

Reference: 18/01228/FUL	Site: 53 - 55 Third Avenue Stanford Le Hope Essex
Ward: The Homesteads	Proposal: Ten detached dwellings with associated access road, additional access, hardstanding, landscaping and bike stores following the demolition of two existing detached bungalows.

Plan Number(s):		
Reference	Name	Received
P4A	Proposed Plans	24th August 2018
P5A	Proposed Plans	24th August 2018
P6	Proposed Plans	24th August 2018
P7A	Proposed Plans	24th August 2018
P8B	Proposed Plans	24th August 2018
P9A	Proposed Plans	24th August 2018
P10	Proposed Plans	24th August 2018
P11A	Proposed Plans	24th August 2018
P12A	Proposed Plans	24th August 2018
P13	Proposed Plans	24th August 2018
P14	Other	24th August 2018
P15	Existing Site Layout	19th October 2018
P16	Existing Site Layout	19th October 2018
PSF	Proposed Site Layout	26th November 2018
P1A	Location Plan	4th September 2018
P2B	Existing Site Layout	4th September 2018

<p>The application is also accompanied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design & Access Statement - Drainage Strategy - Highways Note - Tree Report - Viability Appraisal 	
<p>Applicant: Mr D Darby</p>	<p>Validated: 24 August 2018</p> <p>Date of expiry:</p>

	14 January 2019 (Extension of time agreed with applicant)
Recommendation: Refuse	

This application is scheduled for determination by the Council’s Planning Committee because it has been called in by Cllrs S Hebb, J Halden, D Huelin, A Watkins and B Johnson (in accordance with the Constitution Chapter 5, Part 3 (b), 2.1 (d) (ii)) to assess the impact of the proposal on the character of the area.

1.0 BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

1.1 The key elements of the proposals are set out in the table below:

Site Area (Gross)	0.29 ha						
Height	9m ridge height						
Units (All)	Type	1- bed	2- bed	3- bed	4- bed	5- bed	TOTAL
	Houses	0	0	2	5	3	10
Car parking	Houses: 10 Total allocated: 20 spaces (Average of per unit – 2) Total Visitor: 2 spaces (Average per unit – 0.2) Total: 22						
Amenity Space	Minimum: 91 sq.m Average: 104.9 sq.m Maximum: 126 sq.m						
Density	34.5 units per ha						

1.2 This is an application for planning permission for ten detached dwellings with associated access road, additional access point, hardstanding, landscaping and bike stores following the demolition of two existing detached bungalows.

1.3 The proposal would be made up of 2 three bed units, 5 four bed units and 3 five bed units. Three of the dwellings would be positioned in a similar area to the existing bungalows facing onto Third Avenue. There would be an access road

which would be located between Plots 2 and 3 which would provide access to the remaining plots to the rear. Three dwellings would be located on either side of this access road with the final four dwellings sited at the end of the access road towards the rear of the site. Parking areas would be provided to the front or side of all the units.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site relates to two separate plots of land both of which contain detached bungalows with rooms in the roof. These dwellings are to the south west side of Third Avenue which is within a residential area of Stanford-le-Hope. Both existing dwellings benefit from large rear gardens which back onto a block of garages located off Rose Valley Crescent. The site has a total area of 0.29 hectares and is surrounded to the side and rear by residential dwellings, garages and gardens.
- 2.2 The site is within the Homesteads ward within Stanford-le-Hope. This is a designated residential precinct which is identified as being an area where character is a key issue. The Homesteads ward is identified as being intensively developed in the past and therefore proposals for backland development must be very carefully considered.
- 2.3 The site is approximately 800m from the central shopping area in Corringham and 1.7km from the centre of Stanford-le-Hope and 2km from the station. There are protected (TPO) trees towards the front boundary of the site.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 There is no relevant planning history in relation to this proposal.

4.0 CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.1 Detailed below is a summary of the consultation responses received. The full version of each consultation response can be viewed on the Council's website via public access at the following link: www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning
- 4.2 PUBLICITY:

This application has been advertised by way of individual neighbour notification letters and public site notice which has been displayed nearby. 34 letters of objection were received in relation to this application. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of light

- Loss of privacy
- Loss of view
- Air/Light/Noise Pollution
- Noise from construction
- Traffic/parking from construction
- Damage to highway/drains
- Damage to nearby buildings
- Flood risk and surface water
- Impact on property value
- Parking
- Highway safety
- Refuse collection
- Impact upon drains
- Overdevelopment in the Homesteads area
- Impact upon the character of the area
- Contrary to policy
- Loss of green space
- Impact on community facilities
- Impact on drains
- Removal of trees
- Impact on TPO trees
- Impact on ecology
- Similar application in the area refused
- Lack of need for dwellings of this size
- Lack of affordable housing contribution
- Precedent for development
- Insufficient consultation

4.3 ANGLIAN WATER:

No objection subject to conditions and informatives.

