

<u>No:</u>	BH2018/02703	<u>Ward:</u>	Goldsmid Ward
<u>App Type:</u>	Full Planning		
<u>Address:</u>	2 Old Shoreham Road Hove BN3 6EQ		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Erection of a single storey side extension and conversion of existing building to create 4no flats (C3), including loft conversion and alterations to fenestration.		
<u>Officer:</u>	Charlotte Bush, 292193	tel: <u>Valid Date:</u>	14.09.2018
<u>Con Area:</u>		<u>Expiry Date:</u>	09.11.2018
<u>Listed Building Grade:</u>		<u>EOT:</u>	19.06.2018
<u>Agent:</u>	Lewis And Co Planning SE Ltd 2 Port Hall Road Brighton BN1 5PD		
<u>Applicant:</u>	Mr John Robinson		

1. RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1. That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out below and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the following Conditions and Informatives:

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings listed below.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Location and block plan	TA1128/01	E	8 March 2019
Proposed Drawing	TA1128/10	G	19 March 2019
Proposed Drawing	TA1128/11	K	19 March 2019
Proposed Drawing	TA1128/12	L	19 March 2019
Proposed Drawing	TA1128/13	K	19 March 2019
Proposed Drawing	TA1128/14	E	19 March 2019
Proposed Drawing	TA1128/15	E	19 March 2019
Proposed Drawing	TA1128/16	E	19 March 2019
Proposed Drawing	TA1128/17	H	19 March 2019

2. The external finishes of the single storey extension hereby permitted shall match in material, colour, style, bonding and texture those of the existing building.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
3. Notwithstanding the proposed drawings, the dormers hereby permitted shall be finished in hanging tiles to match the existing roof tiles.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

4. Within 6 months of commencement of the development hereby permitted or prior to occupation, whichever is the sooner, a scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to provide that the residents of the new second floor flat, other than those residents with disabilities who are Blue Badge Holders, have no entitlement to a resident's parking permit.

Reason: This pre-commencement condition is imposed in order to allow the Traffic Regulation Order to be amended in a timely manner prior to first occupation to ensure that the development does not result in overspill parking and to comply with policies TR7 & QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP9 of the City Plan Part One.

5. Notwithstanding the approved drawings, within 3 months of commencement of the development hereby permitted, details (including proposed location) of secure cycle parking facilities for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development shall have been submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority. The approved facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the second floor flat and shall thereafter be retained for use at all times.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory facilities for the parking of cycles are provided and to encourage travel by means other than private motor vehicles and to comply with policy TR14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

Informatives:

1. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SS1 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One the approach to making a decision on this planning application has been to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Local Planning Authority seeks to approve planning applications which are for sustainable development where possible.
2. The applicant is advised that the scheme required to be submitted by Condition 4 should include the registered address of the completed development; an invitation to the Council as Highway Authority (copied to the Council's Parking) to amend the Traffic Regulation Order; and details of arrangements to notify potential purchasers, purchasers and occupiers that the development is car-free.
3. The applicant should note that the grant or consent of planning consent does not guarantee against the local authority taking action under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Investigating a noise, odour or dust complaint should complaints be received.

2. SITE LOCATION & APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

- 2.1. The application site relates to a large semi-detached property on Old Shoreham Road, on the junction with Montefiore Road. The building has a red brick finish, with gable features on each elevation and pitched roof

elements. The property is currently subdivided into 2no. one bedroom flats at ground floor level and 1 no. three bedroom flat at first floor level.

- 2.2. The scheme as originally submitted was to extend the existing building with a two storey side extension in order to create additional living space comprised of two additional flats and an additional dwelling house.
- 2.3. The proposed extension and alterations were considered to be an overdevelopment of the plot which would cause significant harm to neighbouring amenity. The proposed scheme has been amended, the revised plans submitted on the 19/03/2019. The revised scheme is for 4 flats and would not require a two storey side extension. The roof space will be altered and extended by the creation of 3 dormer windows and 4 roof lights to facilitate the extra accommodation. A small 3.8m² single storey extension is also proposed on the eastern elevation.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1. **PRE2018/00154** - Conversion and extension of existing property comprising 3 units to form 6 self-contained units in total.

4. REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.1. **Twenty (20)** letters has been received objecting to the proposed development for the following reasons:
 - Inappropriate height
 - Size and bulk of the proposal
 - Overshadowing
 - Overlooking and loss of privacy
 - Increased noise and disturbance
 - Damage to a protected tree
 - Increased density of the building is out of keeping with the predominantly Edwardian terrace family homes established in the area
 - Lack of private amenity space for future residents
 - Increased likelihood of traffic accidents
 - The flats appear very small
 - The new extension is out of character with the scale of character of its surroundings
 - Increased sense of enclosure to the properties on Montefiore Road which is at a lower ground level than 2 Old Shoreham Road
 - Detrimental effect on property value
 - Restriction of view
 - The proposed new development would have the form of an additional three bedroom terrace house rather than an extension.
 - A similar scheme was refused on Cissbury Road in 2009
 - Greater pressure on parking
 - Poor design
 - Too close to the boundary

- Lack of cycle path on the easterly track towards the 7 dials roundabout so cycling towards Brighton would be dangerous
- The parking survey has been incorrect carried out
- The extension has been reduced but it is still an unneighbourly form of development
- Restrict natural light to neighbouring properties

Five (5) letters were received objecting to revised plans received on the 19/03/2019

- Top heavy overdevelopment of the original building
- The dormer windows are shown as light sources. These overlook the properties to the East and South thus affecting their privacy
- An extra dwelling on the site will add to parking demand. There should be a new assessment of this by the Transport Department
- Still out of keeping with the character of the area (due to higher occupancy)
- The dormers are out of keeping with the character of the area and the dormers disrupt the roofline
- Additional traffic when the area is already highly congested
- Delivery trucks will be forced to park on the roads making congestion worse
- Overshadowing
- Poor design
- Cramp living accommodation
- Increased noise from so many people living in one building in close proximity to neighbours
- Residential amenity
- Damaging trees in neighbouring garden
- Inappropriate height of development

RSPB

- 4.2. The RSPB have also commented on the scheme requesting the installation of two swift bricks on the two storey extension. This element has now been removed from the scheme.

5. CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1. **Environmental Health:** No objection

Traffic flow on this part Old Shoreham Road is often moving. Air quality in the area opposite the park is good. On grounds of air quality we recommend approval.

Further comment received 12.04.2019

No contaminated land.

- 5.2. Below are the council guidelines for noisy works, please make sure a noise disturbance is not caused to neighbouring residents outside of these hours.
- Monday to Friday 8am -6pm

- Saturday 9am -1pm
- Sunday's & bank holidays - No works

5.3. **Arboriculture: As originally submitted - Objection**

The existing property has a small narrow front garden that borders both Old Shoreham Road to the north and Montefiore Road to the west. A 1.5m high hedge grows within the western boundary and a semi-mature holly, now managed as a 3m high bush grows upon the corner of the two roads. A small lonicera shrub grows upon the Old Shoreham Road side adjacent to the eastern elevation of the property.

5.4. There is a small rear garden to the east of the property with small maintained shrubs and a single garage with driveway forms the eastern boundary of the site.

5.5. An elm tree, 10m in height, grows to the north of the existing property. This is a highway tree that is healthy, in good condition and is cyclically pruned by the council.

5.6. A large mature copper beech tree grows within the rear garden of number 61 Montefiore Road. This is 16m tall and has a crown spread of 10m approx. (5m radius approx.) and is in a healthy condition with no irredeemable defects. The tree is approximately 2m from the boundary wall shared between the two properties. This tree is protected by Tree Preservation Order 2 of 2009.

5.7. The beech tree does not appear to have been considered to be a constraint to development at this site, branches overhang the site, and whilst there may be limited roots below the garage and the drive, there will be roots within the rear garden of number 2 due to the trees mature stature and low foundations of the adjacent garden wall. There will be roots around the driveway and concrete base of the garage and any removal of this base with mechanised machines or driving upon unprotected ground will cause damage to the roots of this important tree. This area of garden will be used for building activities and facilitation pruning will be required to enable a two storey development.

