throughout the city, the policy seeks to retain and protect those buildings that are seen to have an important historical context, not merely to prevent the removal of any building that is constructed from granite.
- Each individual case should therefore be assessed on its own merits to determine if the requirements of this policy are applicable. This is achieved by ascertaining the historical importance of the building; its context and design; and how these contribute to the heritage of the city.
- In this case, the existing building is a 2 storey villa of traditional Victorian design; however other than its location within a streetscape with other granite buildings; there is no evidence to suggest that it has historical importance or heritage in the wider context.

With the retention of the existing house not justified under Policy D4 and the site and surrounding area being zoned as Residential under the Aberdeen Local Development Plan, the principle of erecting a replacement house is considered acceptable, subject to compliance with the relevant Residential Policy and guidance.

#### Policy D1 – Architecture & Placemaking & Scottish Planning Policy – Housing

It is acknowledged that the proposed house is substantially larger than the existing house and the adjoining properties in terms of both footprint and width. However in order to fully evaluate its impact within its context and setting, one must also take account of all other relevant factors. Of particular importance in making this judgement is the need to evaluate how the building would relate to the 2 No. adjoining properties, nos. 37 and 41 Deevie Road South, in terms of scale and massing, and in the wider context in terms of plot size, ratio and density.

#### D1 – Northern Elevation

- Looking firstly at the streetscape and in particular the northern elevation which addresses Deevie Road South; it is acknowledged that this elevation vastly exceeds the adjoining properties in terms of width.
- However to fully assess the acceptability of this elevation in terms of its context and setting, one must have full, collective regard for all proposed circumstances.
- The proposed ridge line would be only 2 metres higher than no. 37, with a separating distance between highest ridge points of 16 metres. Wallhead heights would be 0.5 metres higher, with a separating distance between elevations of 16.75 metres. With No. 41, the proposed ridgeline would be only 1 metre higher, with a separating distance between highest ridge points of 19 metres. Wallhead heights would again be 0.5 metres higher, with a separating distance between elevations of 11 metres.

#### D1 – Southern Elevation

- As with the northern elevation, the proposed southern elevation differs significantly from the adjacent properties in that it is of 3 storeys in height and again substantially wider within the plot.
- However as with the northern elevation, all other relevant factors must also be taken on board and fully considered.
- In this instance, it is firstly noted that this elevation will not be visible from the immediate public realm, other than from at a distance within the Dee Valley.
- Furthermore the proposed scale of 3 storeys comes primarily as a result of the existing topography and slope of the site to the south and not by raising the proposed ridgeline or wallhead heights from that which is proposed to the northern boundary.
- Indeed, the differences between ridgelines, wall-head heights and distances between the properties remain as above.

#### D1 – Plot Size

- In order to assess the proposed development in terms of its impact on the wider area, it is also important to consider the plot size, density and ratio.

- Council guidelines state that when erecting a new house, no more than 33% of the plot should be built upon. To allow a comparison, the existing ratio for no. 37 is 7% and no. 41 is 9%.
- With a site area of approximately 1981 square metres, this would allow for a 33% guideline of 654 square metres.
- The ground floor footprint of the proposed house would be approximately 297 square metres, a ratio of 15%.
- The width of the existing curtilage is substantial enough to allow a dwelling to be accommodated without detracting from or prejudicing amenity levels.
- The distance between the proposed and existing gable ends is similar to a number of houses located within the street.

By taking full consideration of the size of the site; its topography and natural slope to the south; the minor differences in ridgeline heights; wallhead heights; and the distances between each property; and having regard for existing and proposed landscaping, it is not considered that the scale and massing would be considered inappropriate for its context or setting and therefore compliant with Policy D1 and Scottish Planning Policy. The excessive width of the building in its own right would not carry enough weight to warrant a refusal of the proposal. Having regard for the size of the overall site, plot ratios and density; when compared to adjacent properties we can see that the development ratio is 8% larger than no. 37 and 6% larger than no. 41. However it still remains 18% lower than the recommended guidelines and therefore would remain within acceptable levels. It would not be considered to constitute overdevelopment, and does not result in the loss of valuable or valued areas of open space, thus complying with Policy D1.

