

PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision

Item 6.1

1 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION DETAILS

Ref: 17/04018/FUL
 Location: Homestead, Gibsons Hill, Norbury, London, SW16 3ER
 Ward: Norbury
 Description: Demolition of existing building: erection of three storey building with accommodation in roof space comprising 6 three bedroom and 3 two bedroom flats: formation of vehicular access and provision of associated parking
 Drawing Nos: 4844-11, 4844-01, 4844-03 Rev A, 4844-04 Rev A, 4844-05 Rev A, 4844-06 Rev A, 4844-07 Rev A and 4844-20
 Applicant: Mr Datto
 Agent: Ideal Planning & Design Ltd
 Case Officer: Katy Marks

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
Flats	0	3	6	0
Totals	0	3	6	0

Number of car parking spaces	Number of cycle parking spaces
9	18

1.1 This application is being reported to Planning Committee because objections above the threshold in the Committee Consideration Criteria have been received and the ward councillor (Councillor Khan) made representations in accordance with the Committee consideration criteria and requested committee consideration.

2 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That the Planning Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

A. That the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport has delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions

- 1) Development in accordance with the submitted plans
- 2) Submission of details of external facing materials, including samples and detailed drawings of design elements
- 3) Submission of balcony and screening details
- 4) Submission of details of hard and soft landscaping
- 5) Submission of tree survey and new tree planting schedule
- 6) Submission of tree protection plan
- 7) Submission of construction logistics plan
- 8) Submission of details of boundary treatment
- 9) Submission of details of cycle and refuse store

- 10) Submission of detailed drawings for the parking layout, disabled parking and electric vehicle charging points
- 11) The parking spaces shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation
- 12) The existing vehicle access points will be removed and the pavement reinstated (at the applicant's expense) prior to occupation.
- 13) 19% reduction in carbon emissions
- 14) Water usage restricted to 110 litres per person per day
- 15) Installation of at least 2 water butts
- 16) Commencement of the development within 3 years
- 17) Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport

Informatives

- 1) Site notice removal
- 2) CIL liability
- 3) Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport

3 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

3.1 The proposal involves:

- Demolition of the existing building
- Erection of a 3 storey building (with accommodation within the roofspace)
- The building would accommodate six 3 bedroom flats and two 2 bedroom flats
- Formation of vehicle access
- Provision of 6 parking spaces to the front of the building and 3 on the adjacent land
- Associated landscaping
- Associated cycle parking and bin storage

3.2 The size of the building has been substantially reduced during the course of the application but the number of units remains unchanged. The original application proposed significantly oversized flats, the flats in the scheme now all meet or slightly exceed the minimum space standards.

Site and Surroundings

3.3 The application site is located to the southern side of Gibson's Hill between Leathfield Close and Averil Grove. The site comprises a detached 1930s residential property with several extensions. The land slopes south/westward with a fall of about 1.3m. There are a number of mature trees along the western boundary of the site.

3.4 The area is residential in character, with a mixture of houses and blocks of flats, and the site lies opposite the Norwood Grove Conservation Area. However, it is not within a conservation area itself. There are three Grade II Listed Buildings in close proximity of the site on Arnall's Road (Beech Cottage on the corner with Gibson's Hill and nos.4 and 10) and St Joseph's College on the corner of Gibson's Hill is locally listed, the

nearest of these is located about 40m from the front boundary of the site. The site does not have any other constraints.

Planning History

3.5 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

- 06/01652/P – Planning permission refused and dismissed on appeal for erection of a two storey building with accommodation in roof space comprising 11 x 2 bedroom units and 1 x 1 bedroom units. Reasons:
 - The development was not considered to have a high quality design that respects its context
 - The building would be set some 8m further forward than the existing building line.
 - The ground level changes, large footprint, height, proportions and design including steeply pitched roofs to all sides would result in a very large and bulky building and there would be relatively few features to break up its overall mass.
 - This would be particularly apparent on the side elevations which would be as prominent in views from Gibson's Hill and Leaffield Close as the front elevation.
 - In these respects the development would be an overdevelopment and an unduly dominant and intrusive feature in the street scene.

4 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 The proposed development would contribute to meeting the Borough's housing targets. The redevelopment of the site for residential flats is acceptable in principle and the quantum and layout would not harm the character and appearance of the street scene.
- 4.2 The massing and scale of the building would not impact upon adjacent neighbours living conditions given the distances between the site and neighbouring properties and orientation of the building.
- 4.3 The proposed flats would provide high quality living conditions for future occupiers including suitable amenity space.
- 4.4 A sufficient level of car parking is provided and the development is not considered to give rise to any significant transport concerns in terms of on street parking and congestion.

5 CONSULTATION RESPONSE / LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 5.1 The application has been publicised by way of letters sent to neighbouring occupiers of the application site and by 3 site notices displayed in the vicinity of the application site (due to the site's position adjacent a conservation area). Re-consultation was also undertaken by way of letters (to neighbours and objectors) and site notices on the receipt of amended drawings. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 70 Objecting: 70 Supporting: 0
 (8 of these objections are 2nd objections received in response to the re-consultation)

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

Summary of objections	Response
<i>Principle</i>	
<p>Overdevelopment – overly large development and introduction of flats to replace 1 house would affect the character of the area</p> <p>The number of 3 bedroom flats means no affordable housing would be provided</p> <p>Previous smaller scheme was refused and dismissed on appeal (in 2006)</p>	<p>The development is not considered to be an overdevelopment. See paragraphs 7.2-7.5.</p> <p>There is an identified need in the borough for 3 bedroom properties. See paragraph 7.4.</p> <p>The policy framework has changed since the previous application. See paragraph 7.5.</p>
<i>Layout/Design/Scale & Massing</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The development is significantly larger than the existing in height and footprint and sits further forward in the street scene -It is overly large, too tall for the prominent site and is out of proportion with the surrounding properties -The development is out of keeping with the character of the area and the conservation area -Amendments have not significantly reduced it -Harm to the visual amenity of the area and aspect of the street scene -Design is old fashioned and not in keeping with the modern style of the area. St Josephs is not an appropriate precedent. It is inconsistent with the pattern of the area where there are no newly built properties. -Does not fulfil the provisions of the London Plan regarding size and volume of surrounding buildings and would detract from the established character of the street -Balconies out of character 	<p>The development is considered to be an appropriate response to the context of the site. The amendments have helped to reduce the scale and bulk of the development and improve the design and proportions. See paragraphs 7.6-7.11.</p>

<i>Amenity of neighbours</i>	
-Number of windows will result in loss of privacy for neighbours -Height would result in loss of light -Harm to the visual amenity of residents in the conservation area -Overlooking from rear balconies -Increase in noise and disturbance	The development is not considered to result in harm to the living conditions of neighbours as set out in paragraphs 7.12-7.14.
<i>Residential amenity of future residents</i>	
Insufficient amenity space (especially given front garden parking rather than basement parking in the 2006 application)	The amenity space is considered acceptable to meet Local and London Plan standards. See paragraph 7.16.
<i>Highways and Transport</i>	
-Insufficient parking for the number of occupants. -Impact on grass verge on Gibson's Hill from parking pressure. -Parking and access issues for existing residents and waste collection along Averil Grove More people parking illegally -Increased congestion and traffic in area which is already busy due to nearby school. -Increased traffic would result in increased danger for pupils of neighbouring school	9 parking spaces are proposed (1 for each flat) which is in line with London Plan standards. The development is not considered to result in a significant increase in numbers of cars and on street parking. There are no parking restrictions along parts of Gibson's Hill and Averil Grove and therefore an existing parking issue here cannot be controlled through this planning process. The number of cars and journeys to and from the site is not considered likely to result in significant increase in congestion or traffic or harm to pupils. Traffic associated with this development is not considered to exacerbate an existing issue.
<i>Trees</i>	
The parking area would result in the loss of trees and shrubs Loss of trees and green areas and harm to trees from foundations Loss of habitat for local wildlife	These trees are not considered to be of a high quality and would not warrant a tree preservation order. New landscaping is proposed. The existing trees on the site are proposed to be retained. The building would be located at least 2m from the side boundary of the site closest to the grass verge on Leafield Road. With an appropriate tree protection plan it is not considered to result in harm to these tree. This would be secured by condition. No evidence has been provided suggesting that there are any protected species on the site. A full landscaping plan would be secured by condition and should seek to improve biodiversity.

