

Reference: 18/01613/FUL	Site: 55 Corringham Road Stanford Le Hope Essex SS17 0NU
Ward: Stanford Le Hope West	Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of four storey block of 7 apartments with undercroft car park

Plan Number(s):		
Reference	Name	Received
01	Existing and Proposed Block Plans	8 November 2018
02	Proposed Parking, Bin Store and Cycle Store Plans	8 November 2018
03	Proposed Ground Floor Plan	8 November 2018
04	Proposed First Floor Plan	8 November 2018
05	Proposed Second Floor Plan	8 November 2018
06	Proposed Elevations	5 December 2018
07	Site Location Plan	8 November 2018
1002 06	Existing Elevations	30 November 2018
1003 06	Existing Floor and Roof Plans	30 November 2018

The application is also accompanied by: - N/A	
Applicant: D Martin	Validated: 8 November 2018 Date of expiry: 11 January 2019 (Extension of time agreed with applicant)
Recommendation: Refuse	

This application is scheduled for determination by the Council's Planning Committee because the application was called in by Cllr. S. Hebb, Cllr. A. Jefferies, Cllr. G. Collins, Cllr. A. Anderson and Cllr. A. Watkins to consider issues regarding overdevelopment and neighbour amenity in accordance with Part 3 (b) 2.1 (c) of the Council's constitution.

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

1.1 This application seeks planning permission to demolish the existing three bedroom detached dwellinghouse at 55 Corringham Road and replace this with a four storey building containing seven flats. The flats would consist of 5 x one bedroom units and 2 x two bedroom units. There would be a parking area under the building at ground level and to the rear with a total of seven parking spaces.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 The site presently comprises a single dwellinghouse on a corner plot on the junction of Corringham Road and Manor Road. There is a private rear garden area and hardstanding to the Manor Road facing elevation for parking.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

Application Reference	Description of Proposal	Decision
17/01401/FUL	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 5 x 1 bedroom flats	Refused

4.0 CONSULTATIONS 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

PUBLICITY:

4.2 This application has been advertised by way of individual neighbour notification letters and public site notice which has been displayed nearby. At the time of writing this report there had been objections received from eight addresses, the matters raised were:

- Overdevelopment of the site
- Create overlooking
- Noise
- Loss of light
- Lack of parking
- Deficient access
- Out of character
- Lack of schools and health facilities

4.3 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:

No objection subject to conditions.

4.4 HIGHWAYS:

Recommend refusal.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework

5.1 The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012 and amended on 24 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:

4. Decision-making
5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
11. Making effective use of land
12. Achieving well-designed places

Planning Policy Guidance

5.2 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
- Noise
- Planning obligations
- Use of Planning Conditions

Local Planning Policy

Thurrock Local Development Framework (as amended) 2015

- 5.3 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:

Spatial Policies

- CSSP1 (Sustainable Housing and Locations)

Thematic Policies:

- CSTP1 (Strategic Housing Provision)
- CSTP22 (Thurrock Design)

Policies for the Management of Development:

- PMD1 (Minimising Pollution and Impacts on Amenity)²
- PMD2 (Design and Layout)²
- PMD8 (Parking Standards)³
- PMD16 (Developer Contributions)²

[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 assessment below covers the following areas:

- I. Principle of the Development
- II. Design and Relationship of Development with Surroundings
- III. Amenity Issues (Neighbours)
- IV. Living Standards
- V. Access and Parking
- VI. Infrastructure Improvements and Affordable Housing

I. PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

6.2 The site is within a residential area in Corringham which has no designation within the Core Strategy and presently comprises a single dwellinghouse. Therefore, the principle of further residential use of this site is considered acceptable subject to other policy criteria being met.

II. DESIGN AND RELATIONSHIP OF DEVELOPMENT WITH SURROUNDINGS

6.3 The NPPF focuses on the importance of good design. Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

6.4 Policy PMD1 of the Core Strategy states that development will not be permitted where it would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

6.5 Policy PMD2 of the Core Strategy requires that all design proposals should respond to the sensitivity of the site and its surroundings and must contribute positively to the character of the area in which it is proposed and should seek to contribute positively to local views, townscape, heritage assets and natural features and contribute to the creation of a positive sense of place.

6.6 Policy CSTP22 of the Core Strategy indicates that development proposals must demonstrate high quality design founded on a thorough understanding of, and positive response to, the local context.

6.7 This application follows the refusal of an earlier scheme in 2017 (planning ref. 17/01401/FUL) which sought planning permission for five x 1 bedroom flats within a three storey building with the third floor contained within a dual pitched roof. The scheme was deemed unacceptable due to concerns over the design, bulk and scale and the quantum of development.

Despite the refusal in 2017, the current proposal seeks more units within a building which would have a greater depth, height and bulk than the earlier scheme.

The design and scale of the proposed building would be at complete odds to the existing dwelling and others in the immediate location; the building would be overly bulky and devoid of architectural design quality. The mass and scale of the building would be exacerbated by the poor quality elevation treatment and awkward fenestration.

The scheme does little to address the earlier reasons for refusal; indeed, the current scheme, in many respects is less favourable than the rejected 2017 scheme.

If permitted, the development would result in the introduction of an incongruous and overly dominant and cramped feature in the street scene which would be harmful to the character of the immediate area and appearance of the street scene. The scale, bulk, form and design pay no regard to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The scheme is in direct conflict with the NPPF and Policies PMD1, PMD2, and CSTP22 of the Core Strategy.