#### D1 – Building Lines

- By way of layout, the houses along Deevie Road South form a semi-formal building line, which should be respected where possible. What is understood by semi-formal in this instance is that houses are generally located within a similar location in the site, although some elevations do project below or above this line due to the natural topography of each site.
- It is also noted that the situation within the street is unique in that whilst vehicular and pedestrian access is taken in most cases from the northern boundaries, the buildings themselves face south providing principle elevations which overlook private garden grounds and face Dee Valley to the south.
- The southern building line is therefore considered as the principle frontage, which should be respected under the terms of policy requirements.
- In this instance the proposed development projects no further forward of the general building line than other houses on the street.
- With regards the northern building line, it is therefore important to establish that this is considered the rear elevation, projecting northwards of this building line to incorporate an integrated garage would not conflict with policy.
- Indeed it is the case that a number of properties have garages, outbuildings or general built form that projects northwards towards the boundary.
- The key issue is to evaluate the proposed garage in terms of scale, massing, design and materials to ascertain its impact and acceptability within the streetscape.

- It is again noted that the proposed garage is substantially larger in terms of scale and massing than other garages or outbuildings within the street.
- In this regard, one must look individually at each aspect of its built form. It is noted that it would have a hipped roof profile and a wallhead height of 2.5 metres from ground level, set behind the existing boundary wall at a height of approximately 1.5 metres. Such a scale would not be considered to be over-dominating in its own right.
- In design terms, the external walls would be finished solely in natural granite, differing from other materials on the main house elevation (evaluated in full below), thereby giving a clear visual representation of a garage unit that is separate from the main house; as opposed to an additional, projecting section that may be interpreted as part of the overall built form of the house itself.

Having regard for all of the above, the Planning Authority is satisfied that the proposed dwelling respects the southern building line as required by Policy. The proposed garage to the northern elevation, although projecting northwards of the main living area, would, by way of height and external materials, clearly represent an independent garage and not part of the main built form of the dwelling. The hipped roof profile and proposed wallhead heights would ensure that its visual impact on the streetscape is minimised. In this regard, its location to the north of the site and proximity to the boundary would not be justification for further changes to the proposals or refusal of the application.

#### D1 – Design & Materials

- The proposed design and materials should be assessed both in terms of the surrounding area but also on their own merits and the individual site.
- In this sense, the existence of traditional properties on surrounding sites does not necessarily prevent a modern design being considered acceptable, however in such instances the Planning Authority would expect some reflection of local features or characteristics to be incorporated.
- This proposal includes the use of natural slate to all roof profiles and a significant amount of natural granite to the northern elevation. The east and west elevations would also have a granite finish in areas that would be most easily viewable from the public realm on Deevew Road South.
- The remaining areas of the property would be finished with a combination of cedar timber linings and wet dash rough-cast.

The site is not subject to any specific design requirements, other than it should be designed with due consideration for its context. In light of the above points, it is considered that although the design is modern in comparison to adjoining properties, the proposed materials are sufficient to reflect those within the area, in particular on the northern elevation, and would therefore comply with Policy D1.

#### Policy D6 – Landscape

In terms of both the site as a whole and the overall impact of the proposed dwelling on the surrounding area, consideration must be given to the existing trees within the site and the proposed landscaping that would be a conditional requirement of an approval.

- The existing site does not currently benefit from the somewhat substantial levels of vegetation and screening as adjoining sites, or indeed as the site itself did previously.
- However when assessing the application, one must have regard for the existing trees on site and the impact that the development may have on these.
- As such a tree survey has been submitted and has been fully considered by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. In this instance the Council is satisfied that important trees within the site can be both retained and protected throughout construction and the use of the proposed development.
- Furthermore the plans confirm an indicative landscaping scheme, which would be controlled through condition.

The proposal would not result in the loss of important trees within the site, with those retained being fully protected, and further landscaping being introduced within the site through condition. In this regard the proposal is considered to accord with Policy D6.

#### Policy H1- Residential Areas

A primary area of concern with such a proposal is the impact the development may have on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal includes various windows and elevated walkways to the eastern and western elevations that may impact upon privacy of neighbouring properties, whilst windows, balconies and patio areas to the southern elevation may impact upon neighbouring amenity by way of overlooking areas of rear garden ground. Each elevation can be evaluated independently as follows.