<i>Other</i>	
Insufficient bins for the site Where are the cycles and refuse bin collection area be located?	These are shown on the proposed site plan and are considered acceptable. The screening and size of the bin enclosure and cycle store would be secured by condition.
Potential for antisocial behaviour from the separate car parking area (dumping, drug taking/ prostitution)	Suitable boundary treatment and gating would be required for the parking area. This would be secured by condition.
Design does not appear to use environmentally friendly building methods or energy saving technology	The design would have to meet carbon dioxide reductions and water targets as set out in paragraph 7.24. The building regulations also control environmental performance of buildings which would have to be complied with.
<i>Non-material issues</i>	
Ownership issues – concern that the car parking area is not located within the applicant’s ownership as it has been included within a fenced area for the neighbouring site	The applicant has signed Certificate A on the application form and has provided evidence that this land is within their ownership. This is considered sufficient for planning purposes. A condition is proposed to ensure that the parking is implemented prior to occupation.
Noise, dust and visual impact of construction work	A condition required the submission of a construction logistics plan.
Security of neighbouring site given its use to house diplomats	The security of individuals on neighbouring sites is not considered to be a material consideration and should not restrict development in the area.
<i>Procedural issues</i>	
An objection was received from Mr Donald Trump which states ‘What s all the fuss’	This is not considered to be a valid support letter
No site notices seen outside property Insufficient consultation process	The application was advertised in line with the Council’s procedures. Site notices were erected and the council is in possession of photographic evidence. See paragraph 5.1.
Application not dealt with as a major application	The application does not meet National threshold for major applications (10+ flats)
Applicant has filed an application for 9 units rather than 10 which would result in more scrutiny and they can modify it after	An application for 9 units rather than 10 does not result in less scrutiny. Should the applicant later decide to apply for more units, the amended scheme would be fully assessed.
It is described as a 3 storey building but it is 4 storeys	Whilst there are 4 storeys of accommodation, the description of a 3 storey building with accommodation in the roof space is considered accurate.

5.3 Ward Councillor Shafi Khan has made the following objections to the scheme:

- The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site, out of keeping with the character of the area and detrimental to the appearance of the street scene by reason of its size, siting and design and would therefore conflict with Policies SP3, UD2, UD3 and H2 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Plan.
- The development would have a cramped and overcrowded layout with inadequate private amenity space for the occupiers of the dwelling and would thereby conflict with Policy UD8 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Plan *[Officer note: The Council has now adopted CLP 2018 which supersedes the UDP policies]*

5.4 The Norwood Society make the following objections:

- Notwithstanding the modifications to the original proposals contained in the amended plans, we still believe that this development is inappropriate in its context.
- We remain of the opinion that the proposed block of flats, by reason of its size and massing, is overlarge and over dominant in the local context and in that of the site itself. The modifications to the principal elevations, i.e. front and rear, are minimal, there are still nine flats and the footprint of the building has barely changed from that originally proposed. The design, a pastiche of that of the neighbouring early nineteenth century St. Joseph's School, is wholly inappropriate to a building of this nature.
- There is too little private amenity space provided for future residents of the nine proposed flats.

5.5 London Assembly Member, Steve O'Connell, has made the following objections:

- Although amended, the building is far too large for the site which adjoins the Norwood Grove Conservation Area and is totally out of proportion with the surrounding properties, would ruin the aspect of the area due to height and would be out of scale with the buildings around it
- It would not fulfil the provisions of the London Plan regarding the size and volume of surrounding buildings and would detract from the established character of the street
- Properties in the area would suffer a loss of privacy as there appear to be windows on each side of the building
- Parking provision is totally inadequate and would exacerbate an already difficult parking situation
- The refuse storage also appears unrealistic

5.6 The Member of Parliament for Croydon North, Steve Reed, has made the following objections:

- Comments sent in response to concerns raised by a constituent
- Development over-dominant inappropriate in light of the street scene
- Overlooking to neighbouring properties
- 9 parking spaces to accommodate a possible 48 tenants
- Similar to a previous planning application which was refused

6 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

6.1 In determining any planning application, the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of its Development Plan so far as is material to the application and to any other material considerations and the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Council's adopted Development Plan consists of the Consolidated London Plan 2015, the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (CLP) and the South London Waste Plan 2012.

