

STA/19592/3 – Mr & Mrs Morris

Erection of a 3 bedroom dwelling, widen drive and re-surface, and garden space for no.22 Horsecroft. Demolition and repositioning of stone wall and fence at no.14 Horsecroft (land adjoining no.22 Horsecroft) Land adjacent to no.22 Horsecroft, Stanford In The Vale

1.0 The Proposal

- 1.1 The application proposes the erection of a 3 bedroom dwelling with associated driveway, access and parking arrangements.
- 1.2 Extracts from the application plans are at **Appendix 1**.
- 1.3 This application is brought to Committee as the Parish Council objects to the application.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 STA/19592 Two storey side extension with covered verandah. Conditional permission July 2006.
- 2.2 STA/19592/1 Demolition of existing lean-to extension. Erection of new three-bedroom dwelling. Refused in March 2007.
- 2.3 STA/19592/2 Erection of 2no. two bedroom dwellings with associated works including widening and re-surfacing of drive and demolition and re-positioning of stone wall and fence at 14 Horsecroft. Refused in October 2007.
- 2.4 The above refusal notices and site layout plans are at **Appendix 2**.

3.0 Planning Policies

- 3.1 Policy DC1 of the Local Plan requires development to be of a high design quality in terms of layout, scale, mass, height, detailing, materials to be used, and its relationship with adjoining buildings, and to take into account local distinctiveness. Policy DC5 of the Local Plan requires safe and convenient access and parking.
- 3.2 Policy DC9 seeks to ensure development will not unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties and the wider environment.
- 3.3 Policy H11 of the Local Plan permits development within the larger villages on sites up to 0.5ha and up to 15 dwellings subject to acceptable design and layout. Policy H13 of the Local Plan restricts housing development outside of the built up areas of the towns and villages.

4.0 Consultations

- 4.1 Stanford in the Vale Parish Council object to this application due to “neighbour objections, access/egress, flooding, sewage, and possible rights of way.
- 4.2 County Engineer – No objections subject to conditions.
- 4.3 Drainage Engineer – “The applicant has provided insufficient details concerning the intended methods of draining the site. The applicant should be requested to provide further details or planning consent could be made conditional on the provision and approval by Technical Services of drainage details submitted after the consent and prior to the commencement of

building on site.”

4.4 8 letters of objection have been received from neighbours, their comments can be summarised as follows:

- This site is part of the gardens on properties 22-24 Horsecroft and the application would result in two properties completely without gardens
- The area is unsuitable and inappropriate for any building works
- The proposal has not resolved any of the previous problems
- The proposed access is not within the ownership of the applicant
- Concerns relating to highway safety including traffic, access, parking and manoeuvring
- The future occupiers would be reliant on the private car
- Concerns relating to drainage issues
- Concerns relating to the tarmacing of the drive, its impact on the character of the area, and increased surface water run-off
- Concerns relating to the impact on the character of the area
- Concerns relating to the exposed location of the remaining garden for no.22
- The parking bay for no.22 will be sited over a right of way
- The proposal is adjacent to a field where horses and cattle graze
- The proposal may obscure light to the adjacent vegetable gardens
- Concerns relating to the possible location of storage tanks
- Concerns relating to the relocation of the wall of no.14

5.0 **Officer Comments**

5.1 Two previous applications for dwelling(s) have been refused on this site. The current proposal is most similar to application STA/19592/1, which was for an end terrace dwelling in the same location as that now proposed. Whilst this was refused for two reasons, no objections were raised to the principle of a new dwelling in this location, its design or its impact on neighbouring residents. In this regard the current proposal is of a similar scale and design to the previous application STA/19592/1, and is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the area. Objection was raised to application STA/19592/2 which was for two dwellings, due to the extension of the built up area of the village into the open countryside. However, these were located further to the south east than the dwelling proposed in application STA/19592/1, and the dwelling now proposed.

5.2 Application STA/19592/1 for the single dwelling was refused due to the intensification of the access onto Horsecroft. However in the subsequent application for two dwellings no such objections were raised as the applicants were able to provide alterations to the driveway and access arrangements due to their ownership of no.14, which was considered to overcome the previous reason for refusal. The applicants are proposing the same alterations within this application, and in this regard the County Engineer is not raising objection on highway safety grounds, to the application subject to conditions. These conditions include the provision of a rumble strip and vision splays.

5.3 Application STA/19592/1 for the single dwelling was also refused due to the shared parking and manoeuvring area, and the impact of this on the future occupiers of the existing and proposed dwelling. Objections were also raised to the standards of amenity and neighbourliness provided. The proposal now submitted shows an area of garden to the immediate front of no.22, and a smaller garden area to the front of the proposed dwelling. These are considered to provide a buffer to the movements of vehicles, whilst still being able to provide acceptable parking and manoeuvring arrangements. Furthermore it is noted that the proposed dwelling would have an outlook, and a larger garden area to the south east. In light of the above it is considered that the current application has overcome the reasons for

refusal of application STA/19592/1.

5.4 It is not considered that the proposed parking spaces for no.22 would impinge on the access to the gardens to the south east. It is noted that some concerns have been raised with regard to the tarmacing of the private drive. The County Engineer has confirmed verbally that 5 metres of tarmacing at the entrance would be essential, however the remainder of the driveway could remain in the existing materials, or otherwise as agreed in writing. In addition drainage and surface run-off details will need to be submitted.

6.0 **Recommendation**

6.1 *It is recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to the following conditions.*

1. *TL1 Time Limit – Full Application*
2. *MC1 Submission of all external materials*
3. *Details of the surfacing of the driveway to be submitted and approved.*
4. *Submission of details of internal and external boundary treatments*
5. *RE8 Submission of drainage details (surface water and foul sewerage)*
6. *HY16 Parking, turning and manoeuvring in accordance with plan, and retained as such thereafter*
7. *Details of the construction of the access (including vision splays and a rumble strip) to be submitted and approved*