#### H1 – Eastern Elevation

- The proposed eastern elevation includes kitchen windows at ground floor level, although it should be noted that due to site topography these windows are in essence at first floor level.
- Given their elevated position, located approximately 5 metres from the boundary there is therefore the potential for overlooking.
- The boundary line incorporates a retaining wall; however the height of this offers no screening with regards these windows.
- However there exists screening on the boundary by way of various trees and vegetation.
- Adjoining the boundary is the driveway of no. 37, and a small secondary window on the western gable.
- The two properties sit approximately 16.5 metres apart.
- Having regard for the nature of the living space at this level (kitchen space) it was noted that the original proposal (glazing unit of 2.5 metres in width) was of considerable size and would intensify the potential of overlooking. As such the proposal was amended to incorporate 2 No. smaller windows at a width of 1.5 metres each.
- The elevation also includes an access door at the same level with external staircase.

It is noted firstly that at a distance of 16.75 metres, such an arrangement does not meet Council guidelines in terms of minimum window to window distances. However it is also noted that these are guidelines, and one must look at all the factors involved. It is considered that at 1.5 metres wide, at first floor level, with



trees located on the boundary, the potential for a detrimental impact on privacy by way of overlooking a relatively small, secondary window on the ground floor of the neighbouring property, would be reduced somewhat. Therefore despite a shortfall of 1.5 metres in terms of the guidelines, on balance it is considered that in general the arrangement is not sufficient to pose a serious threat. Likewise given that adjoining the boundary wall is the driveway of the neighbouring property, this is not considered private amenity space. Overlooking onto a driveway does not carry the same weight as overlooking private garden ground. The proposed staircase is, by nature, to provide access to an entrance door. As such and by way of its use for accessing and exiting the property only, any immediate impact would be brief rather than sustained, and as such not considered sufficient to generate a detrimental impact.

#### H1 – Western Elevation

- The proposed western elevation also includes 2 No. elevated windows at first floor level, located approximately 2.5 metres from the boundary. Owing to the site topography it is actually noted that due to internal floor levels and the slope of the site, the windows are actually slightly higher than first floor level when measured from the actual ground level.
- 1 No. of these windows is to provide daylight to an en-suite, and would be conditioned to incorporate frosted/obscured glazing.
- The second window is approximately 1.5 metres wide, servicing a proposed bedroom.
- The boundary incorporates a retaining wall with additional screening by way of various trees and vegetation.
- Adjoining the boundary is the driveway of no. 41, and a small secondary window on the western gable.
- The two properties sit approximately 11 metres apart.
- The elevation also includes an access door with an elevated walkway providing access from the northern edge of the site.

At a distance of 11 metres, such an arrangement is significantly lower than Council guidelines in terms of minimum window to window distances. However it is again noted that these are guidelines. As with the eastern elevation, it is considered on balance that the potential for a direct impact is reduced having regard for the proposed window width, its high location, with trees located on the boundary, and the location, size and secondary nature of the neighbouring window at ground floor level. The shortfall in distance between buildings is therefore not considered in its own right to be sufficient to pose a serious threat. Again the driveway of the neighbouring property abuts the boundary wall and this is not considered private amenity space. Likewise the proposed walkway is, by nature, to provide access. Such a use would again only pose a risk in terms of a brief impact.

#### H1 – Southern Elevation

- The proposed southern elevation incorporates substantial areas of glazing along with balconies and external patio area. With the elevation being broken up into 3 No. identifiable sections, the areas of concern regarding glazing and balconies can be narrowed down to the corner sections of both the eastern and western wings which project further south into the site.

- Again as with measuring impact on privacy, to fully evaluate the impact on amenity by way of overlooking, regard must be given to all factors.
- Firstly it is noted that when any houses are located in a line with private gardens to the rear, there is always potential for overlooking of these areas. Therefore it is the degree of overlooking that must be determined, and whether it is of a level that would be considered detrimental.
- The southerly facing windows do not pose a serious threat given that they are at right angles to the gardens. Furthermore it would be unreasonable to restrict south facing glazing as they would maximise the sunlight, daylight and views to the south; an arrangement no different to any other house along Deevue Road South.
- As a result of the proposed footprint, the wings are set slightly forward of both neighbouring properties, both of which have private areas of garden ground located to the south of their sites.
- Both wings incorporate a balcony at second floor level (taking the garden ground as ground floor level). These are recessed within the eaves of the roof; with both projecting forward a distance of 1 metre. As such they are considered to be primarily south facing.
- Furthermore the natural use of such an area in terms of using the space would be orientated towards the south rather than the east or west.
- The areas of glazing at ground floor and first floor level (again taking the garden ground as ground floor level) face directly east and west.
- By way of the nature of the internal space however, these glazing areas represent corner windows leading to access doors to enter and exit the property.
- They therefore do not constitute primary windows, and regard must be given to their use, and the significantly lower threat they would pose when compared to a primary window.
- As noted previously, both boundaries contain varying levels of screening and vegetation, with further landscaping to be agreed within the site.

