

A001: APPEAL STATEMENT

2 TILEHURST ROAD SM3 8PB

(JULY 2022)



0.00 INTRODUCTION

- 0.01 This document (A001) is intended to supplement the existing Planning Statement (S001) in order to focus in on the areas of difficulty identified in the Delegated Report. 5 new documents (A002-A006) have also been enclosed as visual aid and additionally a Parking Stress Survey (Lambeth Method) prepared by Fotom Consulting Ltd.
- 0.02 Seven neighbours were consulted and no neighbour objections were received in relation to the revised proposal although planning disagreements still exist in 6 key areas.
- 0.03 These issues are summarised in turn by Appendix A of the Delegated Report; the following statement will address these issues with some slight restructuring in order to provide simplicity and avoid any conflation of the issues at hand:

No.	Issues of Contention	Sutton Local Plan (2018)	London Plan (2021)
1.00	Neighbour Amenity	Policy 29	
2.00	Boundary Conditions, Front Dormers, Eccentricity	Policy 28	D4
3.00	Internal and External Amenity Standards	Policy 9	D6
4.00	Density (Local Character)	Policy 7	
5.00	Overdevelopment (Open Space)	Policy 13	
6.00	Off street Parking Provision	Policy 37	

1.00 NEIGHBOUR AMENITY

(Sutton Local Plan (2018) Policy 29)

- 1.01 Conflict with Policy 29 has firstly been suggested on the principles of Visual Intrusion and a Sense of Enclosure to 126 Malden Road; and secondly by way of Overlooking to 4 Tilehurst Road. The Local Authority are of a mind that this that would warrant a condition to secure un-opening and obscure glazing to the principle bedroom of 2 Tilehurst (as proposed) such that the bedroom in question would no longer have an outlook.

Visual Intrusion:

- 1.02 With regard to the suggested fact of Visual Intrusion it is understood that this relates primarily to the proposed two storey extension to 2 Tilehurst Road since the proposed New Dwelling is not visible from any openings of the main house.
- 1.03 To quantify this level of Visual Intrusion an additional document has been created in the form of a set of annotated block plans (A005). A005 shows that the proposed extension "appears" to reduce the absolute field of view from the primary rear outlooks by 5 degrees.
- 1.04 However, in conjunction with the diminutive form of the gambrel roof, the 10m distance from the rear outlook and the oblique positioning it is considered that there are remediating factors that further decrease the impact of the proposed development. It is shown in A005 and A006 that the point at which the proposal becomes materially intrusive by blocking a reasonable amount of daylight occurs at point 2.975m in from the edge of the house as existing and that the proposed extension has no material impact at all.

Sense Of Enclosure:

- 1.05 With regard to a Sense of Enclosure this would normally be considered in relation to the main garden area immediately adjacent to the house which in this case would be an area of patio fronting the rear outrigger of 126 Malden Road.
- 1.06 The proposed New Dwelling is set back from this outrigger to align with the main house and this set-back distance is in the order of 2.7m.
- 1.07 Additionally the proposed extension to 2 Tilehurst Road would begin at a distance of 10m from this area and as previously stated has a diminutive and unimposing gambrel roof form. It is shown in A006 that the point at which any sense of enclosure is manifested occurs 390mm in from the existing building and that the new extension has no material impact at all.
- 1.08 Bearing in mind that a somewhat panoramic outlook of 141 degrees to the East would be retained despite the development proposal it would seem extremely difficult by definition to apply the term "Enclosure" to the situation at hand. Especially in any meaningful way in which it could be perceived as a cause of significant material harm (see A005 and A006).

