
Case Number	18/02229/FUL (Formerly PP-07043142)
Application Type	Full Planning Application
Proposal	Erection of a dwellinghouse (Re-submission of planning permission 18/00924/FUL) (Amended plans 01.08.2018).
Location	Land Between 94 And 98 Wheel Lane Grenoside Sheffield S35 8RN
Date Received	11/06/2018
Team	West and North
Applicant/Agent	Oakleaf Architecture Ltd
Recommendation	Grant Conditionally

Time limit for Commencement of Development

1. The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.

Reason: In order to comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act.

Approved/Refused Plan(s)

2. The development must be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved documents:

Street scene and sections A (PL) - 003 rC (received 12.06.2018)

Amended location plan, site plan, floor plans and elevations A(PL)-001 rH

Amended surface water plan A(PL)-014 rC

Amended wheel wash details A(PL)-010 rD

Amended landscape and surface plan A(PL)-012 rD

(all received 01.08.2018)

Reason: In order to define the permission.

Pre Commencement Condition(s) – ('true conditions precedent' – see notes for definition)

Other Pre-Commencement, Pre-Occupancy and other Stage of Development Condition(s)

3. The privacy fencing hereby approved along the boundary with 98 Wheel Lane shall be 1.8 metres high and shall be erected before the occupation of the dwelling. It shall thereafter be retained and maintained.

Reason: In order to ensure minimum privacy levels for dwellings

4. Details of all proposed external materials and finishes, including samples when requested by the Local Planning Authority, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before that part of the development is commenced. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure an appropriate quality of development.

Other Compliance Conditions

5. If unexpected contamination is encountered at any stage of the development process, works should cease and the Local Planning Authority and Environmental Protection Service (tel: 0114 273 4651) should be contacted immediately. A Remediation Strategy shall then be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved revised Remediation Strategy.

Reason: In order to ensure that any contamination of the land is properly dealt with.

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2015, Schedule 2, Part 1 (Classes A to H inclusive), Part 2 (Class A), or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, no extensions, porches, garages, ancillary curtilage buildings, swimming pools, enclosures, fences, walls or alterations which materially affect the external appearance of the site shall be constructed without prior planning permission being obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of occupiers of adjoining property, bearing in mind the elevated nature of the curtilage and to ensure that there is no encroachment into the Green Belt.

7. The flat roofed area of the dwellinghouse hereby permitted shall at no time be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of occupiers of adjoining property.

8. The office window on the elevation of the dwellinghouse facing East towards No.98 Wheel Lane shall be fully glazed with obscure glass to a minimum privacy standard of Level 4 Obscurity and no part of the window shall at any time be glazed with clear glass.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of occupiers of adjoining property.

9. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (and any order revoking and re-enacting the order) no additional windows or other openings shall be formed in the dwelling hereby permitted without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining property.

10. No demolition and/or construction works shall be carried out unless equipment is provided for the effective cleaning of the wheels and bodies of vehicles leaving the site so as to prevent the depositing of mud and waste on the highway.

Reason: In the interests of the safety of road users.

Attention is Drawn to the Following Directives:

1. By law, this development requires the allocation of official, registered address(es) by the Council's Street Naming and Numbering Officer. Please refer to the Street Naming and Numbering Guidelines and application forms on the Council website here:

<http://www.sheffield.gov.uk/home/roads-pavements/Address-management>


For further help and advice please ring 0114 2736127 or email snn@sheffield.gov.uk.

Please be aware that failure to apply for addresses at the commencement of the works will result in the refusal of statutory undertakers to lay/connect services, delays in finding the premises in the event of an emergency and legal difficulties when selling or letting the properties.

2. The Local Planning Authority has dealt with the planning application in a positive and proactive manner and sought solutions to problems where necessary in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. You are advised that this development is liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge. A liability notice will be sent to you shortly informing you of the CIL charge payable and the next steps in the process, or a draft Liability Notice will be sent if the liable parties have not been assumed using Form 1: Assumption of Liability.