Having regard for all of the above, it is considered firstly that by way of their southerly orientation, recess within the eaves and minor projection, the proposed balconies do not pose a serious threat to the general amenity of the neighbouring garden grounds. The eastern and western facing windows at ground floor and first floor do pose a more significant threat, however it is also noted that the nature of their use, their distance from the southern areas of the adjoining sites and the combination of existing and proposed screening along the boundaries goes some way to reduce this threat. On balance, it is agreed that it is highly likely that these windows will overlook some areas of garden ground; however for the reasons above this level is not considered sufficient to warrant refusal of the application.

#### H1 – Patio Area

- The proposal includes an elevated patio area to the rear of the dwelling.
- Located 7 metres from the eastern boundary and 3.5 metres from the western boundary at the closest points, this would provide outdoor useable space for proposed residents in addition to the rear garden.

- Given their elevated position and proximity to the boundaries however, there is clearly a significant threat of overlooking into neighbouring garden areas, and of the patio area being looked into from neighbouring gardens.

In light of the above, it was considered that this threat to amenity was of a significant level to warrant changes to the proposals. As such the applicant amended the proposals to include screening along both extremities of the patio boundaries to protect the amenity of both existing and proposed residents. This is considered sufficient to mitigate the concerns.

#### H1 – Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing

Further to the potential impact on privacy and amenity, the Planning Authority must also measure the impact the development may have on levels of daylight and sunlight of neighbouring properties, the potential for overshadowing and levels of light pollution in relation to neighbouring amenity. In this instance it is important to consider and understand the existing situation, to measure the impact of the proposed development, and to determine if the level of impact is sufficient to be considered detrimental. The applicant provided further drawings to allow these areas to be evaluated in full.

- Having regard for the position of no. 41 and no. 37 within their sites, the majority of direct sunlight and daylight comes from mid morning time through to mid evening as the sun moves through its southerly orientation. The southern elevations of both properties benefit from their siting and would receive the majority of direct sunlight throughout the day. Early morning sunrise and late evening sun-set levels would be restricted by the combination of both the height of the sun in the sky, the topography of each site and adjoining sites, and screening that exists by way of trees and vegetation.
- It is likely that the proposed development would impact upon no. 41 in the early stages of sunrise, with the potential to overshadow the eastern gable and driveway. As noted before on this elevation there is a small, secondary window.
- As the sun continues rise and move towards the south, this impact would be limited for a very brief period of time.
- Furthermore existing trees along this boundary would already overshadow these areas.
- The impact on no. 37 is likely to occur from mid afternoon to late evening as the sun sets in the west.
- Indeed the submitted plan shows that the property will overshadow the driveway and sections of the western gable as the sun moves.
- Overshadowing currently exists in this area however by way of large trees located close to the boundary, within the site.
- The potential impact is again considered to be limited, taking on board the current overshadowing from trees and the fact that it would only impact upon the western elevation, which at later stages of the day does not currently benefit from significant levels of sunlight.

It is acknowledged from the above that there may be an increase in levels of overshadowing and loss of direct sunlight for both nos. 41 and 37. However, for the majority of the day from mid morning to mid afternoon, throughout the year, both no. 41 and no. 37, and in particular their southern elevations, would continue to receive and enjoy the same levels of sunlight and daylight. Such an impact is therefore not considered significant and certainly not of a level that would warrant refusal of the application.