Overlooking:

- 1.09 With regard to the "Overlooking" that has been associated with the window of the proposed two storey extension facing 4 Tilehurst Road it is considered that this window is materially acceptable by Local Policy and articulated by SPD4 (3.4.3).
- 1.10 SPD4 (3.4.3) specifies a separation distance between rear/side facing outlooks of 14m and supplies a diagram to illustrate this concept. The proposed extension would sit 15m away from the side elevation of 4 Tilehurst Road. Additionally a window of this location, size and orientation is an existing site condition and in view of SPD4 is thought to represent an acceptable alteration rather than any new form of imposition upon the amenity of 4 Tilehurst Road.
- 1.11 The level of overlooking is quantified in A005 and A006 showing that the Garden at 4 Tilehurst retains a large degree of privacy and that by degree the altered levels of overlooking are not significant.
- 1.12 The distance between the proposed rear extension and boundary of 4 Tilehurst Road exceeds the 7m rule of thumb that is generally used to determine whether levels of overlooking are acceptable or not.
- 1.13 Most of the increased area in overlooked space corresponds to an off street parking area with an open boundary and it is argued that in this context would be a positive imposition by increasing the sense of security and designing out crime.

Summary:

- 1.14 In summary there is no significant adverse harm caused to Neighbour Amenity or contradiction with Policy 29 and the development is carefully designed and sited to achieve this aim. No Neighbour Objections were received in relation to the development proposal and there is no cause by Policy to condition an obscurely glazed and un-opening window where separation distances are met in full and the 7m rule of thumb has been observed.

2.00 BOUNDARY CONDITIONS, FRONT DORMERS, ECCENTRICITY

(Sutton Local Plan (2018) Policy 28)

(London Plan (2021) Policy D4)

- 2.01 Conflicts with Policy 28 and London Plan (2021) Policy D4 have been suggested in relation to the smaller elements that make up the boundary treatments and the breaking up of the existing large front dormer to provide 3 small front dormers.

Boundary Conditions:

- 2.02 Objections are raised over the inclusion of 2m boundary Fencing to rear gardens of both properties. It is considered that this aspect of the proposal would be within permitted development tolerances and that this would be a material consideration in any application by virtue of Zurich Assurance Ltd vs North Lincolnshire Council (2012). Where this fencing fronts a highway such permitted development tolerances would not apply. However this does not relate to the rear boundary with 126 Malden road and the rear boundary with the private access road which does not front a Highway (45 degrees or less).
- 2.03 The current boundary treatment that fronts the Highway on Malden Road is of a height of roughly 1600mm. It is not thought that the proposal to raise this fencing to 2m is particularly harmful bearing in mind that this would secure privacy and additionally regularise the haphazard appearance of the existing boundary. However, if considered to be of significant harm then this problem can be obviated through a condition that specifies evergreen screening (such as bay trees standards) to a height of 2m and boundary fencing not to exceed current height limitations. The aesthetic outcomes of such a condition are explored in A002, A003 and A004.
- 2.04 In a related appeal decision (APP/P5870/C/18/3198971) pertaining to the same subject the appeal officer notes in point 23:
- "The fencing and gates are about 1.8m high and are therefore about 0.8m higher than the permitted development height. I do not consider that they look particularly out of place in the street scene. They have improved the security of the land and reduced opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour, since the approved layout is open to the road. They would not be effective in these respects if they were lowered to a height of 1m. On balance, I do not consider that they are sufficiently at odds with any of the applicable provisions of the Local Plan Policy 28: Character and Design to justify withholding planning permission for them."
- 2.05 In relation to boundary conditions the Highways Officer has also specified that at no stage should a height of 600mm be exceeded in the visibility splay of the proposed crossover and as such the bricks piers and gate should be abandoned from the scheme on a similar condition or reduced to a height of 600mm. Additionally any landscaping within the visibility splay area should be restricted to a height of 600mm to ensure child safety. The aesthetic implications of this condition are also explored in additional documents A002-A004.
- 2.06 It is also maintained that the presence of a rear Garden fronting onto Malden Road is simply an existing site condition rather than being alien, an anomaly or a cause of significant material harm.

Front Dormers:

- 2.07 In regard to the breaking up the large front Dormer of the existing building it is considered that this presents as an improvement or alteration of an existing site condition and provides a reduction or softening in visual impact rather than the propagation of alien phenomena. No additional overlooking is created and the glazed area is of a lesser extent with sash windows and privacy bars. Additionally the central dormer window is a clerestory window above the stairwell and has no immediate outlook.

Eccentricity:

- 2.08 The existing building is counterpoised and familiarised by the new dwelling and these two dwellings together have a massing that is comparable to the semi detached development at 4-6 Tilehurst. While the dwellings are essentially an "odd couple" and are eccentrically related in the first order of built form, they are strongly tied together through deep structural and second order similarities including fenestration, plot morphology, high quality materials, boundary treatments, feature chimney detail and the ordination of elevations. It must also be acknowledged that this eccentricity is also an existing site condition as the same formal relationship essentially already exists between the elevations of 2 Tilehurst and 126 Malden Road. Although arguably this existing condition is further exacerbated by mismatching materials, the blank yellow stock elevation of 126 Malden; brown roof pantiles, multi-tone pink render and the low quality fenestration of the existing large front dormer at 2 Tilehurst.
- 2.09 As a pair of non symmetrical detached dwellings read in adjacency it is considered that the development proposal on this SRQ/API Gateway Site would mirror or echo the arrangement on the opposing SRQ/API Gateway Site at 117 and 119 Malden Road and provides a pleasing sense of relational accord.

Summary:

- 2.10 In summary it is not thought that the smaller elements that define the boundary conditions of the proposed development cause any significant harm to the streetscape in themselves; and that this is particularly the case if any perceived harm is obviated by condition (as visualised in A002-A004). The existing house at 2 Tilehurst Road is described in the delegated report as "without architectural merit" yet it is argued that the proposed renovations, alterations and extension create a building that is re-proportioned and modified to the extent and degree that it could be considered as a positive addition to the streetscape. The development is thought of a positive intervention and would meet the criteria of Local Plan (2018) Policy 28 and London Plan (2021) Policy D4 (see A004).

3.00 INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AMENITY STANDARDS

(Sutton Local Plan (2018) Policy 9)
(London Plan (2021) Policy D6)

- 3.01 Issues have been raised in relation to the Internal and External Amenity Standards provided by the proposal. This primarily relates to occupation by GIA, height restrictions and outlook within the loft bedroom of the new dwelling; and the external amenity spaces of both dwellings.

Occupation by GIA:

- 3.02 It is maintained that both the new and proposed dwellings meet internal space standards and nationally described space standards for the proposed levels of occupation (3 bed 4ppl). The case officer has mistakenly used the figure of 109.28m² for the new dwelling which is a figure that most probably relates to the GEA although this is however unclear. With 2 habitable floors the existing house as extended is considered as a 2 storey dwelling and with 3 habitable floors the New Dwelling is considered as a 3 storey dwelling. The table below illustrates that space standards are met and exceeded.

Proposal (3 bed 4ppl)	Proposed GIA	Nationally Described Space Standards
2 Tilehurst (As Extended)	84.1m ²	84m ² (2 storey) (3 bed 4ppl)
New Dwelling	98.8m ²	90m ² (3 storey) (3 bed 4ppl)

Loft bedroom:

- 3.03 Issues raised in relation to the loft bedroom are difficult to appreciate in principle as the bedroom in question has a qualifying GIA of 15.3m², is 6.6m wide and has a further 6.6m² that falls below the GIA threshold of 1.5m in height but still constitutes usable space. Additionally the proposed bedroom has 4 roof light windows. 2 of which begin at the qualifying height of 1200mm with the express intention of providing acceptable outlook by London Plan standards. The table below quantifies the floor area of this bedroom in relation to key ceiling heights:

Ceiling Height	over 2.5m	Over 2.0m	Over 1.5m (Habitable GIA)	Less than 1.5m (Non habitable)
3rd Floor Bedroom Area	4.3m ²	9.8m ²	15.3m ²	6.6m ²

- 3.04 One possible way of trying to understand the issue raised is in the categorisation of the loft bedroom as a principle bedroom bearing in mind that it has only 9.8m² of floor area above a height of 2.0m. However in consideration of the fact that the proposed dwelling has another bedroom of 12.7m² that exceeds the principle bedroom GIA standards of D6 (11.5m²) this is not viewed as an issue of material concern but as a matter of private choice as to which bedroom would be occupied as principle. Furthermore these concerns would only arise by discounting active GIA area which is somewhat questionable bearing in mind that the defined limits are deemed acceptable in view of extracting a CIL.

Garden Sizes:

- 3.05 In relation to Issues raised about the size of rear gardens it is maintained that the proposal meets the flexible requirements of the Local Plan (2018) and that flexible amenity provision is acceptable in view of the Corner Location, Gateway Location and Urban SRQ/API location of the development site. The proposed amenity spaces are sufficient for most intents and purposes and for other purposes that require more extensive space Cheam recreation ground is 100m away.
- 3.06 The London Plan would specify a private amenity area of 7m² for each unit respectively to meet the burden of use-value. The proposed "rear" external amenity spaces of 46m² and 35.4m² respectively and are thought to be acceptable in the de-limited "urban" context.

- 3.07 The Delegated Report attempts to argue that a flexible approach is not suitable according to Policy 9 for three reasons that relate extraneously. Firstly by inaccurately contriving the new dwelling as a 3bed 5ppl dwelling (see 3.02); secondly by contriving the boundary conditions facing the highway as an irresolvable problem in relation to privacy when such perceived difficulties can be obviated through a landscaping condition (see 2.04) and lastly by comparing the development to non adjacent plots and suggesting that this lack of accord with the generic trend of the local area would constitute overdevelopment by harming the character of the appearance of the area.
- 3.08 The concept of overdevelopment itself is attached to the idea that when compared with the generic pattern of development across the location the development proposal is in such relative terms cramped in the relationship between its' rear doors and respective rear boundaries. And, as in the case of appeal decision APP/P5870/W/21/3281440 (point 11) the Council's assertion that this is not a regularly occurring feature in this relatively spacious part of the borough does have some merit.
- 3.09 However, it must also be taken into account that the condition proposed is not significantly different from that of 4-6 Tilehurst Road and is thought to reflect the difference in SRQ/API delimitation between the "Suburban" site of 4-6 Tilehurst Road and the "Urban" site of 2 Tilehurst Road. At their widest fronting the Principle Elevation and the Highway these two proposed gardens have a "winged" width of 7.2m and the neighbouring development on Tilehurst Road with a similar plot morphology and garden layout have "winged" garden widths of 10.7m.
- 3.10 Moreover, the idea that having a smaller garden may cause significant material harm to the character of an area cannot be meaningful in itself when adequate separation distances are brought into consideration. As the inspector implies in the stated appeal case above this would be an issue of private rather than public amenity. On this issue (a conflation between public and private amenity) the following is stated:
- "Even less likely would be the perception that this causes meaningful harm to the character or the appearance of the area. In short, the proposed house would not appear cramped, incongruous, or out of keeping and I note this was essentially the conclusion of the Inspector in the 2013 appeal (ref. APP/P5870/A/13/2190067)"
- 3.11 As such the development cannot be viewed in absolute terms as being cramped and the private amenity provision of 46m² and 35.4m² would fully comply with the flexible amenity standards of Policy 9 and grossly exceed the specification of the London Plan (2021). While relatively smaller than non adjacent developments and non-visible plots outside of the SRQ/API area, the provision provided would again be adequate for almost all intents and purposes. It is reasserted that the specification of 70m² is overly onerous outside of a "suburban" context and that flexible standards of external amenity space are advocated and supported by Local Policy 9. As the Inspector notes in APP/P5870/W/21/3281440 this private amenity condition would be reflected as a market choice for any prospective buyer as to whether the property would meet their needs and provide a greater variety of urban spaces as to the small sites context.

Summary:

- 3.13 In summary the Development proposal is not in conflict with Local Plan (2018) Policy 9 or London Plan (2021) Policy D6.

4.00 DENSITY (LOCAL CHARACTER)

(Sutton Local Plan (2018) Policy 7)

- 4.01 The delegated report asserts that despite meeting the density criteria of the London Plan (2021) and Local Plan (2018) the proposal is unacceptable in relation to the Local Character and therefore conflicts with Policy 7. This primarily relates to perceived harm to the urban grain and the adoption of the integrated rather than subordinate approach to development.
- 4.02 The development proposal is not situated in a Conservation Area and the local area is of mixed forms, materials, fenestration, typologies (detached/semi detached/terraced) and styles. The site itself is characterised by an isolated and over exposed building in a state of disrepair, haphazard boundary treatments and the blank side elevation of 126 Malden Road.
- 4.03 In relation to Tilehurst Road the proposed principle Elevation backgrounds the existing blank side elevation of 126 Malden Road with an architectural facade that fronts on to Tilehurst road and provides a spacious and open frontage with low walls and an abundance of visible green space.
- 4.04 It is maintained that the development proposal improves the coherence and appearance of the streetscape on Tilehurst Road through a continuation of the plot rhythm of the adjacent development (4-6) which is characterised by centralised front gardens that are flanked on either side by "winged" rear gardens (see A004). It is also argued that when there is a morphological accord in the layout pattern with the neighbouring development fronting Tilehurst Road (4-6) it seems odd that the development should be then critiqued for not following layout patterns of less immediate developments or a generic pattern of development.
- 4.05 In relation to the Malden Road street scene it is thought that the new "side elevation" fronting Malden Road constitutes an improvement aesthetically by concealing the awkward shape of the existing gambrel roofed dwelling. Additionally the proposed dwelling integrates with the existing built form, existing materiality and existing building lines of 126 Malden Road while also retaining a spacious quality through a 2.5m set back from the edge of the plot to align with the existing building line of 2 Tilehurst. It is also stated again that the presence of a rear garden fronting onto Malden Road is simply an existing site condition rather than being alien, an anomaly, or a cause of significant material harm.
- 4.06 An "integrated approach" has been adopted both for the proposed new dwelling and the extension to the existing property. It is argued that this is acceptable by virtue of the Corner Location, Gateway Location and SRQ/API Location; and that a "subordinate approach" has no overriding mandate in this particular context. Additionally, attempts to specify the "subordinate approach" for the existing gambrel roof are thought to be inappropriate due to the already diminutive and subordinate nature of such a profile and without any practical consideration towards the aesthetic outcome of such a specification.
- 4.07 While the two buildings are not identical in form and can be viewed as being eccentrically related, practically it is evident that the development proposal is a significant improvement both to the existing building and the street scenes on Tilehurst Road and Malden Road. It must also be appreciated that by emulating the form of the existing property on Malden Road the new arrangement is not of significant formal difference to the current site arrangement.

- 4.08 In policy terms it is argued that flexibility in relation to form and density is materially specified by Paragraph 3.25 of SPD14 Urban Design Guide (2008) which states the following:

"In certain other instances development on Corner Properties may be suitable, such as highlighting a gateway or signifying a change in the urban form. This includes development that highlights an entrance or gateway into the borough, an SRQ area or an employment area. In these instances development may be emphasised by an increased height, higher density, larger form, detailing, colouring or materials."

Summary:

- 4.09 In summary it is not thought that harm is caused to the local character and that the proposal does not conflict with Policy 7 of the Local Plan (2018).

