

## **Use of Pre-Application Report**

APPLICATION NO: 19/60200/PREAPP

PREAPP DESCRIPTION: Erection of two bed single storey bungalow

LOCATION: Land Rear of Ashgrove, Maldon Road, Hatfield Peverel

### **Executive Summary**

Original Report comments:

*If a formal planning application was submitted for consideration, the proposal could not be supported by Officers for the following reasons: - - The size, scale and layout of the proposed dwelling is considered to be cramped and congested in the plot and out of keeping with the neighbouring property and would be harmful to the character of the area. - There is concern that the development would have a detrimental impact upon neighbouring residential properties (the existing dwelling). - The application does not demonstrate that sufficient car parking/manoeuvring and turning space for the proposed and retained dwelling.*

This Report comments:

**Over the past 18 months I have invested a lot of time and money into being able to comply with the feedback giving to me when attending pre app in 2019. I have managed to comply with every comment to be able to meet the requirements of a successful planning application. Using pre app to good use. All the changes are listed below in each response section.**

### **Principle of Development:**

Relevant policies

RLP2 SP1 SP2 LPP1

Original Report comments:

*The application site is located within a defined development boundary (village envelopment or town development boundary) where the general principle of residential development is considered to be acceptable subject to compliance with the relevant policy criteria. The proposal would therefore accord with the relevant policies.*

This report comments:

**N/A**

### **Layout, Design and External Appearance**

Relevant policies

RLP3, RLP4, RLP8, RLP10, RLP90 CS9 SP6, LPP37, LPP50, LPP55

Original Report comments:

*The resultant plot size for the retained dwelling and the proposed dwelling would be in keeping with the more modest provision of private amenity for other dwellings in the locality and no objection is raised in this respect.*

*However, there are concerns that the development would appear cramped. The proposed dwelling would be sited close to the northern boundary (requiring the removal of an established hedge), would be sited close to the flank elevation of the existing dwelling containing habitable windows and doors, and the proposed parking provision would be constrained. These are factors which contribute to an overdevelopment of the site.*

*In terms of detailed design, whilst the dwelling in itself raises no objections, but there are concerns with the size, scale and massing which is significantly larger than the retained dwelling to which it relates. As discussed within the meeting, Officers would also not support accommodation within the roof space. The proposal would not therefore accord with the relevant policies.*

This report comments:

**My comments regarding the above in accordance to the new Layout, Design and External Appearance of the planning application are of the following:**

**Since attending the pre application meeting in 2019 (19/60200/PREAPP) my client has significantly extended their plot size, by purchasing 334m<sup>2</sup> of unused garden land from a neighbour, west of the original plot. Putting both pieces of land together has nearly doubled the area of the land to 774 m<sup>2</sup>. Which is 334m<sup>2</sup> bigger than the original pre app size land. This puts the proposal in a positive light, as the development now has a larger garden and more greenery/ vegetation areas. Making the proposal less 'cramped' as explained in the pre app comments.**

**Regarding this below statement:**

*The proposed dwelling would be sited close to the northern boundary (requiring the removal of an established hedge),*

**The new proposal has 4691mm distance between the flank wall and the northern boundary, leaving eligible space to be able to access the rear garden for activities. Such as green waste bin removal. Plus leaving sufficient space between the boundary and flank wall is adequate. The hedge that was acting as a boundary between the land and Vondene was 'brown' inside, meaning that the hedge was dead. After my client had purchased the land at the rear of Vondene, the hedge has subsequently been removed to open the complete plot. Now the plot has been extended, I strongly believe this resolves the above concern.**

**There will also be a 422m<sup>2</sup> wrap around garden which is 334m<sup>2</sup> amount larger than the plans proposed when coming to pre app.**

**The proposed new dwelling is surrounded by a combination of mainly detached houses, semi-detached houses, chalet Bungalows and bungalows (which have Velux windows installed into their roofs, which demonstrates that they have used their loft space for potential amenity space) To which I believe was an unjustifiable reason for concern in the pre app report, as other properties around the plot have used their loft space for amenity. There is a variety of property types that create the characteristics of the surrounding area. I do not believe the new proposed dwelling would be harmful to the characteristics of the area but bring value to the area. For example, the mix of roof tile colours surrounding the plot is between slate grey colour and brown. In which the proposal suggests matching the same colour grey slate as multiple properties surrounding. Along with a mixture of brick (to match existing red facing brick) of the existing property, and cream/white render. To match the existing surrounding area.**

### **Proposed Residential Amenity**

Relevant Policies: RLP90 LPP55

Original Report comments:

*The Council requires garden sizes to comply with the Essex Design Guide standards. Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) should be complied with for all affordable dwellings and applicants should aim to comply with NDSS for all market dwellings.*

*The floorplans indicate that bedroom 2 will have an outlook onto the shared boundary (understood to be a fence). Given the proximity of this, it would result in poor amenity in terms of light and outlook. Whilst this may be acceptable for a bathroom, utility room or secondary window etc., it would be unacceptable for a bedroom. (Also note the proposed flank utility room door would not be accessible). The proposal would therefore not accord with the relevant policies.*