6.2 Government Guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), issued in March 2012. The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, requiring that development which accords with an up-to-date local plan should be approved without delay. The NPPF identifies a number of key issues for the delivery of sustainable development, those most relevant to this case are:

- Requiring good design.
- Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions

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

Consolidated London Plan 2015 (LP):

- 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- 3.4 Optimising housing potential
- 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
- 3.8 Housing Choice
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.21 Woodlands and trees

Croydon Local Plan 2018 (CLP):

- SP2: Homes
- SP4: Urban Design and Local Character
- SP6: Environment and Climate Change
- SP8: Transport and Communication
- DM1: Housing choice for sustainable communities
- DM10: Design and character
- DM13: Refuse and recycling
- DM16: Promoting healthy communities
- DM18: Heritage assets and conservation
- DM23: Development and construction
- DM27: Protecting and enhancing our biodiversity

- DM28: Trees
- DM29: Promoting sustainable travel and reducing congestion
- DM30: Car and cycle parking in new development
- DM41: Norbury

Supplementary Planning Guidance as follows:

- Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards

7 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider are:

1. Principle of development
2. Townscape and visual impact
3. Residential amenity of adjoining occupiers
4. Residential amenity of future occupiers
5. Highways and transport
6. Trees and landscaping
7. Sustainability, flood risk and drainage

Principle of development

- 7.2 Policies support new housing in existing residential areas. The principle of demolishing the existing property and redeveloping it would be acceptable as the floor space of the existing dwelling is over 130m² and its demolition would not result in the net loss of a 3 bedroom home.
- 7.3 The proposed development would contain 6 three bedroom properties and 3 two bedroom properties. There is a specific need in the borough for larger three bedroom properties in particular and whilst there are no site specific targets for this size of development, larger developments in this area are expected to provide a minimum of 70% three bedroom properties. The suburban location of the site makes it suitable for family sized accommodation and it is therefore considered to contain an appropriate mix of unit sizes and would meet an identified need in the borough.
- 7.4 Local residents have raised concerns about the lack of affordable housing on the site. Sites providing 10 or more residential units are expected to provide affordable housing. This site provides 9 units and therefore this policy does not apply to the site. Some residents felt that the site could provide more than 9 units. However, during the course of the application, the applicant has sought to overcome concerns with regards to the height, scale and massing and this has reduced the size of the building and therefore the number of units which can be provided on the site. It is noted that had the applicant chosen to provide smaller units, there may have been some scope to provide additional units and affordable housing, however the housing mix currently proposed is considered to be acceptable and additional units on the site would give rise to other requirements such as an increased parking need and amenity requirements.
- 7.5 Local residents have also raised concerns that the development is of similar size or larger than a scheme which was refused in 2006. This previous development was different in design, massing and layout. It proposed a 2 storey building with accommodation in the roofspace providing 12 flats with basement parking, with the

basement access taking up much of the rear of the site. Since the date of this decision, the planning policy framework has changed with the adoption of NPPF, a new London Plan and the Croydon Local Plan 2018. All of these promote sustainable development and have prioritised the provision of housing to meet increased housing targets. The scale of the development is considered acceptable in this new policy context and the design and layout is considered to be an improvement from the previous scheme.