4.4 EMERGENCY PLANNER:

No objection subject to conditions.

4.5 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:

No objection subject to conditions.

4.6 ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL ARCHAEOLOGY:

No objection.

4.7 HIGHWAYS:

No objection subject to conditions.

4.8 HOUSING:

Additional information required. Requested an affordable housing statement or a viability appraisal.

4.9 LANDSCAPE AND ECOLOGY ADVISOR:

Object due to impact on TPO trees.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT

5.1 National Planning policy Framework

The NPPF was published on 27th March 2012 and amended on 24th July 2018. Paragraph 10 of the Framework sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 2 of the Framework confirms the tests in s.38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and s.70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and that the Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions. Paragraph 11 states that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The following headings and content of the NPPF are relevant to the consideration of the current proposals:

2. Achieving sustainable development
4. Decision-making
5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
11. Making effective use of land
12. Achieving well-designed places
14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

5.2 Planning Policy Guidance

In March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched its planning practice guidance web-based resource. This was accompanied by a Written Ministerial Statement which includes a list of the previous planning policy guidance documents cancelled when the NPPF was launched. PPG contains a range of subject areas, with each area containing

several subtopics. Those of particular relevance to the determination of this planning application comprise:

- Design
- Determining a planning application
- Flood Risk and Coastal Change
- Hazardous Substances
- Land affected by contamination
- Planning obligations
- Transport evidence bases in plan making and decision taking
- Travel plans, transport assessments and statements in decision-taking
- Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas
- Use of Planning Conditions
- Viability

5.3 Local Planning Policy

5.4 Thurrock Local Development Framework (2015)

The Council adopted the “Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development Plan Document” in (as amended) in January 2015. The following Core Strategy policies apply to the proposals

OVERARCHING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT POLICY

- OSDP1 (Promotion of Sustainable Growth and Regeneration in Thurrock)¹

SPATIAL POLICIES

- CSSP1 (Sustainable Housing and Locations)

THEMATIC POLICIES

- CSTP1 (Strategic Housing Provision)
- CSTP2 (The Provision Of Affordable Housing)
- CSTP22 (Thurrock Design)
- CSTP23 (Thurrock Character and Distinctiveness)²

POLICIES FOR MANAGEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT

- PMD1 (Minimising Pollution and Impacts on Amenity)²
- PMD2 (Design and Layout)²
- PMD8 (Parking Standards)³
- PMD9 (Road Network Hierarchy)

- PMD10 (Transport Assessments and Travel Plans)²
- PMD15 (Flood Risk Assessment)²
- PMD16 (Developer Contributions)²

RETAINED POLICIES FROM LOCAL PLAN 1997

- H11 (Infill Development: Backland Development and Residential Precincts)

[Footnote: 1New Policy inserted by the Focused Review of the LDF Core Strategy. 2Wording of LDF-CS Policy and forward amended either in part or in full by the Focused Review of the LDF Core Strategy. 3Wording of forward to LDF-CS Policy amended either in part or in full by the Focused Review of the LDF Core Strategy].

Thurrock Local Plan

- 5.4 In February 2014 the Council embarked on the preparation of a new Local Plan for the Borough. Between February and April 2016 the Council consulted formally on an Issues and Options (Stage 1) document and simultaneously undertook a 'Call for Sites' exercise. In December 2018 the Council began consultation on an Issues and Options (Stage 2 Spatial Options and Sites) document.

Thurrock Design Strategy

- 5.5 In March 2017 the Council launched the Thurrock Design Strategy. The Design Strategy sets out the main design principles to be used by applicants for all new development in Thurrock. The Design Strategy is a supplementary planning document (SPD) which supports policies in the adopted Core Strategy.