Site Location



© Crown copyright and database rights 2016 Ordnance Survey 10018816

LOCATION AND PROPOSAL

The application relates to a former reservoir site located between numbers 94 and 98 Wheel Lane. The development site area is 0.12 hectares. Land to the rear is also within the applicant's ownership but it is in the Green Belt and does not form part of the proposed application site. The site has an existing vehicular access from Wheel Lane. Land levels across the site vary, with levels generally increasing from east to west in line with the incline of the street.

The applicant proposes to erect a five bedroom dwelling on the site with associated parking and garden space. Space is retained within the site for the potential future development of a further dwelling house however; this does not form part of the assessment of this particular application and separate permission would be required.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

A number of proposals for housing developments on the site have previously been approved. These include planning applications 06/04610/OUT and 09/03060/FUL which were both for the erection of two dwellinghouses. These permissions expired without being implemented. There have been no material changes in circumstances since these applications were approved. The site is still within a Housing Policy Area and is previously developed land.

Planning permission 18/00924/FUL was granted earlier this year. That permission related to the site to which the current application relates, but also included land to the rear of this application site. Permission was granted for the erection of a dwelling house and associated area of hardstanding. Whilst the proposed dwelling was not within the Green Belt, the area of hardstanding was within the Green Belt (on land which is now not included within the current red line boundary area). Application 18/00924/FUL was quashed for reasons relating only to the hardstanding in the Green Belt. As such no extant planning consent exists for the redevelopment of the site.

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

28 representations have been received in total, 27 in objection and 1 neutral comment which makes reference to an incorrect address being displayed on the web site.

23 of the letters of objection have been received from local residents; a summary of the comments is listed below:

Design and character issues

- The proposed access is not in keeping with the other houses on the street which all have driveways to the front.
- The proposed scale is overly large and dominant and will form a visually incongruous feature within the street scene.
- Design considered to be lacking architectural detailing.
- The proposed footprint breaks the building line.

- The development will dominate the sky line.

Residential amenity issues

- The land is higher than it was previously; therefore the houses will be much higher and overbear numbers 94 and 98.
- Due to the proposed height of the building it would overlook dwellings to the rear and sides.
- Two metre high boundary fencing would be overbearing to number 98, could permitted development rights be removed?
- Increased traffic movements associated with up to two dwellings would impact on living conditions and the structural integrity at number 94.
- The proposed footprint will impact on the conservatory at number 98, with regards to overlooking and over dominance. Views to the side will also consist of a brick wall.
- Potential for the flat roof to be used as a terrace which would impact on privacy levels.
- The proposed laurel hedging will have maintenance issues and could become over bearing.
- The development will be invasive and dominate the other properties and occupants destroying their right to light and privacy.

Green Belt and landscape issues

- The red line boundary should be amended to include the housing area only; the remainder of land owned by the applicant in the Green Belt should have a blue line boundary.
- No information has been submitted regarding how the Green Belt land is to be used.
- It is alleged that land levels on site have been altered.
- One of the trees surrounding the site has died and it is alleged that the applicant proposes to remove it.
- The property backs on to agricultural Green Belt land.

Highway issues

- Two parking spaces are not considered to be adequate for a 5 bed dwelling.
- There are visibility and highway safety issues with the proposed access.
- Construction vehicles utilising the access would lead to congestion and would disturb the adjacent number 94.
- Turning facilities should be identified on plan for both dwellings.
- Highway safety issues due to existing congestion and that Wheel Lane is a “feeder road” to the M1 motorway.

Other issues

- The ground levels should be reduced as suggested in the application in 2006.

- The garages from the previous submission have been removed; therefore where will future garages be located? The size of the dwelling suggests that garages will be required.
- Plans for one dwelling have been submitted rather than two, this makes it difficult to assess the proposal as a whole.
- It is understood that a second dwelling is to be developed on the remainder of the site; this would multiply the issues of this development.
- Previous proposals on the site have been more sympathetic and these should be reconsidered.
- Ground floor office window identified on plan but not on the east elevation.
- Height of the roof lantern not shown.
- Issues regarding the future development plot and whether it is adequate.
- The plans are not considered to be sufficiently detailed, particularly with regards to land levels.
- Part of the boundary wall has been damaged during the land clearance.
- Numerous references have been made to Sanderson and Weatherall Design and Access statement from the 2006 application.
- The developer's financial situation should have no bearing on any planning decision.
- The applicant is continuing the development prior to determination of the application.
- Lack of communication between the planning department and the applicant.
- Issues around change of committee date.
- Issues around communication from the Planning Service.