Townscape and visual impact

- 7.6 The proposed building has been reduced since the application was submitted, with the rear section of the building significantly reduced in scale. The building would be 3 storeys in height, with accommodation within the roof space, with a rear projection of 1-2 storeys in height.
- 7.7 The surrounding area has a very varied character in terms of both building massing, heights and designs. Opposite the site within the Norwood Grove Conservation Area, the properties are generally 2 storey detached houses (mostly of early to mid-20th Century design) and there are several listed buildings along Arnall's Road and locally listed St Joseph's College on the corner of Gibson's Hill and Beulah Hill. The properties adjacent to the site to the east and west are a mixture of modern terraced properties of 2-3 storeys in height with pitched roofs and 3 storey blocks of flats. The area is very green with several mature trees and most properties set back within their sites with planting to boundaries.
- 7.8 The massing is considered to be an appropriate response to the local character and would not appear overly dominant or prominent within the street scene. The height would be in keeping with the Local Plan which seeks to achieve a minimum of 3 storeys whilst respecting the surrounding area. The reduction of the rear part of the building means that the massing would appear less bulky in the street scene with this part of the building appearing subordinate to the main street frontage.
- 7.9 Given the varied context of the site, with large flatted blocks and house as well as the St Joseph's College building on the corner of the road, the development would not appear out of keeping with the area and it is not felt that it would harm the setting of the conservation area. The design would reflect the Georgian design found at St Joseph's College. Amendments have been received which improve the proportions of the front elevation, with an oversized front door and porch central to the façade and appropriately sized windows with decorative façade treatment in the form of coining, window surrounds and decoration to the eaves and dormer roofs. Full details of these decorative features would be secured by condition.
- 7.10 To the rear, the balcony balustrades have been simplified and set partially into the parapet of the roof below. This helps to reduce the bulk and appearance of the rear section of the building. Planters would be incorporated into the larger terraces to provide privacy and reduce the impact of the railings. Taller screening would be provided between the two larger terraces for the first 3m which would be wrought iron trellising with planting. Full details of the balustrades and privacy screens and planting would be secured by condition.
- 7.11 The proposed facing materials would be brick, with render detailing and a slate roof. Whilst red brick would be the preferred option to reflect the elevations of St Joseph's College, the proposed materials would be secured by condition to ensure that the brick would be of a high quality which would be appropriate within the context of the area.

7.12 In summary, the proposed building is considered to be an appropriate design response in an area of varied character without appearing as a pastiche. The scale is considered to be appropriate in its context and is also considered appropriate in the policy context of the Croydon Local Plan 2018.

Residential amenity of adjoining occupiers

7.13 The proposed dwelling is well separated from all adjoining occupiers. There are no adjoining neighbours either side of the application site, the nearest neighbours to the east and west are separated by Leafield Close and Averil Grove and are located between 17-20m away from the boundary of the site. It is not considered that these neighbours would be impacted by the development.

7.14 To the rear, the site is bounded by a block of garages (to the south) and to the south east, the site abuts the side boundary of 2 Leafield Road. This property does not have any windows to the side elevation facing onto the application site. Whilst the proposed building is taller than the existing building on the site, it would actually be positioned further away from the boundary with this neighbour than the existing property. At ground floor, the proposed new building would be located a minimum of 10m away from the boundary. At first and second floor, the bulk of the building would be stepped back further back. The main bulk of the building would be set more than 16m away from the boundary. The proposals would result in balconies at first floor and above, however, the boundary treatment and soft landscaping along the boundary of the site would reduce any visual impact of the building. The proposed building would also be angled away from the neighbour and would therefore not result in significant overlooking to their garden. The distance is considered acceptable to ensure that it would not result in significant overlooking of the neighbours garden.

7.15 Concerns have been raised about overlooking and loss of light to neighbours to the north. However, the nearest properties are separated from the site by about 30m, which is a considerable distance in an urban context. It is not considered that the development would harm the living conditions of any neighbours to the north. The scale and massing of the building is considered appropriate to the size of the site and the surrounding area, therefore it is not considered that the development would result in visual intrusion or harm to the amenity of neighbours.

