

APPLICATION NO: 16/01149/FUL	OFFICER: Miss Michelle Payne
DATE REGISTERED: 30th June 2016	DATE OF EXPIRY: 25th August 2016
WARD: Charlton Park	PARISH: Charlton Kings
APPLICANT:	Allan White
AGENT:	Evans Jones Ltd
LOCATION:	15 Greenhills Road, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham
PROPOSAL:	Erection of a single dwelling to the rear of 15 Greenhills Road and associated access drive

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 This is a full application for the erection of a dwelling to the rear of 15 Greenhills Road.
- 1.2 Access for both the existing and proposed dwelling would be provided via a new access from Greenhills Road. The existing garage to the eastern side of the existing dwelling would be demolished to provide access to the rear of the site.
- 1.3 The application proposes a dwelling of a similar design to that quite recently approved to the rear of nos. 16 and 17 Greenhills Road, with the first floor accommodation provided within a steeply pitched hipped roof. Private amenity space, and parking and turning facilities for both the existing and proposed dwelling would be provided within the site.
- 1.4 The proposed dwelling has been revised during the course of the application to address a number of officer and consultee concerns. Most notably, the footprint and massing of the building has been reduced, and the garage detached. Additionally, the access from Greenhills Road has been centrally located to achieve the required visibility splays.
- 1.5 The application is before the planning committee at the request of Cllr Baker due to the concerns from nearby residents in regard to scale and loss of privacy, and following an objection from Charlton Kings Parish Council. Members will visit the site on planning view.
- 1.6 The application previously appeared on the Agenda for the September Planning Committee meeting but was deferred in the absence of a detailed consultation response from the County Council on highway matters.

2. CONSTRAINTS AND RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Constraints:

Smoke Control Order

Relevant Planning History:

CB08694/00

PERMIT

24th March 1969

Proposed conversion of garage to bedroom and store to bathroom and additional garage

CB21327/00

PERMIT

27th July 1995

Alterations and two storey extensions

3. POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Adopted Local Plan Policies

CP 1 Sustainable development

CP 3 Sustainable environment

CP 4 Safe and sustainable living

CP 7 Design

GE 5 Protection and replacement of trees

GE 6 Trees and development

HS 1 Housing development

RC 6 Play space in residential development

TP 1 Development and highway safety

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

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

Residential Alterations and Extensions (2008)

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Gloucestershire Centre for Environmental Records

7th July 2016

Available to view online

Cheltenham Civic Society

7th July 2016

This is a very heavy and clumsy design, and the roof arrangement is particularly awkward. We think there is scope for something much better here.

Tree Officer

14th July 2016

It is regrettable that there is no BS5837 (2012) tree survey to accompany this application as there are several large trees within the sphere of influence of the development-notably, the large poplar to the rear and also the fully mature birch in the adjacent rear garden.

Whilst the proposal will involve the removal of several fruit trees, these trees are not so remarkable that they ought to be retained. The previous Tree Survey for 16 Greenhills Road (14/01226/FUL) states that the tree should have a root protection radius of 8.4 metres and the nearest distance to this proposed building is approx. 8 metres. The shortfall of 0.5 metres can be off set elsewhere. Foundation design should take guidance from NHBC Chapter 4.2.

The point of the nearest patio area is approx. 3 metres to the centre of the trunk and as such provision should be made for this tree's roots when installing this patio. No excavation should be deeper than 150mm. Work should be undertaken by hand. The patio should be of a porous design so as to not reduce the volume of rainwater feeding nearby roots. No roots greater than 25mm should be severed during any excavation.

It is noted that previous arb consultant recommendation to reduce the overall height of this poplar by 8 metres to 17 metres overall height has not been undertaken. It would be considerably easier if this surgery was undertaken before any adjacent dwelling was built. Such a reduced height poplar would likely also reduce possible perceived anxiety of new inhabitants of this proposed dwelling and therefore there would hopefully be reduced demand to remove or prune more harshly.

