

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan Ref. Expiry Date
Mr. S. Hussey 'B'	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 3 no. detached dwellings and associated parking - 1 Blakes Field Drive, Barnt Green, B45 8JT	Residential	11/1102-DK 23.02.2012

Councillor C. B. Taylor has requested that this application be considered by the Committee, rather than being determined under delegated powers.

RECOMMENDATION:

- (a) that **DELEGATED POWERS** be granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services to determine the application following the expiry of the publicity period on 13.02.2012.
- (b) In the event that further representations are received, **DELEGATED POWERS** be granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services in consultation with the Chairman of Planning Committee to assess whether new material considerations have been raised and to issue a decision after the expiry of the statutory publicity period accordingly.

MINDED TO APPROVE

Consultations

WH	<p>Consulted: 06.01.2012. Response received: 11.01.2012.</p> <p>Recommends that the permission be deferred for the following reasons:-</p> <p>The applicant should provide additional information to address the following:</p> <p>The visibility splay onto Plymouth Road should be 2.4m x 43m in both directions. The existing street lighting column on Plymouth Road should be shown to consider if the new access conflicts with it. The visibility splay onto Blakesfield Drive should be 2.4 x 25m in both directions for each access.</p>
Lickey and Blackwell PC	Consulted: 06.01.2012. No response received.
ENG	Consulted: 06.01.2012. No response received.
WRS	Consulted: 06.01.2012. No response received.
WWT	Consulted: 06.01.2012. No response received.
Tree Officer	Consulted: 06.01.2012. Response received: 13.01.2012.
	<p>I have no objection to this development in view of any tree related issue and recommend the following condition.</p> <p>1. All trees to be retained within the site and trees within influencing distance of the development in neighbouring properties should be</p>

afforded full protection in accordance with BS5837
Recommendations: 2005 during the development of the site.

Publicity Neighbour notification: 3 letters sent 06.01.2012; expired 27.01.2012.
Site Notice posted 23.01.2012; expires 13.02.2012.
No responses received to date.

The site and its surroundings

The application site comprises an existing bungalow elevated above the level of Blakes Field Drive and Plymouth Road. Whilst there is some landscaping, there is still a relatively open aspect to these streets from the front of No. 1 Blakes Field Drive. There is a mature boundary to Plymouth Road. The area is characterized by large detached properties in spacious gardens such as in the adjoining 2, and 4 Berry Drive and 2 Blakes Field Drive. The design of the existing bungalow is characteristic of the properties on Blakes Field Drive and there are a mix of properties on Plymouth Road.

Proposal

The proposal is for the demolition of an existing dwelling and the erection of 3 no. detached dwellings and associated parking.

Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE1, QE2, QE3
WCSP	CTC.1, D.5, SD.2, SD.3, SD.4, SD.5, T.1
BDLP	DS4, DS13, S7, S8, C4, C17, BG4, TR1, TR11
DCS2	CP18
Others	PPS1, PPS3, PPS9, PPG13, SPG1

Relevant Planning History

P11/0107	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 3 detached dwellings with associated parking. Pre application advice.
----------	---

Notes

I consider that the key issues in the determination of this application are:

- (i) The principle of development on this site,
- (ii) The impact of the plot sub-division and the resulting density and layout in respect of the character of the area
- (iii) The impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring residents

In this respect, policies BG4, S7 and S8 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and the advice of PPS3 (Housing) and SPG1 (Residential Design Guide) are most relevant in determining the application.

Principle

I note the amendments to PPS3 in respect of the exclusion of gardens from the definition of previously developed land. This does not mean that all proposals for residential development on gardens is unacceptable and each application must be considered on its own merit. I consider that the principle of the development is acceptable provided that the proposal fulfils the requirements of the extant development plan. Therefore, I will examine the proposal on the basis of policies S7, S8 and BG4 of the BDLP and the advice of SPG1.