6.0 ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 The material considerations for this application are as follows:

- I. Principle of the development
- II. Design and Layout and Impact upon the Area
- III. Traffic Impact, Access and Car Parking
- IV. Flood Risk and Drainage
- V. Effect on Neighbouring Properties
- VI. Ecology and Landscaping
- VII. Viability and Planning Obligations
- VIII. Other Matters

- I. PRINCIPLE OF THE DEVELOPMENT

- 6.2 The site is identified in the Adopted Interim Proposals Map accompanying the LDF Core Strategy (2011) and Focused Review (2015) as part of the Homesteads Ward. Core Strategy Policy CSTP23 protects residential precincts such as The Homesteads where the original spacious pattern of development has been eroded by significant infilling and backland development.
- 6.3 Policy H11 of the Thurrock Borough Local Plan 1997 is not a saved policy but provides a good background to the situation – that the Homesteads ward was the subject of rapid house building in the 1960-1980s, which dramatically altered the character of the area. Specifically, the Homesteads ward has suffered with extensive infilling and subdivision of large private gardens.
- 6.4 The policy then refers to Annexe A9 which is saved and relevant as it links to Core Strategy Policy CSTP23. The Annexe restricts development which would harm the character of The Homesteads.
- 6.5 In accordance with the above, the Council has strived to protect the spacious plots that characterise the Homesteads. The current plots are spacious with large rear gardens which contribute towards the identified special character of the area. The current proposal would result in 10 dwellings on the site including a significant amount of backland development which would encroach into a large area of open garden space to the rear of properties on Third Avenue and Rose Valley Crescent. This leads to an in principle objection to development which would result in an intensive backland development which would specifically conflict with the aims to protect spacious plots within this area. Policies PMD2 and CSTP22 seek to protect the character of an area and contribute to the positive sense of place through the application of high quality design and the proposal would therefore be contrary to these policies as well as CSTP23.

II. DESIGN AND LAYOUT AND IMPACT UPON THE AREA

- 6.6 The proposed dwellings would be of a relatively uniform traditional pitched roof design. There is some variation in the appearance of the dwellings as a number include front and rear gable ends and/or dormer windows in the roof. There is also variation in the materials to be used with a mix of facing brick and weatherboarding along with tiled roofs. The eaves and ridge height of the dwellings is uniform across the proposed development with a maximum height of 9m. There is some variation in the scale and bulk of the units due to the inclusion of front and rear gable ends and dormer windows on some of the larger properties.
- 6.7 There are a mix of house types and designs in the area including detached, semi-detached and terraced properties. These are generally of traditional design with hipped or pitched roofs and follow a relatively uniform forward building line. The proposal includes three detached dwellings located along the frontage with Third

Avenue. These are located in closer proximity to the road than the existing dwellings to either side of the site, particularly Plot 1 and 2 which are substantially forward of the neighbour at No.51A. The proposed dwellings would also appear to have a significantly greater bulk and mass than the nearby properties due to their width and pitched roof design. The result of this siting and bulk would be a row of properties which would appear overly dominant and incongruous in the street scene resulting in significant harm to its character.

- 6.8 There would be a central access road between plots 2 and 3 which would provide access to the seven dwellings located within what is currently garden space for the existing dwellings. Three dwellings would be located alongside the access road with a further four located at the end of this road towards the rear of the site. Whilst these dwellings would not be immediately visible in the street scene they would encroach into an area of land which is currently open and forms part of the general open character to the rear of properties on this part of Third Avenue. The proposal would introduce dwellings of significant scale and mass within a cramped layout which aims to maximise the number of units that can be provided within the area resulting in the overdevelopment of the site. The buildings would also be of a scale and mass which is greater than the surrounding dwellings, particularly due to the ridge height, pitched roof design and use of gable ends and dormer windows. The requirement for access and parking would also exacerbate these issues resulting in an area that is dominated by significant amounts of hardstanding around the proposed buildings. Therefore, as a result of the siting, scale and design of the proposed dwellings it is considered that they would result in the overdevelopment of the site, appearing as overly dominant and incongruous features within an open area which makes an important contribution to the character of the Homesteads ward.
- 6.9 Given the above the proposal is considered to result in a significant adverse impact upon the street scene and the general character of the area contrary to policies PMD2, CSTP22 and CSTP23 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- 6.10 Each dwelling would be of a sufficient size to provide a suitable living environment for future occupiers. However there are some issues with the internal layout of the units and the potential for overlooking of private amenity space and habitable room windows within the development. Plot 5 includes a bedroom with a side facing window in order to avoid overlooking towards No.51A. The result of this is a habitable room window facing the flank wall of Plot 6 resulting in inadequate light and outlook to this room.
- 6.11 In terms of privacy there are concern regards in the overlooking of private amenity space of a number of the plots. This is particularly the case with Plots 1, 3 and 5 which all include windows at first and second floor level which would overlook the private amenity space of other plots within a relatively short distance. This is

indicative of the cramped nature of the proposal and the overdevelopment of the site resulting in an unacceptable living environment for future occupiers contrary to Policy PMD1 of the Core Strategy.