Other trees/vegetation on site needs protection during the course of construction and as such a Tree Protection Plan (at distances recommended in BS5837 (2012) and should be submitted and agreed before the commencement of any work. Where construction access is required, appropriate ground protection will be necessary.

Similarly a method statement for the construction and installation of the patio should be submitted and agreed.

Parish Council

19th July 2016

Objection. We are objecting on the following grounds:

(1) Loss of amenity to adjacent properties. The proposed new dwelling will be close to the rear of properties in The Avenue with its front facing those properties. It is not clear from the

plans how close; in one drawing the distance appears to be 5m, but this could be an error in the scale given on the plan. The gap should be consistent with the Supplementary Planning Document.

(2) As noted by the Tree Officer, we agree that a Tree Survey to British Standard 5837 needs to be carried out, particularly given the presence of a large poplar and mature birch.

(3) From the plans and scale provided we note that the proposed access road to the new property will be narrow and just about sufficient for emergency vehicles.

GCC Highways Planning Liaison Officer

1st August 2016

I refer to the above planning application received on 19th July 2016.

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.

If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

GCC Highways Planning Liaison Officer (revised comment)

19th September 2016

I refer to the above planning application received on 19th July 2016, with Plan(s) Nos SP02,1-6,1-5,1-3,1-2,1-1,2-1,1-7,3-4,3-3,3-2,3-1, Plan number viz 01, Application form and design and access statement.

Development Proposal

The proposal is for a single dwelling in the rear garden of 15 Greenhills road with a shared access.

Site Access

A site visit was undertaken on the 19 September 2016 to review the existing site layout and whether the proposed emerging visibility splays as shown on drawing Plan number Viz 01, could be achieved on site. I can confirm that I have measured the achievable visibility splay using an 'x' distance of 2m and 10.1m is available to the east measured to the nearside carriageway edge. I have also considered whether measuring to the nearside vehicle track rather than the kerb edge would improve the available visibility in accordance with MfS and Mfs 2 and I estimate that 24.2m could be achieved, to the west after the removal of the hedge row to facilitate the widening of the access the required 54m (Y distance) can be achieved. The required 'Deemed to Satisfy Visibility Standards' as shown in Table 3.10 of GCC Standing Advice require visibility splays of 54m and the available visibility to the east is significantly below this requirement. The access layout as shown on plan number SP-02 shows a restricted width driveway and no pedestrian visibility splays.

Plan number SP-02 shows that a large estate car can pass alongside the existing dwelling to access the purposed parking spaces for the new dwelling.

I recommend that this application be refused for the following reason:

The proposed development fails to provide safe and suitable access that minimises conflict between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists due to the restricted visibility to the south contrary to Paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

GCC Highways Planning Liaison Officer (further revised comment)

1st November 2016

I refer to the additional information received on Tuesday 27th October 2016, submitted with Transport Statement which includes data from a speed survey, Appendix A, 360 TSL Traffic Data Collection Speed Survey undertaken on Wednesday 14th September 2016 between 10.00-13.00 hours. Revised plans, alternative access arrangement ref; SK03, location plan ref; 12725 3-1, block plan ref; 12725 3-7, tracking of 4x4 ref; SP02, elevations erf; 12725 3-5, plans ref; 12725 3-4.

Site Access

A site visit was undertaken on the 1st November 2016 to review the revised site layout and whether the proposed emerging visibility splays as shown on drawing Plan number SK03, could be achieved on site. I can confirm that I have measured the achievable visibility splay using an 'x' distance of 2m and 43.41m is available to the east measuring to the nearside vehicle track rather than the kerb edge in accordance with MfS and Mfs 2. To the west of the access the required 54m (Y distance) can be achieved, however this also is based on measuring to the nearside vehicle track edge (approximately 500mm). The Double relaxation of standards will be required, in reducing the "x" distance from 2.4m to 2m and measuring from the vehicle track edge I can confirm the visibility splays can be achieved.

