PROPOSED THREE HOUSES ON THE SITE OF 1 – 5 CAUSEY DRIVE LANGLEY MIDDLETON M24 5PN

PLANNING STATEMENT **LPA ref. 20/01222/FUL**

PLANNING HISTORY

Two of the three former dwellings at nos. 3 – 5 were granted permission for use as an office in 1991 and again in '95. In the first decade of the millennium, the dwellings were demolished and the site has since been vacant, awaiting redevelopment. The wider Langley Estate was built in the 1950's/60's as 'overspill' housing and given mainly Lake District road names. It is one of the pockets of redevelopment opportunity, as was the larger adjacent Ravenglass Drive modern housing.

PRE APPLICATION ADVICE (PREAPP/00065/19) & PLANNING HISTORY

The applicant/agent sought the Authority's response and this application has heeded the advice by letter of 21/10/19, *as far as possible*. There was reference to permission for housing redevelopment as part of a much larger 65 dwellings 's scheme, long after the grant of office use for the dwellings at nos. 3 and 5 (builder's site offices? as renewed ref. 95/D31883). *So the proposal will be a more compatible use within the solidly residential area.*

THE PROPOSAL

A short row of three houses are to replace the demolished dwellings, with off street parking, private gardens and landscape planting (please see Links Architecture Ltd.'s drawings).

The proposed development is also informed by planning policy, both national and local, which this statement will demonstrate.

POLICY COMPLIANCE

The Authority's Local Plan Core Strategy (CS) is stated as the key one of the suite of documents. In it housing is stated as a key challenge, including to direct new dwellings to the south of the Borough 'where there is capacity' like Middleton e.g. in the Langley Regeneration Area. *So the proposal in principle satisfies policy CS2.*

The fact that the site was previously developed land as residential units could be argued, even though the cleared site has become 'incidental open space' from about 2011. *Primarily it is within*

the defined urban area and appropriate for housing as 'sustainable development' that the planning system is required to deliver by reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Sustainability of this location for the proposal is also proved by the following existing services:-

The bus service along Windermere Road, with stops only about 100m from the site, e.g. to discourage car use for trips 'into town' (well under the 400m threshold accessibility standards in the CS appendix (reference policy T2) or on foot to the much closer Wood Road services, that include a medical centre, chemist and dental surgeries;
the Bowlee Park Community primary school & nursery, just a few minutes' walk along that road and the public open space behind it and open area opposite the site;
Willow Park off Windermere Road in the Hollin Lane direction (which more than compensates for the modest but adequate garden sizes).
St Mary's Primary & Nursery School is 'round the corner' about 5 minutes' walk along Wood Street, *where there is a sub post office too.*
Therefore 'saved' Unitary Development Plan (UDP) policy H/3 is satisfied too, because the proposal is 'well located' (criterion b).

The proposal would be directly in character with the immediate area which comprises a mix of short terraces, some flats/maisonettes, semi- and some detached houses, *including 3 storeys as permitted at no. 7. So UPD policy H/3 criterion c) is also satisfied.*

Policy CS02 is also met by proposing high quality housing for sale to 'widen tenue choice' in a regeneration area and beneficially use poor quality, impractical open space, like this site.

The preapplication response of 'flatted development' as a possibility can be dismissed because the policy C2 and C3 aspirations were highlighted including (quote) 'an emphasis on good quality *family housing* in the Langley Regeneration Area'. The applicant also knows there is a market for these houses; hence the planning (pre) application!

In turn the proposal would contribute to delivery of the target number of dwellings for the Borough,

to satisfy policy CS1 as also expected via the NPPF.

Therefore it is the details of the proposal that are to be agreed by the Authority, by reference to policy as follows:

Policies P1 and P3 are satisfied by the Links Architecture Ltd. scheme because firstly, the layout has been amended to avoid a noticeable 'street scene' step forward of the adjacent rows at this corner site (drawing – 10).

Secondly, visual interest, as portrayed on drawing - 12 is created by a vertical break of a cavity wall thickness between the corner house no 1. and the other two, as well as by steps in roof lines and the vertically aligned first floor street elevational window projections and roof dormers. The latter are boarded to vary facing materials; brick headers and boarding link the smaller windows and the pitched front door canopies would draw the visitors.