4 of the letters of objection were received from Councillor David Pepper, Grenoside Conservation Society and Ecclesfield Parish Council.

Councillor David Pepper:

The proposed dwelling is out of proportion, has very little garden space and inadequate parking provision for a 5 bedroom house. There are concerns that the Green Belt land to the rear will become an over flow car park. Drawings submitted suggest that part of the Green Belt is to be incorporated in to the residential curtilage. The proposed development is too large for the site and does not respect the semi-rural location. It is requested that this application is referred to the planning committee.

Grenoside Conservation Society:

The proposed dwelling is considered to be out of proportion with the surroundings. Very little garden space is included and if a second house were to be developed there would be issues with parking leading to concerns that the Green Belt area will be used for parking. The development should be sympathetic to the semi-rural location. It is requested that the application is referred to the planning committee.

Ecclesfield Parish Council (EPC) (two letters of objection):

EPC Planning Committee are objecting and recommend refusing this application on the grounds that it will be overbearing and impact the nature of the land, it is not in keeping with the other properties, the dwelling will stand significantly higher than the other properties and this proposal will dominate the landscape significantly. Are Highways aware of the impact of this application? A site visit should be made to see the distance from the front and back from Cinder Hill Lane, Grenoside so Members will be able to see the impact that this application will have on the surrounding area.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Policy Context

This assessment will take account of relevant policies from the National Planning Policy Framework, the Core Strategy and the Unitary Development Plan.

Principle of the development

The application site is designated as a Housing Area as defined by the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). Policy H10 states that housing is the preferred use in these areas and therefore the principle of the development is acceptable, subject to compliance with Policies H12 to H16 as appropriate.

The application site is contained exclusively within an allocated housing area as defined by the Sheffield UDP proposals map. The area to the rear of the application site, defined by a blue line on the submitted plans, is Green Belt land in the applicant's ownership. No development is proposed in the Green Belt.

The proposal is considered to constitute an infill plot which is located between two existing dwellings in an established housing area.

Density

Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.

Core Strategy Policy CS26 states that new housing will be required to make efficient use of the land, but the density of new housing should be in keeping with the character of the area. For the majority of the urban area, which includes the application site, this policy recommends a density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare, however it also states that densities outside this range will be permitted where they achieve good design, reflect the character of an area or protect a sensitive area. The site area of this application is approximately 0.12 hectares, and with one dwelling proposed on the site results in a density of 8 dwellings per hectare. The proposal is below the recommended density for the area; however the application proposes a single dwelling with garden that is comparable in size with the surrounding properties on Wheel Lane. It is therefore considered that the proposal would reflect the character of the area.

The submitted plans indicate that a second dwelling could potentially be erected within the site subject to gaining separate planning permission. This would result in a density of 16 dwellings per hectare.

It should also be noted that Sheffield can only currently demonstrate a 4.5 year housing supply of deliverable housing sites across the city. It is therefore considered that the proposed development of this site for a single house would make a small but positive contribution to housing land supply across the city and should be given weight as a material consideration, even if only limited.

Core Strategy Policy CS24 'Maximising the use of previously developed land for new housing' states that priority will be given to the development of previously developed sites.

The site is a former covered reservoir and is considered to be previously developed land. In light of the above the principle of housing development on this site is considered acceptable and accords with adopted local and national planning policy.

The site falls within a Local Nature Site noted for geological interest. This does not afford the same level of protection as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or Areas of Natural History Interest. UDP Policy GE13 states that Many Local Nature Sites lie in areas which are needed for development. However, there may be opportunities to conserve or enhance some features of greatest wild life or community value in any development scheme and compensate for any damage which is caused.

The site is an infill plot within an established housing area. The site has previously been cleared and the principle of redevelopment has been established in previous applications. It is therefore not considered that there are opportunities within the development to conserve or enhance any special features on the site.

Design and street scene

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

UDP Policy H14 states that new development and extensions will only be permitted where they are well designed and in scale and character with neighbouring buildings and where the site would not be overdeveloped.

UDP Policy BE5 'Building Design and Siting' also provides design guidance stating good design and the use of good quality materials will be expected in all new and refurbished buildings and extensions.

Policy CS74 'Design Principles' requires development to respect and take advantage of unique design characteristics within the local Neighbourhood.

It is not considered that this part of Wheel Lane has a distinctive character; however; the majority of dwellings are elevated above street level. Bungalows, dormer bungalows and two-storey dwellings are read in context with the site. Approaches to

design also vary with the dwellings directly adjacent being a traditional brick bungalow and a more contemporary dormer bungalow with a largely rendered finish. Garages at lower ground level which abut the highway are also a common feature on the street which impacts on the building line and the overall character of the area.

Due to the incline of the hill from east to west the majority of dwellings naturally stagger in height. However the height differences do not follow a rigid or consistent pattern. For example, due to previous extensions and land level differences, the ridge height of number 98 is significantly higher than neighbouring dwelling number 100. However the height difference between numbers 100 and 102 is much reduced.

A number of concerns have been raised with regards to the height of the proposed dwelling. Given the varied appearance of Wheel Lane, it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would result in an overly dominant or intrusive feature in the street scene. Previously approved schemes for this site included reducing the ground level, notably within the 2009 application a lower ground floor garage was approved. The street scene elevations provided however indicate the proposed dwelling is of a similar overall height to the previous approval in relation to the adjacent neighbouring properties. The Local Planning Authority acknowledges concerns from local residents regarding changes in land levels over the years and that this may result in the height of the dwelling varying slightly from previously approved schemes. However the principle of a 2.5 storey dwelling of a similar height has been established on the site and this carries considerable weight in the determination of this application.

The proposal includes front dormer windows which are a common feature in the street scene, therefore the overall design which reads as a 2.5 storey dwelling is considered to be acceptable. The design lacks a traditional front door to the property however on balance this is not considered reasonable grounds to refuse the application. The applicant has included a double height feature window in order to maintain an active frontage and break up the overall scale and massing of the dwelling. The proportions and features of the frontage are considered to be acceptable. Rural style facing bricks are proposed as the main facing materials with black weatherboarding to the dormer cheeks. Stone lintel and cill detailing is proposed. The existing stone boundary wall to the front and sides of the site are to be retained. It is considered that in order to ensure a high quality finish details of materials including samples will be secured by condition.

Due to the use of high quality materials and features the proposed design is considered to accord with part 12 of the NPPF "Achieving well-designed places". Furthermore the proposed building design and siting is considered to accord with UDP Policy BE5 and Core Strategy design principles. Although concerns from local residents have been fully considered; it is not considered that the proposed design is harmful and so a refusal on these grounds would not be warranted in your officers' view.

Landscape and Green Belt impacts

UDP Policy BE6 'Landscape Design' requires new development to provide a suitable landscape scheme with regards to new planting and/or hard landscaping and details

of existing vegetation to be removed or retained. The development should try to integrate existing landscape features and also use native species where appropriate.

The site has previously been cleared therefore no trees or planting were identified during the case officer site visit which would be affected by the development. Mature trees to the rear of the site in the Green Belt are adequately distanced from the development; therefore their protection is not a concern of this particular application.

Comments received suggest that land levels on site have been altered. A number of case officer and enforcement visits, as well as reference to historical images, suggest that, other than some possible minor alterations, land levels have broadly remained unchanged.

Details of hard and soft landscaping on the site have been submitted which includes a lawn area, planting and laurel hedging to parts of the site boundary. It is considered that the details provided satisfy the requirements of UDP Policy BE6 and the implementation of the scheme is covered by condition, including a requirement for 5 years maintenance of the landscaping.