Speed Survey

The results of a speed survey were submitted along with additional information, while calculations were undertaken by an independent traffic data collection agency the incorrect formulas were applied. The calculations shown do not take into account that Greenhills road is on a bus route. The recorded 85th percentile vehicle speed Eastbound on Greenhills road is 32 mph or 29.5mph with a wet weather reduction of 2.48 mph applied. Westbound 85th percentile speed was recorded as 30 mph or with the wet weather reduction applied, 27.5 mph. however the correct calculations as stated by MFS2 SSD = $vt + (vv / (2d + 0.1a))$ v= speed (m/s), t= driver perception time (seconds) d= deceleration (m/s m/s) therefore applying the correct formula, the required visibility splays are; 43.41 metres eastbound with 45.81m of forward visibility and westbound visibility splays of 38.97 metres and forward visibility of 41.37 metres.

Summary

With the submission of further information and a further site visit I can confirm that a safe and suitable access can be achieved therefore, I raise no highway objection.

5. PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.1 Letters of notification were sent out to 8 neighbouring properties on receipt of the original application. In response to the publicity, representations were received from the owner/occupiers of five neighbouring properties; an additional representation was submitted on behalf of Green Avenue Ltd.
- 5.2 Further letters were sent out on receipt of the amended house proposals to notify neighbours and allow an additional 7 days for comments. Letters were again sent out to notify neighbours of the most recent access proposals.
- 5.3 All representations have been circulated in full to Members but, in brief, the main objections relate to:
 - Overdevelopment / proximity to neighbours
 - Visual impact / loss of privacy
 - Parking / access / highway safety
 - Lack of tree information
 - Errors on drawings

6. OFFICER COMMENTS

6.1 Determining Issues

6.1.1 The main considerations when determining this application relate to the principle of development, design and layout, potential for impact on neighbouring amenity, and highway safety.

6.2 Principle of development

6.2.1 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF advises that when determining applications for housing they *“should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites”*; as it stands, the Council is currently unable to demonstrate such a five year supply.

6.2.2 Where housing policies are not considered to be up-to-date, the NPPF is quite clear that development proposals should be approved without delay unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the NPPF policies as a whole, or specific NPPF policies indicate that development should be restricted.

6.2.3 In addition to the above, paragraph 53 of the NPPF suggests that local planning authorities should set out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens and this is what the Council's adopted SPD relating to 'Development of Garden Land and Infill Sites in Cheltenham' seeks to achieve. The document is therefore a material consideration when determining this application.

6.2.4 It is however important to remember that the aim of the Garden Land SPD is not to prevent development on garden land but to ensure that development proposals are based upon a thorough understanding of the character of the neighbourhood, and in particular the street and block within which the site is located.

6.2.5 In this instance, the application site is located within the built up area of Cheltenham in a sustainable location and therefore there is no fundamental reason to suggest that the principle of developing this site for a single dwelling is unacceptable; particularly given the recent planning permissions granted on the neighbouring sites.

6.3 The site and its context

6.3.1 The application site is located on the northern side of Greenhills Road within Charlton Kings parish. The existing property currently benefits from a large rear garden which is approximately 50 metres long by 19 metres wide and largely laid to lawn. The garden is bounded on either side by residential properties in Greenhills Road, and The Avenue to the rear.

6.3.2 Greenhills Road is predominantly characterised by substantial detached dwellings in large sized plots; the properties are set back quite some distance from the edge of the carriageway, giving the road an open and spacious feel.

6.3.3 The character and urban grain of the locality has changed quite significantly in recent years as a result of a number of developments having taken place on the rear gardens of nos. 18, 19 and 20 Greenhills Road in the form of a cul-de-sac consisting of five dwellings, nos. 1 – 5 Hayman Close, with a shared access running alongside no. 20 Greenhills Road.

6.3.4 A development of five dwellings, nos.1 – 5 Charlton Gardens, has also taken place on the rear gardens of nos. 108, 110, 112 and 114 Charlton Lane further to the west.

6.3.5 Most recently, planning permission was granted for the erection of single dwellings to the rear of nos. 16 and 17 Greenhills Road; both of these permissions have since been implemented.

6.4 Design and layout

6.4.1 Local plan policy CP7 requires all new development to be of a high standard of architectural design and to complement and respect neighbouring development and the character of the locality. Additionally, part 7 of the NPPF highlights the need to secure high quality and inclusive design for all development.

6.4.2 The proposed dwelling would be located to the rear of the site adjacent to the new dwelling recently constructed to the rear of no. 16 Greenhills Road. As originally submitted, the application proposed an almost identical dwelling to those recently approved in the adjacent gardens but, as this site is narrower in width, and slightly shorter in depth, officers considered it necessary to seek a reduction in the massing and footprint of the dwelling so as to acknowledge the reduced site area and to ensure that the dwelling could be comfortably accommodated within the site.

6.4.3 The applicant has submitted revised drawings that have reduced the bulk of the dwelling although the overall design approach is unchanged, with the first floor accommodation provided within a steeply pitched hipped roof and a similar palette of facing materials. A detached single garage is also now proposed. The mass, scale and external appearance of the dwelling in its revised form is considered to be acceptable.

6.4.4 Access for both the existing and proposed dwellings would be provided via a reformed access from Greenhills Road. In order to provide access to the rear of the site, an existing garage to the eastern side of the existing dwelling would be demolished.

6.4.5 It is acknowledged that the access to the site is relatively tight and close to the eastern boundary of the site. This relationship is exacerbated by the lower fence that sits between the application site and the neighbour to the east. Officers therefore advise that if members are minded to support this application, a condition is necessary to ensure a suitably robust landscaping scheme is delivered to soften the relationship. Members are advised that the relationship of the access road is very similar to that already approved on the adjacent sites and these accesses do work successfully; much of this success is due to the landscaping arrangements that limit views.

6.4.6 Whilst page 36 of the garden land SPD suggests that single 'tandem' development which shares the same access or plot as the frontage development will not normally be acceptable, it does not preclude such developments. In this particular case, backland developments have already successfully taken place, and a secondary line of housing has been established. The proposed block plan clearly indicates that the proposed dwelling would sit well within its context and would respect the already altered character of the locality.

6.4.7 Adequate levels of on-site car parking and private amenity space would be provided for both the existing and proposed dwelling.

6.4.8 The proposed dwelling is therefore considered to meet the aims and objectives of policy CP7, the garden land SPD, and the general design advice set out within the NPPF.

6.5 Impact on neighbouring amenity

6.5.1 Local plan policy CP4 advises that development will only be permitted where it will not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of adjoining land owners or the locality. In addition, the NPPF at paragraph 17 highlights the need to seek “a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings”.

6.5.2 Officers consider that, in its revised form, the proposed dwelling could be comfortably accommodated within the site without significant harm to neighbouring amenity in respect of privacy, daylight or outlook.

6.5.3 Whilst the dwelling would be located in quite close proximity to the rear gardens of properties in the Avenue, these neighbouring gardens are well in excess of 30m in length and are fairly well screened. The first floor windows in the rear elevation would be no closer to the boundary than those accepted in the most recent approval at no. 16 Greenhills Road.

6.5.4 In its revised form, the dwelling has been moved 1m further away from the western site boundary, and the bulk of the building adjacent to the eastern site boundary has been significantly reduced. Moreover, the dormer proposed to the side elevation facing no. 14 Greenhills Road has been relocated to the front elevation, looking back towards the host dwelling. Only high level roof lights are now proposed to the side elevations at first floor. The detached garage, whilst immediately adjacent to the eastern site boundary, is of a scale that would be permissible under permitted development rights.

6.5.5 Following the revisions, officers do not consider that the building would result in any significant loss of privacy, or outlook from the surrounding properties, or have an overbearing effect. Additionally, levels of daylight currently afforded to neighbouring properties should not be unduly affected.

6.5.6 Therefore, whilst all of the concerns of the local residents have been duly noted, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with policy CP4 and advice set out within the NPPF.