This attention to detailing is all within a themed, harmonious design that is informed by the adjacent Causey Drive/Ravenglass Drive redevelopment (permission 05/D45447 for Lovell Homes).

Thus UPD policy BE/2 about design criteria and the Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) are both satisfied.

So the pre application advice for design detailing is heeded, including relocation of bathrooms and their high-level windows to the rear, except at no.1 where windows are avoided at upper level facing the gable of no 290.

The site layout is determined by the size and shape of the plot to which vehicular access remains from the Causey Drive and the dropped kerbs are just to be extended for off-street car parking. *It is noted the Highway Authority did not object* to the draft proposed layout, which is unchanged in these respects.

The spacing between proposed and existing dwellings is only of concern in respect of what was called unit 3 (no.1 in the proposal) by reference to the residential development SPD. The paragraph 4.1 standard of 14m is impossible to meet, *but the spatial separation is maximised and mitigated*, as (to quote 4.3) 'exceptions may be acceptable e.g. because of the density and character of an area'. *This is such a case in point*.

So the design is for a narrower dwelling; the 2 storey gable at no. 290 does not have a habitable room window, but only a small window and glazed side door beyond the existing retained screen boundary fence marked on the landscaping plan -14A.

As a national parameter comparison, the 7m. minimum from rear house wall to the site boundary of no. 290 is met, by reference to the General Permitted Development Order Schedule 2 part 1 A.h (ii). *In turn that Order safeguards that private garden space*, which is relatively wide at approximately 8m and larger than that approved at nos. 7 and 9 in 2005 (referenced above). So it is adequate for what would be a home for a small family, a single person or couple, as part of the variety of house type on offer.

The dwelling on plot 1. is also integral to the design of the proposal, including how the built development visually 'turns' the prominent street corner and to quote the pre-application advice, a 'non-private side garden… to… Windermere Road….' is provided' with 'low height hedge planting'. Along the grassed bank the landscape planting would be visually softening.

Therefore the pre-application advice has been heeded.

The rear garden lengths for nos. 3 and 5 are also determined by the plot depth and the length of an off- street car space i.e. 4.8m plus path to satisfy paragraph 3.15 of the above SPD. At over 8m length the gardens are well over the above permitted development parameter and they abut existing rear gardens beyond *existing* screen fences and proposed tree planting, that would provide neighbour privacy (please see landscaping plan -14A).

The parking provision is to the *maximum* for nos. 3 & 5 and for the smaller dwelling at no. 1, it is adequate commensurate with leaving soft landscaping 'wrapping' the street corner (by reference to CS table 10 schedule of parking standards). The paved parking areas are 'broken' by hedge planting between the plots as recommended in the pre application advice.

Foul water drainage infrastructure exists and the connections are to be as shown on drawing – 10.

The separate surface water drainage would be managed on site, to pipework indicated on that site plan; by soaking into the soft landscaped areas and *by use of permeable car hard standings*, to minimise run off, before entering the existing sewer.
Therefore the National Planning Practice Guidance is satisfied.

The location is in the Environmental Agency's flood risk zone 1 i.e. at 'minimum risk.'

Ecologically there is no constraint upon the proposed development, but the opportunity is taken to provide trees and hedging for *'biodiversity net gain'* as expected in the NPPF (please see the site plan and the *landscaping drawing native species' planting details).*

Energy conservation and 'climate change' are integral to the design (see the energy statement).

Bin storage is expected to be at the rear (heeding pre-application advice, CS point 3.12 and Appendix 1 for container sizes).

Contamination assessment is made in an accompanying *'desk study.*

Community consultation is severely constrained by covid law and regulations, but a courtesy notification ward members is planned, knowing the Authority will inform neighbours and the neighbourhood by site publicity, as their duty.

Therefore, the proposal for decision-taking *does merit conditional approval, in the planning balance of the policy requirements to be considered as a whole.* The three dwellings would provide homes for families and a couple, as part of the ongoing Langley Estate Regeneration, to complete the redevelopment on this side of Causey Drive, of a design that would complement the nearby housing, with added detail to please the eye, not forgetting landscaped biodiversity enhancements.
The case officer is invited to contact the applicant's agent to resolve any issues of detail before the report is prepared, including any consultees queries, as per nationally accepted good practice.

C Ashton BA (Hons) DIP TP MRTPI 4/11/20 cc B Deka cc Links Architecture Ltd.