APPLICATION NO: 14/01678/FUL		OFFICER: Mr Martin Chandler
DATE REGISTERED: 19th September 2014		DATE OF EXPIRY: 14th November 2014
WARD: Warden Hill		PARISH: None
APPLICANT:	Mr Gordon Malcolm	
AGENT:	Quattro Design Architects Ltd	
LOCATION:	Land adjacent to Number 6 Coniston Road, Cheltenham	
PROPOSAL:	Demolition of existing garages and erection of 2no. dwellings and associated hard and soft landscaping	

RECOMMENDATION: Permit



This site map is for reference purposes only. OS Crown Copyright. All rights reserved Cheltenham Borough Council 100024384 2007

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL

- **1.1** The application proposes the erection of two new dwellings on land currently in use as a garage and parking court.
- **1.2** The site contains a total of 16 spaces; 6 lock-up garages and 10 spaces. Five of the garages are currently leased.
- **1.3** This proposal is one of three applications before members at this meeting which relate to parking courts within Hatherley.
- **1.4** The application site is before Planning Committee due to the applicant being Cheltenham Borough Homes. Members will visit the site on planning view.

2. CONSTRAINTS AND RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Constraints:

None

Relevant Planning History:

None

3. POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Adopted Local Plan Policies

CP 4 Safe and sustainable living

CP 7 Design

HS 1 Housing development

RC 6 Play space in residential development

UI 3 Sustainable Drainage Systems

TP 1 Development and highway safety

TP 6 Parking provision in development

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Development on garden land and infill sites in Cheltenham (2009)

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework

4. CONSULTATIONS

Ward Councillors

4th February 2015

As ward Councillor, I have concerns about this application (also applicable to its sister applications in Haweswater Road and Coniston Road). Before committee considers passing this application it is important that residents' concerns, especially over parking, are not only taken into account but are met, given the already acute parking shortages in roads in the 'Lakeside' area. Any loss of parking capacity will create serious difficulties for residents.

At minimum committee should condition adequate parking capacity if it is minded to pass the application(s), as well as ensuring that other neighbour issues (e.g. crime risks in alleyways etc, and loss of light) are fully addressed.

Proposals at the time of writing (03/02/15) propose additional parking through demolitions of garage blocks i.e. additional to the actual building site, and displacement of garage users to underused capacity in adjacent blocks. This approach is good as far as it goes, but DOES NOT go far enough to make good the shortfall. Further measures are needed - by taking this process further and/or residents have suggested other measures such as extending laybys further into grass verge areas, and generally utilising other available spaces.

I await the officer report with interest, having already registered request to speak at committee.

GCC Highways Planning Liaison Officer

23rd September 2014

With regards to the above site; under our Highway's Standing advice criteria we do not need to be consulted on this application and this can be dealt with by yourselves with the aid of our guidance.

GCC Highways Planning Liaison Officer

10th February 2015

The proposal indicates an indication to provide a total of 4 in-curtilage spaces that are felt to be sufficient for a development of this size. As such, a proposal of this size falls under our Highway's standing advice criteria we do not need to be consulted on this application and this can be dealt with by yourselves with the aid of our guidance.

However; I note that the above location is currently used to provide off-street parking for a potential 18 vehicles by way of 12 spaces and 6 garages. Coniston Road provides on-street parking for local residents and acts as the primary vehicular access for St.Margarets Hall, a busy social venue owned by Cheltenham Borough Council and operated by St.Margarets Hall Users Group. The hall provides a large car park, but any overspill parking is accommodated along Coniston Road.

Additional off-road parking provision is available 22 m from the development site at Rydal Walk, 100 m away at Coniston Road 'B' and 170 m away at Grasmere Road. These areas are identified as Group ONE in 'Garage and Parking Strategy - Hatherley'. In addition to the above proposal, there is an indication to clear the garages from Grasmere Road to create additional, clear parking spaces. Overall this will result in a net gain of 3 spaces over the current provision.

A Parking Statement has been submitted in support of this application that considers the implications of the above proposal. It indicates that the off-street parking provided by the development location is lightly used and that there is adequate on-street parking available to accommodate any displaced parking without determent to other highway users. Therefore; the impact of the development cannot be considered to be 'severe' in accordance with paragraph 32 of the NPPF.

The proposed new dwellings will be provided with 2 off-street parking spaces each conforming with the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan.

I refer to the above planning application received on 19th September 2014 with Plan Nos: 4061/P/10, /20, application form and supporting documentation. I recommend that no highway objection be raised subject to the following condition being attached to any permission granted:-

The dwellings hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking associated with that dwelling has been provided in accordance with drawing 4061/P/10, and shall be maintained available for that purpose for the duration of the development.

Reason: To provide adequate parking provision in accordance with paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Contaminated Land Officer

29th September 2014

Small development planning condition for potentially contaminated land

No development shall take place until a site investigation of the nature and extent of contamination has been carried out in accordance with a methodology which has previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The results of the site investigation shall be made available to the local planning authority before any development begins. If any significant contamination is found during the site investigation, a report specifying the measures to be taken to remediate the site to render it suitable for the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The site shall be remediated in accordance with the approved measures before development begins.

If, during the course of development, any contamination is found which has not been identified in the site investigation, additional measures for the remediation of this source of contamination shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The remediation of the site shall incorporate the approved additional measures.

5. PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS

Number of letters sent	12
Total comments received	12
Number of objections	11
Number of supporting	0
General comment	1

- 5.1 To publicise the application, letters were sent to 12 neighbouring properties. In response, 11 objections have been received to the application and one more general observation. The concerns raised by residents primarily relate to the current levels of on-street car parking in the immediate vicinity and the fact that Coniston Road leads to St. Margaret's Hall which generates vehicle movements throughout the day. Loss of privacy is also raised as a concern.
- **5.2** These matters will be discussed fully in the following section.

6. OFFICER COMMENTS

6.1 Determining Issues

6.1.1 The key considerations in relation to this application are the principle of the development and the potential implications it may have for parking provision in the locality, the design and layout of the proposal and potential impact on neighbouring amenity.

6.2 The principle of redevelopment

- **6.2.1** As advised above, the application site currently provides for 16 parking spaces, all of which would be lost as part of this proposal.
- **6.2.2** To support their proposal, the applicant has given consideration to a parking strategy across a wider geographical area. Members may be aware that this part of the borough has a number of parking courts each used in differing amounts. With regard to this proposal, four parking courts have been assessed; Coniston Road 'A' (the application site), Coniston Road 'B', Rydal Walk and Grasmere Road.
- **6.2.3** Coniston Road 'B' provides for 6 garages and five parking spaces. Rydal Walk provides for 24 garages and Grasmere Road provides for 12 garages. The application site provides 6 garages and a further 10 parking spaces.
- **6.2.4** Of the 48 garages provided in this 'zone', only 26 are in use. Cheltenham Borough Homes therefore propose to relocate the 5 garage users of the application site to the 17 available garages in Coniston Road 'B' and Rydal Walk. Their proposed strategy also includes the demolition of the 12 garages in Grasmere Road (of which 8 are in use) and their replacement with 12 car parking spaces.
- **6.2.5** It is apparent from this strategy that the applicant is taking the matter seriously and that capacity does exist to relocate existing garage users without compromising highway safety.
- **6.2.6** Members may recall similar proposals for the garage courts in Imjin Road and Burma Avenue which involved a very similar exercise. Officers understand that these developments have now been implemented with little impact.
- **6.2.7** Given the capacity that has been identified locally, officers consider that the proposal to redevelop the application site to provide two new dwellings represents a good use of brownfield land. The report will now consider the merits of the specific scheme that is proposed.

6.3 Design and layout

- **6.3.1** Local Plan Policy CP7 requires development to be of a high standard of architectural design and to complement and respect neighbouring development. This proposal, as a pair of semi-detached houses, is respectful to the prevailing grain of the area and is considered to comply with the objectives of local plan policy.
- **6.3.2** The two dwellings will sit comfortably within the street scene and when assessed against the provisions of the SPD in relation to infill development, it is considered that the proposal fully understands its context and responds to it well. The houses are brick built with a tiled pitched roof and introduce subtle architectural detailing such as the wrap around canopy porch to add interest.

- **6.3.3** The proposal provides two off road parking spaces for each dwelling, private amenity space, areas for bin storage as well as other external storage and is considered to make a good use of the site.
- **6.3.4** In relation to the design and layout of the proposal, the scheme is fully compliant with the objectives of local plan policy CP7 and the guidance contained within the SPD relating to infill development.

6.4 Impact on neighbouring property

- **6.4.1** Local Plan Policy CP4 requires development to protect the existing amenity of neighbouring land users and the locality.
- 6.4.2 Members will note from the representations received in response to this application that some concern has been raised in relation to loss of privacy. Officers have fully assessed the application in response to this matter and advise that the proposal is compliant with the objectives of local plan policy. Local plan policy expects that first floor windows achieve a minimum distance of 10.5 metres to the rear boundary to ensure that privacy is not unduly compromised. In this instance, the proposal achieves nearly 14 metres. It is accepted that the proposal will change the level of privacy currently experienced by neighbouring residents but the assessment is whether or not this change would be to an unacceptable level. Given the distances set out above, the impact is not considered to be unacceptable.
- **6.4.3** In relation to loss of daylight, the proposal comfortably passes the relevant tests that are consistently applied by officers.
- **6.4.4** The proposal complies with the requirements of local plan policy CP4.

6.5 Access and highway issues

- **6.5.1** In response to the concerns raised by residents, the County Council were asked to expand upon their original response to the application. These comments are set out in full at section 4 above. Members will note that the County are satisfied with the parking strategy identified by the applicant and that whilst on street parking does take place, there is also capacity for additional cars without compromising highway safety.
- **6.5.2** The applicant has also submitted a parking survey relating to the use of the application site itself. This demonstrates that at the times when the surveys took place (Friday 12 December 1000-1100, Saturday 13 December 1400-1500 and Tuesday 16 December 2000-2100) the forecourt is lightly used, with the maximum number of cars observed being 3.
- **6.5.3** To summarise the highway implications, officers accept that this proposal will displace car parking into the local vicinity. To mitigate this, the applicant has identified space capacity in other parking courts in close proximity to the application site. Furthermore, it has been identified that some capacity does exist on street should the need arise.
- **6.5.4** Given this evidence, officers and the County Council are satisfied that the proposal will not compromise highway safety.

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

- **7.1** To conclude, it is considered that this proposal represents a well-considered redevelopment of the site. The applicant has not looked at the site in isolation and has identified a parking strategy to mitigate the displacement of cars from the application site.
- **7.2** The scheme itself is appropriate in form and footprint and will sit comfortably within the street scene. The proposal will not compromise neighbouring amenity unduly.
- **7.3** It is recommended that planning permission be granted.

8. CONDITIONS / INFORMATIVES

These will follow as an update.