5.00 OVERDEVELOPMENT (OPEN SPACE)

(Sutton Local Plan (2018) Policy 13)

- 5.01 The delegated report has argued that there are two conflicts with Policy 13. However, if it can be agreed that neighbour amenity is not a material concern then this conflict would relate solely to the idea that the site makes an important contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As understood this would relate primarily to the open character of the site.
- 5.02 In view of the fact that the site can be effectively screened with soft evergreen landscaping that would supersede regulation by development control it would not be correct to assign a public amenity value to views into this privately owned garden area from the street level. With this in mind the perceived conflict with Policy 13 would have to relate solely to the nature of the open character whose acceptable limits would be established by adequate separation distances.
- 5.03 Since adequate separation distances are established at all points and the development is set back to respect all existing building lines it would seem fair to say that an acceptable standard of openness and relief has been retained by Policy.
- 5.04 Therefore no conflict with Policy 13 can be legitimately maintained. And this would be furthered by the poor quality of the existing site that is characterised by a dilapidated building lacking architectural merit, haphazard boundary treatments and the blank side elevation of 126 Malden Road. It is tendered that the site as developed and regenerated would make a more important contribution to the Local Area than the existing site while maintaining an acceptable standard of openness and relief by Policy.
- 5.05 It is also of note that any conflict with Policy 13 on the basis of character would be materially contradicted both by the SRQ/API delimitation and the approval of applications A2015/71241 and A2017/77966. If it is the case that openness is a characteristic specified for absolute conservation beyond the limit of acceptable separation distances.

Summary:

- 5.06 In Summary there is no meaningful conflict with Policy 13.

6.00 PROVISION OF OFFSTREET PARKING

(Sutton Local Plan (2018) Policy 37)

- 6.01 Issues have been raised in relation to the lack of off street parking proposed for the existing House as extended. Appendix 11 of the Local Plan (2018) specifies parking standards of 1.5 spaces for 3 bed dwellings and also states that:

"Within Areas of Potential Intensification applications proposing less than maximum standards will be favourably considered in order to maximise housing density, so long as the council is satisfied that this will not cause adverse problems arising from overspill and adequate measures are in place to encourage the use of sustainable transport."

- 6.02 The Local Authority have indicated that the provision of 1 additional off street space assigned to the existing house at 2 Tilehurst Road would be materially suitable in relation to the SRQ/API location and that in the absence of such provision a Parking Stress Survey (Lambeth Method) would be able to determine whether the level of overspill can be tolerated.
- 6.03 While this is appreciated in principle it is of argument that the scale of the development and the addition of 1 extra car to the highway would not by degree be an overly onerous imposition. Particularly when there are 15 spaces to this immediate 77m kerbed stretch of Tilehurst Road and only 4 fronting properties (New,2,4,6). The occupation of 1 extra space of these 15 potential spaces would equate to an associated occupation of 6.7%. The site as existing is not with a CPZ.
- 6.04 A Parking Stress Survey has been prepared by Fotom Consulting Ltd. which concludes that the development proposal would be acceptable if it provided no off street parking at all (a displacement of 2 cars).
- 6.05 It is however noted that the values do approach the upper bound of the threshold limit and that in the specific case of 1 car being displaced (this development proposal) the parking stress levels would be 84.4% and 77.8% respectively. 85% is the given figure for acceptable stress levels in the enclosed report and 90% is stated as a normative concessionary figure across London Boroughs.
- 6.06 Something of further consideration is the fact that the provision of 1 additional off street space does not in itself preclude additional levels of vehicle ownership and that if levels of car ownership were to become a concern to the Local Community this would lead to the introduction of a CPZ via neighbour consultation.
- 6.07 In this regard if the values produced are thought to be of a concerning nature then a more robust, future proof and sustainable method of addressing the concept of parking stress associated with the proposed development would be to enter into a S106/S16 unilateral undertaking with the Local Authority.
- 6.08 Such a pre-emptively constructed undertaking could effectively limit vehicle ownership by restricting the issuance of Parking Permits and would activate automatically as soon as the Local Community were of a shared mind that local parking was a material concern to be safeguarded through CPZ implementation.

6.09 The table below in 6.09 quantifies the extent of the impact upon the highway under a series of agreement alternatives available for consideration. The current house as existing would be allowed to apply for 3 permits under Sutton's current CPZ policy and it is considered that all three proposed agreements would act more effectively to limit parking stress to sustainable levels than the provision of 1 additional off street bay.

