



2.3 **North Hertfordshire Draft Local Plan 2011-2031 - (Approved by Full Council April 2017)**

SP6 – Sustainable transport  
SP11 – Natural resources and sustainability  
T1 – Assessment of transport matters  
T2 – Parking  
D1 – Sustainable Design  
D3 – Protecting Living Conditions  
NE12 – Renewable and low carbon energy development

2.4 **Supplementary Planning Document**

Vehicle Parking at New Development SPD (2011)

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **Site Notice:**

Start Date: 27/08/2020

Expiry Date: 19/09/2020

3.2 **Neighbouring Properties:**

3.2.1 49 Newmarket Road:

***“Firstly ref this planning application I as a neighbouring garage holder DID NOT receive a letter informing me of this application. I got it third hand from a neighbour. Why was this?***

***I OBJECT to this application because. Due to the unusual layout of Martingale Road where the said garage is. If I park in front of my garage facing West to East and 13 Suffolk park in front of theirs North to South I am completely blocked in. My address is Newmarket Road even though I park in Martingale Road. I am not allowed to park in Newmarket Road as its a main trunk road through the town. Also, there is a Pelican crossing there and zig zag restrictions not allowing parking or overtaking within them by law. As for 13 Suffolk their address is in a quite close and their garage is also in Martingale road. Up to now they do not park in front of the said garage. Whereas previous tenants of the property have parked inside the garage. If they put the charging point inside the garage it would not be a problem.***

***Placing the charging point outside their garage means they would need to leave their vehicle. there for long periods of time, completely blocking me in. I am an ON CALL Firefighter in Royston Town and have been so for a long time. This means I require 24hr access to my vehicle as and when an emergency arises and I have to respond to my pager/alerter. It is not an option for me to run around to another street to knock someone up in the early hours of the morning to be able to drive to the Fire Station, for example the Parish Church fire a couple of years ago in the early hours of a December Sunday morning.***

***If one is to brick up the garage door surely this is a change of use. Making it no longer a garage but a Room. I can't help wondering are they wanting another room? office?, bedroom? or what. I have noticed there was an application for a single story .downstairs extension five years ago and nothing seems to have come from this".***

3.2.2 53 Newmarket Road:

***"I strongly object to the above planning application. The proposal will severely impact on the access to the four garages that are located at 90 degrees to the garage in question. One of which is in constant need of access by the owner who is both a fireman and ambulance driver. If the person requesting the planning application requires a charging point, might I suggest they install the point INSIDE the garage and charges the vehicle within the garage. Thank you".***

3.2.3 It is worth noting that both of the aforementioned neighbour representations have been withdrawn, due to confusion relating to the location of the application site.

3.3 **Royston Town Council:**

3.3.1 Members of Royston Town Council raised NO OBJECTION to this application.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

4.1.1 The site is an end of terrace garage located on the north side of Suffolk Road, Royston. The site is one of three terraced garages serving properties on Suffolk Road, with the garage in question located approximately 20.0m from application property.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 Planning permission is sought to replace an existing single storey end of block garage door with a brick wall to facilitate the positioning of an EV charging point and access door. The brick wall is not part of the application.

4.3 **Key Issues**

4.3.1 The assessment of this application was made from the documents submitted with the application, photos of the site and surroundings taken by the applicant, information relating to the planning history of the site, and images from Google Maps and Street View.

4.3.2 The key issues for consideration are as follows:

- The principle of development.
- The acceptability of the design of the proposed development and its resultant impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- The impact that the proposed development would have on the reasonable living conditions and well-being of neighbouring properties.
- The impact that the proposed development would have on car parking provision.

Principle of Development:

4.3.3 One of the core principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework is the need to deliver sustainable and low carbon development, in the interest of meeting targets related to reducing carbon emissions. Paragraph 154 of the NPPF states that:

***“When determining planning applications for renewable and low carbon development, local planning authorities should:***

- a) not require applicants to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy, and recognise that even small-scale projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions; and***
- b) approve the application if its impacts are (or can be made) acceptable.”***

4.3.4 The principle for development stated above is consistent within the Emerging Local Plan. The addition of an EV charging point will facilitate the use of more sustainable forms of transport and give local benefits through the reduction of greenhouse gases and harmful emissions from more conventional petrol/diesel vehicles. As such, it is considered that the scheme is a fairly small-scale project that will provide a contribution to reducing the areas carbon footprint, identifying its principle acceptance in my view.

Character and Appearance

4.3.5 The proposal involves the removal of a white garage door and the erection of a brick wall, facilitating the EV apparatus and access door accordingly. The proposed wall will be inset by 0.21m from the garage’s principle elevation, in order to accommodate the depth of the EV meter box, such that none of the associated apparatus will extend beyond the existing principle elevation.

4.3.6 The EV apparatus consists of two main boxes. The larger electricity meter box is coloured white and is 0.21m deep, 0.55m wide and 0.77m tall. The smaller charger is coloured black and is 0.15m deep, 0.35m wide and 0.35m tall with a 5.0m cable extending from its underside. The access door is proposed 0.9m wide and 2.0m tall.

4.3.7 The proposed development will result in a marked change to a fairly domestic and utilitarian row of single storey garages. Due to this considered change in external appearance, the garage in question will exhibit unique characteristics into the street scene, when compared to the remaining two garages in this terraced row and the neighbouring residential properties.

4.3.8 In my considered view, the proposal will result in some impact upon the character and appearance of the street scene. The inset of the proposed brick wall to accommodate the depth of the EV apparatus is an attempt to reduce any visual impact upon the street scene. As such, by virtue of the proposals location on an end-of-terrace garage, the stark setting that exists at the site and the proposed inset, I do not believe that any such impact arising from the development on the character and appearance of the area will be adverse.

#### Impact on Neighbouring Properties

4.3.9 Two objections were received within the consultation period. After speaking with the resident who submitted them, it was found that the original objections were based off incorrect reading of plans/drawings. As such, these neighbour representations were withdrawn

4.3.10 Due to the minor nature of the proposal and its locality on an end of terrace garage, it is considered that the proposed development will not have any material impact upon the amenities and reasonable living conditions of neighbouring properties.

#### Impact on Car Parking

4.3.11 The proposal would remove the ability to park a vehicle within the garage, leaving one space on the driveway in front. The application does not include floor plans for the application property, therefore the ability to cross examine the number of bedrooms with Saved Local Plan Policy 55 (Car Parking Standards) is void. In any case, Suffolk Road enjoys permit free on-street parking, therefore, it is considered that the proposal will not result in an adverse impact on car parking.

#### **4.4 Conclusion**

4.4.1 In the absence of material planning reasons to the contrary it is my view that planning permission should be **GRANTED**.

#### **4.5 Alternative Options**

4.5.1 None applicable

#### **4.6 Pre-Commencement Conditions**

4.6.1 No pre-commencement conditions are recommended.

#### **5.0 Legal Implications**

5.1 In making decisions on applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning legislation, the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of the development plan and to any other material considerations. The decision must be in accordance with the plan unless the material considerations indicate otherwise. Where the decision is to refuse or restrictive conditions are attached, the applicant has a right of appeal against the decision.

## 6.0 **Recommendation**

6.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the details specified in the application and supporting approved documents and plans listed above.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with details which form the basis of this grant of permission.

### Proactive Statement

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted proactively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.