III. TRAFFIC IMPACT, ACCESS AND CAR PARKING

- 6.12 The proposal would utilise three existing vehicular crossovers in order to provide access to the parking areas of plots 1 and 3 and the access road which would be created towards the centre of the site. An additional vehicular crossover would be created to provide access to the parking area of Plot 2. The Council's Highway Officer was consulted on the acceptability of the increase in the intensity of the use of the existing access points and the creation of a new access. They raised no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of a requirement for there to be a no waiting restriction along this length of the highway to ensure that visibility was adequate when exiting the access road to the rear properties. On this basis it is considered that the proposed access points would be acceptable. It is not considered that 10 additional dwellings would significantly impact upon the level of traffic in the area. Therefore the proposal is considered to be acceptable with regards to highway safety and capacity.
- 6.13 The proposal includes a total of 20 allocated parking spaces along with 2 visitor spaces. The site is identified as being within an area of medium accessibility, as set out in the Council's Draft Parking Standards, due to its relative proximity to Corringham Town Centre. In such locations there is a requirement for 1.5 to 2.0 spaces per dwelling with 0.25 spaces per dwelling provided as visitor or unallocated spaces. The standards also state that for houses for 4 or more bedrooms an additional parking space will be permitted which would take these houses up to 3 spaces although it is not indicated that this is a requirement.
- 6.14 The proposal would provide two allocated spaces per dwelling. Eight of the dwellings would have 4 or more bedrooms which would trigger the allowance for an additional parking space for each of these units. However, the guidance within the parking standards only indicates that this would be permitted and not that it is a specific requirement. With regards to the visitor/unallocated parking the proposal would provide 2 parking spaces which equates to 0.2 spaces per unit which is marginally below the requirement of 0.25 spaces. In isolation it is not considered that the deficiency of one space would be sufficient to substantiate a refusal based on a lack of visitor parking. The Council's Highway Officer raised no objection to this level of provision. Therefore whilst the concerns of residents regarding parking are noted it is considered, in this instance that the level of parking provision would be acceptable and therefore the proposal complies with the requirements of policy PMD8.

- 6.15 With regards to cycle and refuse storage there is adequate space indicated for these to the side and rear of the proposed dwellings. Details of the cycle storage have been provided with the application and it is considered that these would be appropriate and provide the necessary level of storage for each dwelling.
- 6.16 Information was provided with the application in relation to refuse collection including a swept path analysis which demonstrates that a refuse vehicle could access the site. This would allow for refuse collection to be from the front of each property which is considered to be appropriate.

IV. FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE

- 6.17 No objection has been raised to the proposal subject to a condition requiring the submission of outstanding information in relation to the surface water drainage strategy. On this basis it is considered that the principle of a suitable surface water drainage strategy has been established and the final details of this scheme and its implementation will ensure that there is no adverse impact upon surface water drainage in the area.

V. EFFECT ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES

- 6.18 Plots 1-3 would be in a relatively similar location to the existing properties on the site. They would not breach the 60 or 45 degree angles to the nearest front or rear facing habitable room windows of the neighbours. Whilst it is acknowledged that there would be some additional views to the rear at a high level this is not unusual in an urban residential environment and given the level of existing mutual overlooking would not result in a significant loss of privacy from these dwellings. These plots do include side facing windows at first and second floor level which could overlook neighbouring properties. However, these windows serve non-habitable rooms and could be conditioned to be obscure glazed in order to restrict any overlooking.
- 6.19 Plot 4 would be sited approximately 1m from the north west boundary of the site and would span the width of the rear boundary of No.1 Rose Valley Crescent. This would present a two storey flank wall running the length of this boundary with a ridge height of 9m where there is currently open garden land. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a reasonable separation distance between Plot 4 and the rear of No.1 it is considered that the close proximity to the boundary along with the scale and mass of the building would result in an overly dominant and overbearing appearance harmful to the amenity of this neighbour contrary to Policy PMD1 of the Core Strategy.