Residential amenity of future occupiers

7.16 The internal floor space and private amenity space for all the flats is set out in the table below:

	Type	Proposed layout		Space standards	
		Internal	Amenity	Internal	Amenity
Flat 1	3b4p	81sqm	30sqm	74sqm	7sqm
Flat 2	2b4p	74sqm	14.7sqm	70sqm	7sqm
Flat 3	3b5p	92sqm	35sqm	86sqm	8sqm
Flat 4	3b5p	86sqm	8sqm	86sqm	8sqm

Flat 5	2b3p	64sqm	8sqm	61sqm	6sqm
Flat 6	2b3p	64sqm	15sqm	61sqm	6sqm
Flat 7	3b4p	78sqm	26.5sqm	74sqm	7sqm
Flat 8	3b4p	74sqm	26.5sqm	74sqm	7sqm
Flat 9	3b5p	87sqm	14.5sqm	86sqm	8sqm

- 7.17 The flats would all comply with or slightly exceed the nationally described space standards for internal floor space requirements. The room sizes, circulation, and storage is all acceptable and the flats are well laid out. All of the proposed flats would receive sufficient light and natural ventilation. Some of the ground floor flat windows would have an outlook out onto shared communal space. However, the proposed landscaping plan indicates that there would be a rockery area providing some separation between these windows and the communal amenity space. This would provide privacy for future occupiers.
- 7.18 Each property would have access to private amenity space in the form of a balcony or terrace in line with (or in excess of) London Plan standards. There would also be a shared communal garden to the rear of the site. The layout and size of the balcony and gardens is considered acceptable to meet the standards for both private amenity space and child play space. It is recommended that the hard and soft landscaping of the rear garden is secured by condition.

Highways and transport

- 7.19 The site is located within an area with poor public transport accessibility (PTAL 2). It is however close to several bus routes on Beulah Hill and Crown Lane/Crown Dale and close to local shops and schools. A total of 9 car parking spaces within 2 areas is proposed. This level of parking provision and the layouts proposed are considered acceptable. Electric vehicle charging points should also be provided and one of the parking spaces within the front forecourt should be designed for disabled use and be located close to the entrance to the property. It is recommended that details of this should be secured by condition.
- 7.20 There are 2 existing vehicle access points to the front of the site, which should be reinstated to footway at the applicant's expense and controlled by condition. For all accesses to the parking areas pedestrian visibility splays should be provided to either side of the access with no obstruction over 0.6m in height. Vehicle sight lines should also be indicated on the deposited plans. It is recommended that this detail is secured by condition.
- 7.21 Two cycle stores are proposed, which comply with London Plan standards and are acceptable. The external stores would need to be secure and covered. It is recommended that these details are secured by condition.
- 7.22 The location of a refuse store is considered acceptable. It is recommended that details of the screening and size for the proposed refuse store should be secured by condition.

Trees and landscaping

- 7.23 There are several trees on the site and several large mature trees on a piece of land to the east of the site. The development would be set further away from the trees on the neighbouring land and is therefore not considered to result in any harm to these trees. However, given the proximity of the trees and the importance of these trees for the appearance of the area, a tree protection plan would be secured by condition to ensure that appropriate protection is put up during construction.
- 7.24 The plans show that the existing trees on the site would be retained and hard and soft landscaping would be provided to the front and rear gardens. The proposed plans suggest that there would be an improvement to the landscaping for the site which is currently mostly hardstanding to the front garden. Whilst the retention of the existing trees would be supported, it is not clear from the submitted information whether these trees are all of high quality. Some appear to have been cut back significantly in the past. Given this, it is recommended that a tree survey and a detailed landscaping plan and planting strategy should be secured by condition.
- 7.25 The submitted information confirms that new boundary treatment would be provided to the site boundaries and to the parking area to the side of the site. Boundary treatment or landscaping is also required within the site to segregate the private amenity space and provide privacy for future occupiers. It is recommended that the details of the boundary treatment should be secured by condition.

Sustainability, flood risk, drainage and air quality

- 7.26 Conditions are recommended to secure a 19% carbon dioxide emission reduction and a water use target of 110L per head per day thereby meeting sustainability targets.
- 7.27 The site does not fall within a major flood risk area or surface water flood risk area and no mitigation measures are considered necessary. However, in order to reduce any potential surface water runoff through rain water harvesting, a condition is recommended to secure the provision of at least 2 water butts for the site.

Conclusions

- 7.28 The application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.
- 7.29 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account.