6.10 Although the 2/3 PTAL is not thought to be conducive to a zero car development; it is hoped that the merit of such an outlook can be appreciated in principle despite the theoretical nature of the CPZ being considered. It is proposed that such an agreement made through officer discretion would allay all concerns raised and provide a significant material improvement over the acceptable by policy alternative to provide 1 additional off street parking bay.

6.11 CPZ parking permits available under different agreement scenarios are explored in the table below:

CPZ PERMIT RESTRICTIONS (S106/S16)	2 Tilehurst As Proposed	Proposed New Dwelling	Development Proposal Combined	2 Tilehurst As Existing	Indexed Impact Level
As Unrestricted	3	3	6	3	1:2 Overspill
Agreement Option 1	2	1	3	3	1:1 As Existing
Agreement Option 2	1	1	2	3	2:3 Existing
Agreement Option 3	1	0	1	3	1:3 Existing

6.12 Further to this proposal for an undertaking that resolves the impact upon parking stress it must also be emphasised that in the intermediate timeframe (prior to activation) such a provisional shortfall of 1 off street parking bay in itself could not be considered by degree to be a serious incremental generating force behind a perceived local need to implement such a CPZ.

6.13 Rather the case, it is thought that such a vector would arise as a result of a broad based vehicle over-dependence across the locality, accrued over time, and potentially exacerbated by a small number of particular households. A CPZ would therefore represent an appropriate general solution to a general problem that could never be solved asymmetrically with 1 additional vehicle crossover in conjunction with unrestricted levels of additional street parking.

6.14 In abstract, the over regulation of Housing Density is not necessarily the solution to the under regulation of Vehicle Ownership. If it can be appreciated that the specification of off street parking will always detract from either habitable space or external amenity space.

6.15 The argument presented would additionally tender that the concept of a latent or dormant undertaking would also provide a tangible deterrent in the intermediate time frame as to limiting car ownership to the degree pre-specified. Thereby potentially providing immediate benefits by implication in addition to a robust, future proof and sustainable method of addressing the potential difficulty of parking stress through the regulation of vehicle over dependence (as and when a significant concern is determined by neighbour consultation).

- 6.16 As to the notion of a reasonable level of undertaking it is thought that Agreement Option 1 would provide a null impact solution that is equivalent to the existing. However additional options are also put forward to accommodate for further insights unavailable to the statement author.
- 6.17 Also of note is that the crossover relocation associated with the new dwelling was approved in principle by the highway engineer who visited the site and suggested that forecourt width of up to 4m would also be acceptable.

Summary:

- 6.18 In summary the conflicts in relation to Policy 37 have either been resolved by the outcome of the Parking Stress Survey or can find resolution through a unilateral undertaking if it is considered that the values associated with the proposal (84.4% and 77.8%) are of concern.

7.00 OVERVIEW

- 7.01 Overall it is considered that there is no meaningful conflict with either local or regional policy and that the proposal should be granted approval. This approval would be subject to additional condition(s) and a Section 16/106 Undertaking if thought necessary by the assigned case officer at appeal.
- 7.02 Overall it is also considered that the development proposal achieves 7 key objectives:
- Morphological integration with the plot form of the neighbouring development on Tilehurst Road.
 - Counter weighting of the architectural massing of the adjacent development on Tilehurst Road
 - Architectural Integration with the terrace block on Malden Road.
 - Regeneration and modification of a property of negative impact to create a building of aesthetically pleasing proportions, materiality and ordination.
 - Maintenance of an open character achieved through adequate setbacks, separation distances and a low walled open frontage with an abundance of green space.
 - Morphological accord with the other "Gateway Site" (Entry into SRQ/API Area) at 119 and 117 Malden Road through the similar presentation of 2 detached dwellings read in adjacency as a pair (another "odd couple" eccentrically related in form).
 - And lastly the optimisation of site capacity within a small sites context.
- 7.03 The effects of which together act to create an aesthetically pleasing, integrated and coherent streetscape of mixed typologies that would be of value rather than detriment to the variegated character of the local area.

END