- 6.20 Plots 5 and 6 would be sited towards the south east side of the site although they would be set off this boundary by a minimum of 10m. Whilst they would be visible from neighbouring properties, particularly number 51A Third Avenue, it is considered that this retained separation distance is sufficient to ensure that there is no significant loss of light or overbearing impact upon this neighbour. With regards to privacy these plots only have one window at first floor level in the rear elevation facing this neighbour's garden. These serve non-habitable rooms and therefore could be conditioned to be obscure glazed to ensure there is no significant overlooking.
- 6.21 Plots 7 to 10 are located to the rear of the site a significant distance from the neighbours on Third Avenue. Plot 10 is in close proximity to the boundary with No.51A and presents a significant structure with a ridge height of 9m. It also includes dormer windows and a front gable end which further increase its bulk when viewed from the rear garden of this neighbour. Whilst the primary impact is towards the rear of this neighbour's garden it is considered that the considerable mass and bulk of Plot 10 would be sufficient to result in an overly dominant and overbearing impact upon this garden space harmful to the amenity of this neighbour. Therefore the dwelling at Plot 10 would have an adverse impact upon amenity contrary to Policy PMD1.
- 6.22 With regards to the impact of Plot 10 on privacy the proposal includes side facing windows at first and second floor level which could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut. There would be some views from the front facing windows of Plot 10 back towards No.51A, however given the angle and distance of these views it is considered that this would not result in a significant loss of privacy.
- 6.23 In terms of Plot 7 this would be separated from the nearest neighbours on Rose Valley Crescent by an access road and given the retained separation distance of approximately 17m to the rear of this neighbour it is considered that there would not be a significant loss of light or overbearing impact upon these neighbours. Plot 7 does include side facing windows facing these neighbours, however these could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut in order to ensure there is no significant loss of privacy.
- 6.24 To the rear of the site is a block of garages and it is considered that given the separation distance to the nearest properties beyond there would not be a significant loss of light, overbearing impact or loss of privacy to neighbours to the rear.
- 6.25 The proposal would result in an increase in vehicular movements to and within the site. There would also be some additional disturbance due to the siting of properties within a currently open area.

VI. ECOLOGY AND LANDSCAPING

- 6.26 There are two trees which are subject to Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) located within the front gardens of the existing properties. Both are mature Oaks; while it is noted that the tree at No.53 is smaller and has been subject to works in the past both significantly contribute to the amenity of the street scene. The Council's Landscape and Ecology Advisor was consulted on the application and noted that the development of the site will move the forward building line closer to Third Avenue than the existing dwellings. In addition the proposed access road would require construction through the root protection area (RPA) of both trees. Whilst it is acknowledged that the RPAs will have been altered by the previous development of the site it is considered that the alteration to the forward building line and the construction of the access road will significantly lessen the amount of undeveloped ground around these trees.
- 6.27 In addition to the above the tree report submitted with the application recognises that the canopy of the tree will require reduction to facilitate the development. There would also be pressure post development to further reduce these trees or even fell them due to the proximity to the front elevation of the proposed dwellings.
- 6.28 Given the concerns with regards to the encroachment into the RPA, the need to reduce the canopies to facilitate development and the future pressure to reduce or fell these trees it is considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact upon these TPO trees. This would be harmful to their amenity value and adversely impact upon the character of the area contrary to policies PMD1 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

VII. VIABILITY AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- 6.29 Policy CSTP2 requires the provision of 35% affordable housing where viable on sites accommodating 10 or more dwellings. Sites below this threshold are required to make an equivalent financial contribution towards off site provision. The current proposal is for 10 dwellings which triggers the requirement for on site provision. The Council's Housing team noted that the application does not propose any affordable housing. Therefore they requested that either an affordable housing statement be provided with policy compliant levels of affordable housing or a viability assessment if no affordable housing is proposed. In this instance a viability appraisal has been submitted with the application which demonstrates that the proposal cannot support this level of affordable housing provision. This was independently reviewed by the Council's Viability Advisor who confirmed that the viability appraisal was sufficient to demonstrate that the proposal could not support the required affordable housing and that any contribution would render the scheme

unviable. Therefore in this instance the lack of affordable housing is not considered to be something that could be objected to.

VIII. OTHER MATTERS

- 6.30 Concerns regarding the impact of construction works are noted. Whilst this would not represent a reason for refusal it is considered that if planning permission were to be granted it would be appropriate to impose a condition regarding a Construction Environmental Management Plan in order to limit the level of disturbance to neighbours during construction works.
- 6.31 Issues over the loss of a view, damage to the highway/drains/nearby buildings and the impact upon property value are not material planning considerations.
- 6.32 The previous removal of unprotected trees, whilst regrettable would not have required permission and cannot be taken into account in the determination of this application.
- 6.33 Concerns have been raised regarding the setting of a precedent for development in the area. Every application is considered on its own merits against relevant planning policy and therefore the determination of this application does not set a precedent. The development would however permanently erode two large plots within the Homesteads, as discussed above.
- 6.34 Concern has been raised regarding the lack of consultation. The correct consultation was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Development Management Procedure Order 2015.
- 6.35 Concerns have been raised regarding the impact upon drains, however Anglian Water advise there is adequate capacity to accommodate the development.
- 6.36 Whilst comments regarding the impact upon community facilities and infrastructure are noted it is considered that a scheme of this size is unlikely to have a significant additional impact. In addition, given its size and the viability of the scheme, the proposal would not be able to support a significant contribution towards infrastructure even if this were to be sought.
- 6.37 Comments have been raised regarding the impact upon ecology on the site and the impact that clearance works have had. Again whilst this clearance work may be regrettable there is nothing in planning terms to prevent this being carried out prior to an application being made. In addition the Council's Landscape and Ecology Advisor has raised no objection to the proposal on ecology grounds.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS FOR REFUSAL

- 7.1 The proposed development would result in the intensive development of a site within the Homesteads Ward. Policy CSTP23 protects the particular character and overdevelopment of sites within such identified residential precinct particularly when a proposal relates to backland development. The current plots are spacious with large rear gardens which contribute towards the identified special character of the area. The proposal would therefore encroach into a large area of open garden space to the rear of properties on Third Avenue and Rose Valley Crescent. This leads to an in principle objection to development of the site due to the adverse impact it would have upon the special character of the Homesteads Ward contrary to policy CSTP23.
- 7.2 In addition to the in principal objection to the intensive development of the Homesteads Ward the proposal would also result in a significant adverse impact upon the Third Avenue street scene, the general character of the area and neighbouring amenity. The overdevelopment of the site would also result in an unsuitable living environment for all future occupiers of the site and put pressure on TPO trees harmful to their amenity. As a result the proposal would be contrary to policies CSTP22, PMD1 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

8.1 Refuse, for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed development, by reason of the subdivision and overdevelopment of these existing generous residential plots in the Homesteads Ward, an area in which spacious gardens are a particularly valuable character trait, would result in a significant adverse impact upon this identified character area. The proposal thereby conflicts with the aims and intentions of policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy 2015.
- 2) The proposed dwellings on Plots 1-3 would, by reason of their siting forward of the building line, scale and design result in an overly dominant and incongruous feature which would be harmful to the street scene and the general character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- 3) The proposed development would, by reason of the scale and mass of the proposed dwellings, use of gable ends and dormer windows along with the extent of hardstanding, result in an overly dominant and incongruous form of development significantly adversely impacting upon the general character of the area. This is contrary to the requirements of policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

- 4) The proposed development would, by reason of its cramped layout, use of flank habitable room windows and limited separation distance between windows of certain plots and the private amenity space of others, result in limited outlook and privacy for a number of the plots adversely impacting upon the amenity of future occupiers. The proposal would therefore fail to provide a suitable residential environment for all future occupiers contrary to Policy PMD1 of the Core Strategy 2015.
- 5) The proposed dwellings on Plots 4 and 10, would, by reason of their siting in close proximity to the boundary with neighbouring properties along with their significant scale result in an overly dominant and overbearing impact upon the garden space of the neighbouring properties at No.51A Third Avenue and No.1 Rose Valley Crescent. This would cause significant harm to the amenity of these neighbours contrary to policies PMD1 of the Core Strategy 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- 6) The proposed development, by reason of the encroachment into the RPA of two TPO trees, the need to reduce the canopies of the trees to facilitate development and the future pressure to reduce or fell the trees would have an unacceptable impact upon these TPO trees. This would be harmful to their amenity value and adversely impact upon the character of the area contrary to policies PMD1 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

Positive and Proactive Statement

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant/Agent the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to liaise with the Applicant/Agent to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online: <http://regs.thurrock.gov.uk/online-applications>