6.6 Access and highway safety

6.6.1 Local plan policy TP1 states that development which would endanger highway safety by creating a new or altered access will not be permitted.

6.6.2 Due to the small scale nature of the development, the GCC Highways Development Management Team would not normally comment on this application as it is covered by their standing advice. However, due to the concerns raised by local residents and the parish council, a formal response was requested.

6.6.3 Initially, the Highways Officer recommended that the application be refused due to restricted visibility splays. As originally proposed, the existing, albeit altered, access would have only achieved 10.1m visibility to the east when measured to the nearside carriageway edge, or approximately 24.2m to the nearside vehicle track; the required visibility distance is generally 54m.

6.6.4 In response, following extensive discussions and negotiation between the GCC Highways Team and the applicant's Highway Consultant, a revised site layout plan has been submitted that shows a new centralised access. This revised layout plan, which has been submitted together with a Transport Statement and data from a recent speed survey, is now supported by the Highways Officer who concludes that “a safe and suitable access can be achieved therefore, I raise no highway objection.”

6.6.5 The revised access and required visibility has been assessed using the results of a speed survey and calculations set out in Manual for Streets (MfS) 2 which in this instance is 43.41m eastbound with 45.81m of forward visibility and westbound visibility splays of 38.97m and forward visibility of 41.37m.

6.6.6 Access to the rear of the site would be provided by a 2.5m wide access driveway alongside the host dwelling.

6.6.7 The proposed access now accords with the requirements of policy TP1 and, additionally, paragraph 35 of the NPPF which requires the creation of “safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians”.

6.7 Other considerations

6.7.1 Access to the rear of the site for fire appliances has been raised as an issue by local residents due to the narrow width of the driveway alongside the existing dwelling. Whilst the driveway is indeed too narrow to allow a pump appliance to access the rear of the site in order to get within 45m of all points of the proposed dwelling, an alternative option is to provide a residential sprinkler system, and this has been discussed with Building Control.

6.7.2 Whilst the Tree Officer acknowledges that it is regrettable that a Tree Survey has not accompanied this application, as there are several large trees within the sphere of influence of the development, they raise no objection subject to the inclusion of conditions and/or informatives. The applicant has confirmed that it is their intention to reduce the height of, or remove, the Poplar tree.

6.8 Conclusion and recommendation

6.8.1 In its revised form, the proposed dwelling is considered to be of a suitable scale, height, massing and footprint for this location and would not result in any significant harm to neighbouring amenity. Subject to a suitably worded condition, officers are satisfied that the access can be delivered without harming the amenity of the neighbouring dwelling.

6.8.2 Additionally, revised plans have now been submitted to demonstrate that a safe and suitable access to the site, to serve both the existing and proposed dwellings, can be achieved.

6.8.3 The recommendation therefore is to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out below:

7. SUGGESTED CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in Schedule 1 of this decision notice.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 No development shall commence on site (including any works of demolition) unless a Highways Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The Management Plan shall:

- a) specify the type of vehicles used during construction;
- b) provide for the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- c) provide for the loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- d) provide for the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- e) provide for wheel washing facilities; and
- f) specify the access points to be used and maintained during the construction phase.

The development shall not be carried out unless in accordance with the details so approved.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, having regard to Policy TP1 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (adopted 2006). Approval is required up front because highway safety could otherwise be compromised at the beginning of construction.

- 4 No development shall commence on site (including demolition and site clearance) unless a Tree Protection Plan ("TPP") to BS5837:2012 (or any standard that reproduces or replaces this standard) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The TPP shall detail the methods of tree/hedge protection and clearly detail the position and specifications for the erection of tree protective fencing and a programme for its implementation. Where construction access is required, appropriate ground protection will be necessary. The works shall not be carried out unless in accordance with the approved details and the measures specified by the TPP shall remain in place until the completion of the construction.

Reason: To safeguard existing tree(s) in the interests of visual amenity, having regard to Policies GE5 and GE6 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (2006). Approval is required upfront to ensure that important trees are not permanently damaged or lost.