5.8. At present the tree is not imposing to the existing property. However, the proposal brings the development closer to the tree, and as the tree will be to the south-east, this will cause shade to the property and rear garden until the middle of the day. The tree will be very imposing to the small outside spaces that are proposed. Future occupants of the property may cause unwanted pressure to the owner to heavily prune tree or remove this protected tree

5.9. It is for these reasons that the arboricultural team object to the proposals and recommend refusal.

Further Arboriculture comments received 09/01/2019 - No objection

5.10. Prefer soft landscaping around the new house- lawn most preferable. Works should be done manually not with machinery. Remain very concerned about

the new extension in close proximity to the protected tree and the significant pressure to prune or remove the tree due to overshadowing, sense of enclosure etc.

- 5.11. The two storey extension element of the scheme, measuring 30m², has now been removed and a single storey 3.8m² extensions is proposed instead. Due to its reduced size the single storey element is situated further away from the tree.
- 5.12. **Private Sector Housing:** Comment
Please note minimum room sizes are subject to each room being of a shape and floor to ceiling height offering adequate useable living space; only the floor area where the ceiling is 1.5m or higher will be counted.
- 5.13. **Sustainable Transport:** No objection
It would appear that the amended plans primarily remove the 1no three bedroom self-contained dwelling house (C3). The following Highway Authority comments are on this amended plans basis.
- 5.14. Four pedestrian accesses are now proposed in total. Two are as existing from Old Shoreham Road. Also, a new pedestrian access is proposed from Montefiore Road and one more from Old Shoreham Road.
- 5.15. If the suggested cycle parking idea is taken up by the applicant then a proposed new access on Old Shoreham Road (the one where the proposed gate clashes with the proposed 'French' doors) could be dropped and a gate created where 2 cycle parking spaces are proposed near the 'French' doors then the flat occupants can access the communal cycle parking and open space area without going out of the site (safer and more secure for children) and use the existing gate onto Old Shoreham Road as the flats rear access. The Highway Authority therefore seeks amendments to this application to that effect to avoid refusal (policy TR7 Safe Development).
- 5.16. Vehicle access is to remain as existing on the eastern edge of the site providing access to an off-street parking space for the occupants of one of the flats on the site. The Highway Authority has no objections to this provision.
- 5.17. No new parking is proposed for the flats.
- 5.18. At the 2011 Census, car ownership for the Goldsmid ward (output area E05002423) was an average of 0.73 vehicles per household. Therefore, the proposed development is likely to generate additional on-street parking demand, albeit a small increase.
- 5.19. SPD14 suggests the consideration of the implementation of car free housing for developments where the impact of overspill parking is considered unacceptable. These impacts may include localised increases in demand for on-street parking which can cause highway safety risks and can have a

negative impact upon the amenity of existing residents in the vicinity of the site, as competition for on-street spaces in a particular area may increase.

- 5.20. Where there is potential for overspill parking (albeit limited in this case), a parking survey is normally utilised to determine whether there is capacity on-street for the additional demand within close proximity to the development.
- 5.21. In lieu of a parking survey, the Highway Authority utilises permit uptake data to assess parking occupancy levels within Controlled Parking Zone's (CPZ). Given the potential variance in uptake across a CPZ, where permit uptake is over 80% over the previous 12 months, no additional overspill parking is permitted without a supporting parking survey.
- 5.22. The site is located within CPZ O, permit uptake within this zone over the last 12 months is consistently over 91%. Therefore, it is recommended that the whole development be made car free and that this is secured by condition. Should the applicant wish to undertake a parking survey demonstrating there is sufficient capacity then the Highway Authority may reconsider.
- 5.23. A total of nine cycle parking spaces were originally proposed in accordance with SPD14 minimum requirements. With the reduction in the size of the proposed development the minimum SPD14 requirements will now be 6 cycle parking spaces. Whilst the proposals indicate that the cycle parking shall be secure no further details are included.
- 5.24. In order to comply with Brighton & Hove Local Plan policy TR14, cycle parking should be secure, convenient, covered and illuminated. There is now the possibility for the applicant to remove the proposed cycle parking in a flat and around the perimeter of the site (some of which is proposed on non-compliant grass and would be difficult and not safe to access and insecure next to a low boundary wall) and concentrate the cycles in one double height secure cycle parking facility where 3 cycle parking spaces are currently proposed next to the driveway. This type of facility is now commonly seen and used by the general public at railway stations for example and would replace the non-compliant proposed 'butterfly' type stands that can damage the front wheels of cycles. The Highway Authority therefore seeks amendments to this application to that effect to avoid refusal (policy TR7 Safe Development) and recommends that cycle parking is secured by condition and informative.
- 5.25. It is not anticipated that the proposals would lead to a significant impact on the surrounding highways and transport network, therefore in this instance, the Highway Authority has no objections.
- 5.26. The proposals have been considered with reference to the Equality Act 2010. It is noted that there is level access to the ground floor flats. On consideration, the Highway Authority had no objections.

6. MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1. In accordance with Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, this decision has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Development Plan, and all other material planning considerations identified in the "Considerations and Assessment" section of the report
- 6.2. The development plan is:
- Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (adopted March 2016)
 - Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (retained policies March 2016);
 - East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan (adopted February 2013);
 - East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Sites Plan (adopted February 2017);
- 6.3. Due weight has been given to the relevant retained policies in the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

7. **POLICIES**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One

SS1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
CP1	Housing delivery
CP7	Infrastructure and developer contributions
CP8	Sustainable buildings
CP9	Sustainable transport
CP12	Urban design
CP14	Housing density
CP19	Housing mix

Brighton and Hove Local Plan (retained policies March 2016):

TR4	Travel plans
TR7	Safe Development
TR14	Cycle access and parking
SU9	Pollution and nuisance control
SU10	Noise Nuisance
QD5	Design - street frontages
QD14	Extensions and alterations
QD15	Landscape design
QD16	Trees and hedgerows
QD27	Protection of amenity
HO5	Provision of private amenity space in residential development
HO9	Residential conversions and the retention of smaller dwellings
HO13	Accessible housing and lifetime homes

Supplementary Planning Documents:

SPD03	Construction & Demolition Waste
SPD06	Trees & Development Sites

8. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

- 8.1. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the creation of an existing unit of accommodation and impact of the proposed alterations and extensions on the appearance of the streetscene and on the amenities of adjacent occupiers. Transport and sustainability issues will also be assessed.
- 8.2. The City Plan Part 1 Inspector's Report was received in February 2016. The Inspector's conclusions on housing were to agree the target of 13,200 new homes for the city until 2030 as a minimum requirement. It is against this minimum housing requirement that the City's five year housing land supply position is assessed annually.
- 8.3. The Council's most recent housing land supply position is published in the SHLAA Update 2018 (February 2019). The figures presented in the SHLAA reflect the results of the Government's 2018 Housing Delivery Test which was published in February 2019. The Housing Delivery Test shows that housing delivery in Brighton & Hove over the past three years (2015-2018) has totalled only 77% of the City Plan annualised housing target. Since housing delivery has been below 85%, the NPPF requires that a 20% buffer is applied to the five year housing supply figures. This results in a five year housing shortfall of 576 net dwellings (4.5 years supply). In this situation, when considering the planning balance in the determination of planning applications, increased weight should be given to housing delivery in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF (paragraph 11).
- 8.4. The creation of 1 additional unit would make a minor contribution towards the Councils housing targets, but will be given due weight in the determination of this scheme.
- Planning Policy:**
- 8.5. Local and City Plan policies seek to retain existing housing and encourage the provision of new units, including increasing density and a more efficient use of land and buildings where appropriate.
- 8.6. The application building has previously been converted into three flats comprising a 1 bedroom unit measuring 54m², a studio apartment measuring 34m², and a 3 bedroom apartment measuring 101m².
- 8.7. The proposed scheme is to extend into the roof space and create an additional flat. There would be some internal reconfiguration to accommodate this but the existing 3 units would remain, with a proposed ground floor extension enabling both ground floor units to be slightly increased in size. Accordingly, the proposed scheme is considered acceptable in principle.