Design Density and Layout

The site forms part of an identified area for low density housing in respect of policy BG4. Policy BG4 states that the special character of the area should be maintained. The area consists of low density housing in a semi rural setting. The erection of the dwellings in the current proposal on a site of 0.32Ha would result in a site density of 9 dwellings per hectare. I note that the explanatory text of policy BG4 provides for an indicative density of 1 - 4 units per acre (approximately 3 - 10 units per hectare). I note that the site density would be higher than adjoining plots but there are areas of higher density along Plymouth Road and in the wider area. I consider that the proposal falls within the parameters of policy BG4 and is therefore acceptable in policy terms.

Policy S8 seeks to prohibit plot sub-division and housing on backland sites where such development would be detrimental to the character of the wider area. I do not consider that the proposal amounts to backland development since it relates appropriately to the corner of Blakes Field Drive and Plymouth Road. I note that there are a number of mature trees close to the corner and this have the effect of integrating the higher gable. I do not consider that the plot sub-division is of particular detriment such that permission can be refused on that basis. I note that permission was granted in B/1993/0142 for the erection of five dwellings at 27 Plymouth Road referred to as 'The Hollies' which similarly amounts to plot sub-division. I do not consider that the development would be contrary to the layout of the area.

The design of the proposal would consist of large detached houses in a one and a half storey format. The applicant has also reduced the ridge heights of the dwellings to reduce the vertical emphasis noted at pre application stage. I note the mix of designs in the area and I do not consider that the proposed design is inappropriate. The applicant has appraised local architectural styles and the proposal is designed to reflect these. Overall, I consider that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its design, density and layout.

Residential Amenity

In terms of the amenity and privacy of adjoining occupiers, the advice of paragraphs 8.0 - 8.4 of SPG1 are most relevant. A minimum separation distance of 21m is required to achieve a degree of privacy between conventional two storey dwellings. The orientation of the plots is such that there is no conflict in terms of the requirements of Figure 14 of SPG1 between the proposed units. Plots 2 and 3 are positioned more than 40 and 50m from No. 26a Plymouth Road and 5 Blakes Field Drive. Similarly plot 1 is more than 40m from No. 23 Plymouth Road opposite. The side elevation of this dwelling would be more than 40m from No. 2 Berry Drive.

I note that all of the windows to the sides of the proposed dwellings (besides Plot 2 which faces Plymouth Road) are serving bathrooms / ensuites and that all main living rooms are set off from the boundaries of adjoining gardens by more than 5m per storey.

In terms of amenity space for the dwellings, the proposal would exceed the requirements of paragraph 9.0 of SPG1.

Overall, the proposal conforms with the advice of SPG1 and with the requirements of policy S7 (e).

Other Issues

This proposal would result in the removal of No. 1 Blakes Field Drive. Article 12(1) of the EC Habitats Directive requires Member States to take requisite measures to establish a strict protection of certain animal species prohibiting the deterioration or destruction of breeding sites or resting places. This directive is implemented by the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994. Paragraph 116 of Circular 06/2005 requires the LPA to have regard to the Habitats Directive when dealing with planning applications where a European Protected species may be affected. The application is accompanied by an Ecological Survey Report. No evidence was uncovered either in a daytime survey or in an overnight emergence survey in the case of the building. Therefore, the removal of the building will not result in the loss of protected species and some voluntary mitigation measures for bats and birds are recommended.

Members should note the views of the Tree Officer as outlined above and the application is seeking to retain most of the existing trees on the site as outlined in the survey and proposed plans. The proposal complies with policies S7 and C17 in this regard.

The site is below the threshold for the provision of an open space contribution in the context of SPG11. The views of WRS and the Drainage Engineer are awaited.

Conclusion

In terms of the existing characteristics of the area and the prevailing policies of the development plan, the proposal is acceptable. I do not consider that there is any harm which would impact negatively on the character of the area, the amenity of residents or on any environmental assets of acknowledged importance. Permission should be granted.

RECOMMENDATION:

- (a) that **DELEGATED POWERS** be granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services to determine the application following the expiry of the publicity period on 13.02.2012.
- (b) In the event that further representations are received, **DELEGATED POWERS** be granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services in consultation with the Chairman of Planning Committee to assess whether new material considerations have been raised and to issue a decision after the expiry of the statutory publicity period accordingly.

MINDED TO APPROVE