Although no development is proposed within the Green Belt it is acknowledged that the proposed dwelling will be conspicuous from the Green Belt land to the rear. The proposal relates to an infill plot on an established residential street. It is therefore considered that as the dwelling will be viewed in context of the surrounding dwellings it will not form an incongruous or intrusive feature when viewed from the Green Belt.

Residential amenity

UDP Policy H14 states that new development and extensions will only be permitted where they would not deprive residents of light, privacy or security or cause serious loss of existing garden space which would harm the character of the neighbourhood.

Although at this time a single dwelling is proposed it is acknowledged that the intention is for a future development directly adjacent. Nevertheless the site layout indicates that approximately 150 square metres of rear garden space will be provided even with a plot retained for potential future development. The siting of the dwelling respects the established front building line of Wheel Lane allowing for a sizeable front garden area. The proposal is therefore not considered to be an over development of the plot.

A number of windows are proposed in the side elevations at ground level only. The window in the east elevation facing number 98 is to be an obscure glazed and top opening window in order to prevent unreasonable overlooking. This will be secured by condition. The openings in the west elevation do not serve main habitable rooms and are adequately distanced from number 94; therefore it is not considered that this neighbouring property will experience unreasonable reductions in privacy.

The alignment of the dwelling is similar to neighbouring dwellings therefore it is not considered that the proposed rear windows will lead to overlooking over and above what is expected in residential areas. Although Juliet balconies are proposed at first floor level; the principle is similar to that of a window opening as access is not

permitted on to the flat roof. A condition will be attached to prevent any future use of the flat roof as a terrace.

A separation distance of approximately 3 metres is proposed between the new dwelling and neighbouring dwelling 98 Wheel Lane. Number 98 has been extended significantly including a raised ridge height, hip to gable extensions, dormer windows and a rear extension which projects approximately 3.4 metres. The rear extension is designed largely as a conservatory however the elevation facing the application site is formed of brick with high level windows.

The proposed dwelling at two-storey level will not project beyond the rear of the conservatory at number 98 therefore the 45 degree rule is respected. The single storey element of the development will project approximately 4.5 metres beyond the conservatory of number 98 at a distance of approximately 3.5 metres from the side elevation of the conservatory. The finished level difference between the application site and No. 98 is approximately 1 metre as indicated on the section drawing provided. The boundary between the two dwellings is defined by an existing stone wall. Due to the separation distance between the dwellings it is not considered that the proposal will lead to unreasonable over shadowing or over dominance.

The existing stone boundary wall between the application site and 98 Wheel Lane is not considered to be high enough to prevent overlooking across into number 98. Solid timber boundary fencing along this side of the site is required at 1.8 metres in height in order to address any issues of overlooking. It is acknowledged that due to the difference in land levels the fencing will appear higher at number 98. This is however standard boundary treatment which would accord with permitted development rights for dwellings. Given the land level differences on the hill this would be similar to situations at neighbouring properties. The requirement for privacy takes precedent in this situation.

It is therefore considered that the proposed dwelling accords with Policy H14 in terms of its amenity impact.

Highway issues

UDP Policy H14 requires new development to have adequate on-site parking and safe access for vehicles and pedestrians.

Core Strategy policies CS51 and CS53 deal with transport priorities and management of travel demand, respectively. Both seek to ensure that access and parking arrangements are safe and adequate.

It is proposed that the existing access from Wheel Lane will be utilised. The access road is approximately 5.8 metres in width and is therefore considered to be sufficient for two vehicles to pass if necessary (and for construction vehicles to access the site). A distance of approximately 6 metres will be retained between the highway and the security gates in order to allow vehicles to pull clear of the highway when entering the site. Space is available for vehicles to turn around within the residential curtilage to allow vehicles to exit the site onto Wheel Lane in forward gear. Congestion and highway safety issues in this area are acknowledged, however it is

not considered that the very limited number of vehicle movements associated with the development will lead to any serious highway impacts (and would certainly not be classed as 'severe' which is the NPPF test, paragraph 109). With vehicles able to exit the site in forward gear it is considered that the proposal to utilise the existing access track is a safer option than the provision of a new front driveway which may require vehicles to reverse out into Wheel Lane. It is therefore considered that visibility is acceptable.