Design and Appearance:

- 8.8. Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan states that planning permission for extensions or alterations to existing buildings, including the formation of rooms in the roof, will only be granted if the proposed development:
- a) is well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area;
 - b) would not result in significant noise disturbance or loss of privacy, outlook, daylight/sunlight or amenity to neighbouring properties;
 - c) takes account of the existing space around buildings and the character of the area and an appropriate gap is retained between the extension and the joint boundary to prevent a terracing effect where this would be detrimental to the character of the area; and
 - d) uses materials sympathetic to the parent building.
- 8.9. The proposed scheme has been significantly altered through the course of the application, with a large two storey extension removed from the scheme. The proposed extensions now relate to a 3.8m² single storey extension which would adjoin an existing extension to the neighbouring property at No.61 Montefiore Road, and a loft conversion which includes the installation of three dormer windows (one each on the south, east and west roof slopes) and four roof lights. A first floor balcony facing onto Old Shoreham Road is also proposed.
- 8.10. The 3.8m² extension would extend the main living room of the ground floor flat and create an access onto the patio area serving the flat. It would have a maximum height of 3.5m with a glazed roof lowering to 2.9m. This extension would not be visible from the road due to an existing configuration of the building. This small extension is considered to be appropriate in scale and design, and there is no objection to this element of the scheme.
- 8.11. The proposed dormers are small and the cladding surrounding the fenestration has been kept to a minimum. The proposed dormers would also be suitably positioned away from the Old Shoreham Road elevation (although the side of the dormer on the eastern roof scape will be partially visible from the streetscene). The dormers would be finished in metal cladding in order to give them a more contemporary appearance. However, this material would appear incongruous in the streetscene and is not considered acceptable. Hanging tiles to match the existing roof tiles would reduce the profile of the dormers on the streetscene and is therefore secured by condition.
- 8.12. Two of the four proposed roof lights are on the north roof scape, facing Old Shoreham Road. The proposed roof lights are appropriately scaled and positioned on the roof scape. The overall number of roof lights is considered acceptable in this instance due to the corner plot position of the property which means that only two roof lights will be visible from the Old Shoreham Road, and only one will be visible when viewed from Montefiore Road. It is also noted that there are numerous examples in the local vicinity of roof lights (No.51 Montefiore Road; Nos. 20, 22, 26 and 28 Cissbury Road).

- 8.13. A first floor balcony is proposed on the Old Shoreham Road elevation. This is a feature of many houses with an elevation facing this road and accordingly, the current proposal would be in keeping with the streetscene.

Standard of Accommodation:

- 8.14. Policy QD27 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan aims to secure a good standard of living accommodation for current and future occupiers.
- 8.15. The 'Nationally Described Space Standards' were introduced by the Department for Communities and Local Government in 2015 to establish acceptable minimum floor space for new build developments. Although these space standards have not been formally adopted into the Brighton and Hove City Plan and relate to new build developments, they provide a useful guideline on acceptable room sizes that would offer occupants useable floor space once the usual furniture has been installed. The 'Nationally Described Space Standards' establishes the minimum floor space for a single bedroom as measuring at least 7.5m², and a double bedroom should measure at least 11.5m². The minimum floor space requires a head height of above 1.5m.

The ground floor would comprise:

- 8.16. A one bedroom flat measuring 58m². This flat would be slightly larger than the existing unit given the ground floor extension and this helps to improve the overall standard of accommodation in terms of living accommodation/circulation space. The extension also enables the flat to have direct access to a patio area for the flat. The bedroom would measure 12m² plus an en-suite shower room. The rooms all have good access to natural light and is considered to provide a good standard of living accommodation.
- 8.17. A studio flat measuring 40m². The internal reconfiguration allows this studio to be increased in size by some 6m². A studio would normally comprise a single room containing the kitchen, lounge and bedroom area, with a separate bathroom. However, the kitchen for this studio is separated from the main living area but this replicates the existing situation which is due to a structural wall being in situ. This studio would have direct access out to a small garden area and overall is an improved offering over the existing studio.