- 5 All service runs shall fall outside the Root Protection Area(s) unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such works shall be carried out in accordance with the National Joint Utilities Group; Volume 4 (2007) (or any standard that reproduces or replaces this standard).

Reason: To safeguard existing tree(s) in the interests of visual amenity, having regard to Policies GE5 and GE6 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (2006). Approval is required upfront to ensure that important trees are not permanently damaged or lost.

- 6 No fires shall be lit within 5m of the Root Protection Area(s) and materials that will contaminate the soil such as cement or diesel must not be discharged within 10m of the tree stem. Existing ground levels shall remain the same within the Root Protection Area(s) and no building materials or surplus soil shall be stored therein. No trenches for services or drains shall be sited within the crown spread of any trees to be retained.

Reason: To safeguard existing tree(s) in the interests of visual amenity, having regard to Policies GE5 and GE6 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (2006).

- 7 Any works taking place within the Root Protection Area(s) shall be carried out by hand and no roots over 25mm shall be severed without the advice of a qualified arboriculturalist or without written permission from the Local Planning Authority's Tree Officer.

- 8 Prior to the installation of the rear patio area, a method statement detailing its construction shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The patio should be of a porous design so as to not reduce the volume of rainwater feeding nearby roots, work should be undertaken by hand and no excavation should be deeper than 150mm.

Reason: To safeguard the retained/protected tree(s) in the interests of local amenity, having regard to policies GE5 and GE6 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (adopted 2006).

- 9 No external facing or roofing materials shall be applied unless in accordance with:
a) a written specification of the materials; and
b) physical sample/s of the materials.
The details of which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, having regard to Policy CP7 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (adopted 2006).

- 10 Prior to first occupation of the new dwelling, the alterations to reform the site access to include the provision of an adequate pedestrian visibility splay, shall be completed in all respects in accordance with Drawing No. 12725/3-3A and maintained as such thereafter, and the existing means of access shall be stopped up and permanently closed.

Reason: To reduce any potential highway impact by ensuring that satisfactory pedestrian visibility and ensure satisfactory access arrangements are provided, having regard to policy TP1 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (adopted 2006).

- 11 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and/or re-enacting that order with or without modification), no extensions, garages, sheds, outbuildings, walls, fences or other built structures of any kind (other than those forming part of the development hereby permitted) shall be erected without express planning permission.

Reason: Any further extension or alteration requires further consideration to safeguard the amenities of the area, having regard to Policies CP4 and CP7 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (adopted 2006).

INFORMATIVES

- 1 In accordance with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2012 and the provisions of the NPPF, the Local Planning Authority adopts a positive and proactive approach to dealing with planning applications and where possible, will seek solutions to any problems that arise when dealing with a planning application with the aim of fostering the delivery of sustainable development.

At the heart of this positive and proactive approach is the authority's pre-application advice service for all types of development. Further to this however, the authority publishes guidance on the Council's website on how to submit planning applications and provides full and up-to-date information in relation to planning applications to enable the applicant, and other interested parties, to track progress.

In this instance, the authority sought revisions to the massing and footprint of the dwelling, together with alterations to the fenestration, so as to acknowledge the reduced site area and to ensure that the dwelling could be comfortably accommodated within the

site. Additionally, revisions to the site access have been negotiated to ensure a safe and suitable access.

Following these negotiations, the application now constitutes sustainable development and has therefore been approved in a timely manner.

- 2 The building foundations should be designed in accordance with guidance set out in chapter 4.2 of the NHBC Standards 2016.
- 3 It is noted that works to reduce the overall height of the Poplar tree by 8 metres to 17 metres overall, as previously recommended by an arboricultural consultant, has not been undertaken. The applicant/developer is advised that it would be considerably easier if this surgery was now undertaken before the approved dwelling is built. Such tree works would also be likely to reduce any possible perceived anxiety of any future occupiers of the approved dwelling and therefore hopefully reduce future demand to remove or prune the tree more harshly.