#### H1 – Light Pollution

- Whilst there is a substantial amount of glazing incorporated within the proposed house, in order to measure the impact of light pollution one must also consider the amount of glazing, the location of the glazing, and the nature of the use of the proposal. Furthermore with all residences producing varying levels of light at night time, the light produced would need to distinctly impact upon and reduce amenity levels of another property for it to be considered as light pollution.
- The northern elevation contains what would be described as an average amount of glazing for a house of this design. Light produced from these windows and any additional external lighting would be considered no more than would be expected. Furthermore by way of the site boundaries and proximity to nearby properties, it is highly unlikely that any light generated from this elevation would cause reduce the amenity of adjoining residents.
- A similar conclusion is reached for both the eastern and western elevations on account of the number of windows proposed.
- On the other hand, the southern elevation does include significant levels of glazing.
- However, given its definitive southern projection, the majority of light produced at night time would generally be orientated towards and contained within the garden ground to the south, with only minor levels affecting neighbouring gardens.
- Furthermore one must consider that within a residential area, there will always be the potential for light generation at night time from the windows of dwellings.

Having regard for the contained areas to the south, and the average levels to the other elevation, the proposed dwelling would not produce any more light pollution than would currently exist within such an area. In addition, it is recognised that the light generated will be visible from across the Dee Valley. This is not considered relevant in this instance however; most light generated at night time would be visible from a distance. To justify changes or refusal on this basis it would need to be proven that this light would have an immediate impact upon neighbouring amenity, which is not the case in this instance.

Having collective consideration for these points and those mentioned previously, it is considered that while the Policy H1.

#### Conclusion

Having collective consideration for all of the above, it is concluded that while the potential exists for various impacts on neighbouring amenity, the levels of each impact when evaluated in full and having regard for all relevant considerations are considered acceptable under the provisions of the Local Development Plan

and Scottish Planning Policy, having regard for all material considerations and subject to appropriate conditions. As such the application is recommended for conditional approval.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **Approve subject to conditions**

## **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

The removal of the existing house is not restricted whilst the proposed replacement house, by way of siting, design and scale is considered to be compatible with the Local Development Plan and Scottish Planning Policy. All areas regarding neighbouring privacy and amenity levels have been fully evaluated as has the potential impact on levels of sunlight, daylight and overshadowing. All issues of car-parking and access have been satisfactorily addressed.

Full consideration has been given to all concerns raised in representations, but neither do they outweigh the policy position as detailed above, nor do they justify further amendments to the plans or refusal of the application. All other relevant material considerations have been considered, and in line with these it is recommended that the application be approved subject to appropriate conditions.

### **it is recommended that approval is granted with the following condition(s):**

(1) that no development shall take place unless a scheme of all drainage works designed to meet the requirements of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority and thereafter no part of the development shall be occupied unless the drainage has been installed in complete accordance with the said scheme - in order to safeguard water qualities in adjacent watercourses and to ensure that the development can be adequately drained.

(2) that the en-suite window in the west facing elevation of the house hereby approved shall not be fitted otherwise than with with obscure glass unless the planning authority has given prior written approval for a variation - in the interests of protecting the privacy of adjoining residential properties.

(3) that no development pursuant to the planning permission hereby approved shall be carried out unless there has been submitted to and approved in writing for the purpose by the planning authority a further detailed scheme of landscaping for the site, which scheme shall include indications of all existing trees and landscaped areas on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development, and the proposed areas of tree/shrub planting including details of numbers, densities, locations, species, sizes and stage of maturity at planting - in the interests of the amenity of the area.

(4) that all planting, seeding and turfing comprised in the approved scheme of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting season following the completion of the development and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a size and species similar to those originally required to be planted, or in accordance with such other scheme as may be submitted to and approved in writing for the purpose by the planning authority - in the interests of the amenity of the area.

(5) that no development shall take place unless a plan showing those trees to be removed and those to be retained and a scheme for the protection of all trees to be retained on the site during construction works has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority and any such scheme as may have been approved has been implemented - in order to ensure adequate protection for the trees on site during the construction of the development.

(6) that any tree work which appears to become necessary during the implementation of the development shall not be undertaken without the prior written consent of the Planning Authority; any damage caused to trees growing on the site shall be remedied in accordance with British Standard 3998: 2010 "Recommendations for Tree Work" before the building hereby approved is first occupied - in order to preserve the character and visual amenity of the area.

**Dr Margaret Bochel**

Head of Planning and Sustainable Development.