The first floor accommodation would comprise:

- 8.18. A two bedroom flat measuring 91m². The existing three bedroom flat is slightly reduced in size (from 101m² to 91m²) to allow a new staircase to be introduced to access the loft space and new flat. The revised layout creates two large double bedrooms each with en-suite facilities. This flat would also have a new private balcony facing Old Shoreham Road. Whilst it is generally preferable if accommodation that might be suitable for families is on the ground floor and has access to a garden, given this is an existing three bedroom flat there is no objection in this instance given that the flat provides a good standard of living accommodation.

The second floor accommodation would comprise:

- 8.19. A one bedroom unit measuring approximately 50m². The total floor space with a head height above 1.5m is 40m²; the bedroom area measures 10.6m² in total but 9m² with a head height above 1.5m. Assessed as a one bedroom/one person unit the flat would provide the minimum necessary to be considered acceptable, particularly given that the only outlook is from the dormer windows and rooflights and head height is compromised to some extent by the ceilings.

Impact on Amenity:

- 8.20. Policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan states that planning permission for any development or change of use will not be granted where it would cause material nuisance and loss of amenity to the proposed, existing and/or adjacent users, residents, occupiers or where it is liable to be detrimental to human health.
- 8.21. The properties most likely to be affected by the proposed development are No.61 Montefiore Road, and the flats in Nos.31 and 33 Cissbury Road.
- 8.22. The proposed 3.8m² ground floor extension has a maximum height of 3.5m lowering to 2.9m and would adjoin the existing extension to No.61. Given the position and height of the neighbour's extension the proposed ground floor extension would not have an impact on neighbouring amenity.
- 8.23. The proposed roof lights on the Old Shoreham Road and Montifiore Road elevations would face onto the road and not cause any amenity issues. The rooflight on the south elevation would be positioned close to the main roof of the building and would therefore only offer views across the roofs of neighbouring properties and thus would have limited impact on neighbouring amenity.
- 8.24. The dormer on the western roof scape would face the Grace Eyre Foundation building (the former United Methodist Church) but would have no impact on their amenity.
- 8.25. The proposed dormers on the south and east elevation roofs would have views across the gardens of 61 Montefiore Road, and the flats in 31 and 33 Cissbury Road. However, the area is predominantly comprised of terrace properties with small gardens. The level of existing mutual overlooking in the area is consequently very high. Given the existing levels of overlooking, the position of the dormer and their size it is not considered that the impact would warrant the refusal of the application.
- 8.26. The balcony faces towards Old Shoreham Road and would not cause harm to the amenity of any neighbours or occupiers of the existing property.

Sustainable Transport:

- 8.27. Vehicle access is to remain as existing, with the site continuing to provide access to an off-street parking space for the occupants of one of the flats on the site. The Highway Authority has no objections to this provision.

- 8.28. No new parking is proposed for the flats. The proposed development is likely to generate additional on-street parking demand, albeit a small increase. The Highways Authority has recommended that the whole development be made car free. However, the Local Planning Authority can't retrospectively take car parking away from an existing user/occupant. The additional flat could however be made car free by condition.
- 8.29. The minimum SPD14 requirements will now be 6 cycle parking spaces. Whilst the proposals indicate that the cycle parking shall be secure no further details are included. Additionally, the proposed location of the cycle storage could cause conflict with pedestrian access to the site. Further details of a secure cycle scheme will therefore be secured by condition.
- 8.30. It is not anticipated that the proposals would lead to a significant impact on the surrounding highways and transport network, therefore in this instance, the Highway Authority has no objections.

Arboriculture:

- 8.31. The single storey extension is approximately 10m from the copper beech tree. As such, the proposed extension is not considered to result in harm to the copper beech tree.

Other Considerations:

- 8.32. The proposed two storey extension has been removed. Therefore securing installation of swift bricks as requested by the RSPB would be considered onerous given the scale of the proposed development.

9. EQUALITIES

None identified.