Parking provision for three vehicles is indicated on the submitted plans. This meets the requirements for a five bedroom property (the Council's latest Car Parking Guidelines published in August 2016 suggest 2-3 spaces for a 5 bedroom dwelling). Limited on street parking is also available on Wheel Lane. It is not a planning requirement for a garage to be provided.

The private track is the only proposed access to the site. The applicant was asked to consider a separate pedestrian access to the front of the property but he declined to do so. There is no policy requirement to insist on this and whilst disappointing from a design perspective it is not a reason in itself to resist the proposal. It is proposed that domestic waste will be taken down the track to the highway for collection.

Details of suitable wheel wash facilities for the construction phase have been submitted with the application (drawing number A(PL)-010). Details of the proposed driveway drainage scheme have also been submitted on drawing A(PL)-015. These details are considered to be acceptable.

The proposed access and parking arrangements are considered to accord with UDP Policy H14 and Core Strategy Policies CS51 and CS53.

Community Infrastructure Levy

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was introduced on the 15th July 2015 and replaces all other financial contributions with the exception of affordable housing. The site lies within housing zone 3 where residential development is subject to a charge of £30 per square metre. The applicant has applied for a self-build exemption.

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS

Reference has been made to the Design and Access Statement submitted by Sanderson and Weatherall in application 06/04610/OUT. This supporting submission collated by the applicants in 2006 does not form part of the assessment of this current application.

With regards to the lack of a garage in the proposed scheme; it is not a planning requirement that a garage is provided with a five bedroom property.

The erection of a single dwelling is proposed in this application. It is acknowledged that the site plans indicate potential future development on the remainder of the plot however this does not form part of this application and separate consent would be

required. Issues and comments relating to a second dwelling are not material to this particular application.

Officers are aware of previous proposals for the site. The Local Planning Authority is however unable to require that the applicant adopts the same approach in this application and the proposal must therefore be considered on its merits.

Any development taking place prior to determination of the application is done so at the applicant's risk.

Amended plans have been submitted to address the discrepancy with the window in the east elevation. Details of the roof lantern have also been confirmed and are considered acceptable

Officers consider that a thorough assessment of the application has been possible based on the submitted plans and the site visit carried out.

Issues relating to the construction period are not material to the planning process.

There is no right to a view across another person's land within planning legislation.

Right to Light is governed by legislation which falls outside the planning process. This report has assessed the amenity impacts of the development on existing dwellings adjacent to the site.

Comments about permitted development rights being removed are acknowledged. A condition will be attached revoking Schedule 2, Part 1 (Classes A to H inclusive) and Part 2 (Class A), of the General Permitted Development Order. This includes amongst other restrictions; extensions, outbuildings and new fences (although a boundary fence is needed between the site and 98 Wheel Lane and this is secured as part of this development).

Concerns around communication between the Planning Service and neighbours have been noted. The planning officer has visited neighbouring dwellings and spoken to a number of local residents during the assessment of the application.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

All development within this application is contained within the designated housing area. No development is proposed in the Green Belt.

The assessment of the proposed development has been carried out in accordance with adopted local and national planning policy. The proposed development is considered to be in overall accordance with UDP Policies H10 and H14 relating to residential developments and the built environment.

Due to the use of high quality materials and features the proposed design is considered to accord with part 12 of the NPPF "Achieving well-designed places". Furthermore the proposed building design and siting is considered to accord with UDP Policies BE5 and BE6 as well as Core Strategy design principles in Policy

CS74. The overall scale and appearance is considered to be compatible in the street scene and will not detract from the character of the area.

Furthermore it is not considered that the development will lead to unreasonable reductions in living standards for neighbouring properties, therefore according with UDP Policy H14.

The development site is previously developed land. The development of previously developed land is a priority of Policy CS24. Whilst the density is lower than that recommended by Policy CS26, it is considered that a single dwellinghouse would conform to the general plot sizes in the locality so is in character with it. Policy CS26 allows for reduced density where local character needs to be protected. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Core Strategy Policies CS24 and CS26.

It is concluded that the development is in accordance with the adopted policies of the UDP and Core Strategy and in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the listed conditions.