This report comments:

**Since the pre application meeting in 2019 (19/60200/PREAPP) The floor plan has changed to suit the above comments. (Internal and external). The bedroom at the front of the bungalow now has a primary window outlook onto the garden, leaving the smaller two windows facing the boundary of Ashgrove as secondary windows. The smaller windows facing the shared boundary are now secondary windows, as preferred in the pre app comments. The access to and from the new position of the utility, is to the north and suffices sufficient space to access from the flank wall. I have c amenity.**

The Essex Design Garden Standards are the following:

**Minimum 10 Meter size gardens, in which the rear flank wall to the boundary is 12m, stated on the garden depth plan.**

**Proposed size garden:**

**I strongly believe the proposed garden comfortably fits in with policy. As stated on the garden depth plan the rear wall of the proposed bungalow to the boundary line is 12m. The garden also boasts a total area of 422m<sup>2</sup>.**

### **Impact Upon Existing Residential Amenity**

Relevant Policies: RLP90 LPP55

Original Report comments:

*Based on the information provided and following a desktop assessment of the proposal, taking into account the position of the existing dwelling and its existing flank openings, it is considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the adjacent residential property in terms of loss of light and outlook.*

**The new proposed dwellings is now situated further away from the current existing bungalow that sits on the land currently, than the drawings that were submitted in the Pre application. The new**

**bungalow sits 4.3 metres away from the flank wall of the existing bungalow. Separated by a hedge in between to boost the amount of greenery / landscaping commented on in the Pre App report.**

Original Report comments:

*Further, it would appear that a boundary fence is proposed to divide the plots – this would result in further harm to the outlook and light to those flank openings. Any application should consider the impact to these openings.*

This report comments:

**We have taken this into consideration and changed the fence to a soft landscaping and will be replacing the fence with a hedge to stop any harm to the outlook and light to the flanking openings**

Original Report comments:

*On any application, floorplans of the neighbouring property would be helpful to assist with such an assessment of impact.*



Original Report comments:

*If a planning application is submitted for consideration it would however be necessary to carefully assess the impact of the proposal on site. Please also note that any planning application will be subject to public consultation and neighbouring properties will be consulted on the proposal along with the Parish/Town Council.*

### **Highway Considerations**

Relevant Policies: RLP49, RLP50, RLP56 CS7 LPP44, LPP45

Original Report comments:

*The plans do not detail car parking provision for the retained or proposed dwelling. You are advised that 2 parking spaces would be required for each dwelling.*

*It is understood that some parking will be provided to the flank of the existing dwelling.*

*However it does not appear that this would be of sufficient size to accommodate 2 spaces (parking space standards are 2.9 x 5.5 metres).*

*Officers would not wish to have hard surfacing harsh up to the existing dwelling. It is also unclear whether adequate turning and manoeuvring can be accommodated to ensure that all vehicles exit the site in forward gear.*

*Any application (or on-going preapplication discussions) should detail parking layout and turning for the existing and proposed dwelling. Please note that the highway impact of the proposal (including the acceptability of any proposed new access or intensification of the use of an existing access) is a matter for Essex County Council Highways and you may wish to undertake a pre-application submission with them with regard to highway matters.*

This report comments:

**The proposal demonstrates where two parking spaces are provided in tandem parking for the proposed Dawson Grove bungalow. Also, on the plan, it states where the current existing bungalow has efficient space for two parking spaces plus a garage. The plan indicated the turning head for cars to move and turn around with sufficient space down the private drive. This ensures that all vehicles can exit the site in forward gear.**

**Also, the proposed bungalow allows for soft surfacing and soft landscaping at the front of the property, and leading towards Ashgrove as demonstrated, and annotated in the plans.**

### **Habitat Regulations Assessment**

Relevant Policies: RLP84 CS8 LPP68

Original Report comments:

*Natural England have published revised interim guidance on 16th August 2018 in connection with the emerging strategic approach relating to the Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) to ensure new residential development and any associated recreational disturbance impacts on European designated sites are compliant with the Habitat Regulations.*

*In accordance with the revised interim guidance, an appropriate assessment will need to be completed for this application by the Planning Authority, as it falls within the threshold for residential development and is located within the updated Zones of Influence.*

*However, at the time of writing, as the development would comprise 99 units or below, the development would not require a financial contribution towards off site mitigation.*

*If or when a planning application is submitted, this position may change and a contribution for off-site mitigation may be required. This contribution would be secured by way of a S106 legal agreement.*

This reports comments:

**N/A**

### **Other matters.**

Original Report comments:

*Relevant Policies: RLP63, RLP64 CS8 LPP73, LPP78*

*No land contamination issues have been identified at this stage and given the nature of site, it is not anticipated that it would be a constraint to development.*

*No unacceptable adverse noise impact has been identified at this stage.*

*The site lies within Flood Zone 1 (a low probability of flooding). It is not anticipated that the development would give rise to an unacceptable risk in flooding.*

This report comments: N/A