III. AMENITY ISSUES (NEIGHBOURS)

- 6.8 Policy PMD1 of the Core Strategy states that development will not be permitted where it would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
- 6.9 Part (v) of Annexe 2 of the Local Plan states that *“where the property is situated close to the common boundary with another dwelling, there shall be no overlooking to the rear gardens of that neighbour from first floor kitchen/dining or main living areas.*
- 6.10 As described above, the proposal would result in a significant increase in bulk and scale of the built form on the site. This would introduce additional windows which would also be at a higher level than the existing building. As such the proposal would be overbearing and lead to overlooking, especially to No.57 Corringham Road and No.2 Manor Road. This would unacceptably affect the amenities of these neighbouring properties.
- 6.11 The introduction an area of car parking in the location of the existing rear garden would give rise to noise and vehicle movements alongside the rear boundary of No.57 Corringham Road which would lead to significant disturbance to this neighbour, harmful to their amenity. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be contrary to Policy PMD1 of the Core Strategy and the relevant criteria in the NPPF.

IV. LIVING STANDARDS

- 6.12 The proposed flats all meet the minimum internal floor standards of 45/55 square metres of internal floor space required in Annexe 2 of the Local Plan. However, the proposal fails to provide any amenity space.

- 6.13 Annexe 2 of the Local Plan requires 25 square metres of amenity space per one bedroom flat and 50 square metres for a two bedroom flat. The proposal would need to provide 225 square metres of private or communal amenity space in order to comply with Council policy. The provision of zero amenity space is not acceptable and only further demonstrates the overdevelopment of the site. The proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy PMD2 for this reason.

IV. ACCESS AND PARKING

- 6.14 Policy PMD2 of the Core Strategy indicates that all development should allow safe and easy access while meeting appropriate standards.
- 6.15 Policy PMD8 of the Core Strategy requires all development to provide a sufficient level of parking.
- 6.16 The parking area would be underneath and to the rear of the property, providing one parking space per unit with no visitor parking. The Council's Highways Officer advises the site is in an area of medium accessibility where the following standards apply:
- a) 1 to 1.25 car parking spaces per unit plus 0.25 spaces per unit (unallocated) for visitors;
 - b) 1 secure and covered cycle parking space per unit plus one additional place for visitors

This would equate to a requirement for total of 10 car parking spaces and 8 cycle parking places for the 7 units proposed. The proposal shows a total of seven parking spaces which would fall short of the minimum requirement in order to comply with Council policy PMD8.

- 6.17 In addition to the numerical shortfall, the layout of the proposed parking is unworkable and would not provide parking spaces which could be accessed with ease or without awkward manoeuvrability. The Council's Highway Officer has recommended refusal on this basis.
- 6.18 A cycle parking area is indicated, however no details of the storage facility has been provided and the area would appear too small to provide secure and covered storage for the required eight cycles.
- 6.19 Turning to the matter of access, the proposed access into the car parking area is considered unsafe, as it is too narrow for two vehicles to pass. With seven separate units having access to the car parking area it is likely that vehicles entering the parking area will encounter a vehicle coming out. This is likely to result in the vehicle reversing back out onto the public highway which may lead to an encounter with pedestrians and vehicles on Manor Road. The right angle turn into the main

parking area from the access is exceptionally tight and unworkable in practice. In view of the above, the proposal would conflict with Core Strategy policies PMD2 and PMD8 in this regard.

V. INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- 6.20 Policy PMD16 of the Core Strategy indicates that where needs would arise as a result of development; the Council will seek to secure planning obligations under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and any other relevant guidance. The proposal is for a small scale development and no infrastructure requirements have been identified arising from this development at this time. Accordingly, it is not considered necessary for an s.106 contribution or affordable housing in this instance.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL

- 7.1 The application site lies within a residential area with no formal allocation. Therefore the principle of residential development is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.2 However, it is considered that due to the incongruous design, impact upon amenity of neighbouring properties, lack of amenity space and unacceptable parking and access, the proposal would represent an unacceptable form of development and is considered to constitute overdevelopment of the site.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

Refuse for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of its scale, bulk, form and unsympathetic design would result in an incongruous and overly dominant feature in a prominent corner location, which would have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 and policies PMD1, PMD2, and CSTP22 of the Core Strategy 2015.
- 2 The proposed development, by reason of its bulk and scale, and significant number of high level windows would result in an overbearing impact and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the introduction of car parking within the existing rear garden would give rise to noise and vehicle movements alongside the rear boundary of No 53 Corringham Road resulting in disturbance to this neighbour. Therefore the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact upon neighbouring amenity contrary to Policy PMD1 of the Core Strategy 2015 and the relevant criteria in the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- 3 The proposed development, by reason of the lack of amenity space fails to provide a suitable residential environment for future occupiers, harmful to the amenity of

these residents. The proposal is therefore contrary to the minimum requirements of the saved Annex 2 of the Borough Local Plan 1997 and Policy PMD1 of the Core Strategy 2015.

- 4 The proposed development, by reason of the lack of sufficient vehicle and cycle parking spaces and an inappropriate car parking layout which is unworkable, would fail to provide a suitable level of parking provision for the development contrary to the requirements of policies PMD2 and PMD8 of the Core Strategy 2015.
5. The proposed access, by reason of its insufficient width and lack of visibility would result in the potential for conflict between vehicle entering and leaving the site which could cause vehicles to have to reverse onto Manor Road, harmful to highway safety. Therefore, the proposal would unacceptably impact upon highway safety contrary to policies PMD2 and PMD8 of the Core Strategy 2015.
- 6 The proposed development, by reason of the its scale, bulk, lack of adequate parking and cycle storage facilities, and lack of amenity space as stated in reasons 1 to 5 cumulatively demonstrate that the proposal would constitute the overdevelopment of the site, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 and Policies PMD1, PMD2, and CSTP22 of the Core Strategy 2015 and saved Annex 2 of the Borough Local Plan 1997.

Informative

Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) - 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. 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:

www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning

