

Council responses to review of development on gardens: Councils Wat-Wy

Contents

Watford Council	p. 2
Waverly Borough Council	p. 8
Welwyn Hatfield Council	p. 13
London Borough of Westminster	p. 18
Winchester City Council	p. 22
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	p. 27
Woking Borough Council	p. 33
Wokingham Borough Council	p. 38
Wycombe District Council	p. 45
Wyre Borough Council	p. 52
Wyre Forest District Council	p. 57

Local Authority	Watford Council			
<p>1. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused by the authority (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04 21</p> <p>2004-05 55</p> <p>2005-06 35</p> <p>2006-07 55</p> <p>2007-08 49</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04 19</p> <p>2004-05 52</p> <p>2005-06 35</p> <p>2006-07 52</p> <p>2007-08 b</p>		
<p>2. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 1 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 161</p> <p>2004-05 315</p> <p>2005-06 171</p> <p>2006-07 324 (230 less sheltered housing)</p> <p>2007-08 238</p>			
<p>3. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>		

<p>4. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>
<p>5. How many net additional dwellings would be provided if the refused planning permissions had been granted in line with questions 1 and 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>
<p>6. What is the total number of dwellings provided through planning permissions in each of the last five years?</p>	<p>Total dwellings</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>

7. How are applications for each of the categories above considered by the authority? Do any specific policies exist?

The principal development plan policy is WDP2000 policy H9, which requires proposals to have a safe and convenient access and to observe general residential standards and character policies, and this is complemented and reinforced by the new Residential Design Guide SPD, adopted by Cabinet in November 2008. This states that:

Planning permission will only be granted where:

- i) a proper means of access which is convenient and safe for pedestrians, non-motorised and motorised highway users is provided, which keeps to a minimum any visual impact within the street scene; and
- ii) the proposal complies with the criteria listed in policy H8 (Residential Standards) and Policy U1, U2, U3 and U4.

8. Have you identified gardens (either individually or through the identification of a broad location) through the plan led system, for future development?

Within the extant Development Plan 2000 Rounton house in Nascot Wood Road has been identified this is a 1.6 ha site with a minimum capacity set at 48 houses.

Watford is currently preparing its Core strategy and as part of this the site allocation development plan document. This will direct future development and safeguard sites such as gardens.

9. Please declare if development on gardens is, or is not, an issue for your authority and why? **If it is not an issue, and your authority is happy to declare this and why** (which could be a combination of the answers to questions 7 and 8 above), then you do not need to provide answers for questions 1-6 (although it would of course still be beneficial to have data from as many authorities as possible).

Despite the attention sometimes given to the issue, backland development is statistically rare in Watford. In Watford, from April 2001 to March 2006 only 4.2% of brownfield development was on back gardens, with a general downward trend over the surveyed years. Backland development appears, therefore, to be reasonably well controlled in Watford. The principal development plan policy is WDP2000 policy H9, which requires proposals to have a safe and convenient access and to observe general residential standards and character policies, and this is complemented and reinforced by the new Residential Design Guide SPD, adopted by Cabinet in November 2008. There is no evidence to suggest that backland development is a significant issue in Watford, and it is considered that no urgent action is needed to improve policy or decision-making in this regard.

While backland development is not currently a significant form of development in Watford, this situation will be kept under review. It would be appropriate to:

- a) carry the principles of WDP2000 policy H9 forward into the Local Development Framework (in the Development Control Policies DPD);

in the LDF Core Strategy policy identifying criteria for selection of sites for residential development, identify back gardens as being among the least appropriate locations, along with public open space.

10. Do you have any other comments?

Local Authority	Waverley Borough Council
------------------------	--------------------------

<p>1. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused by the authority (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>
<p>2. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 1 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>	
<p>3. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>

<p>4. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>
<p>5. How many net additional dwellings would be provided if the refused planning permissions had been granted in line with questions 1 and 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>
<p>6. What is the total number of dwellings provided through planning permissions in each of the last five years?</p>	<p>Total dwellings</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>

7. How are applications for each of the categories above considered by the authority? Do any specific policies exist?

The following “saved” Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 policies, which apply to developments within settlements, are relevant:

D1 – Environmental Implications of Development

D4 – Design and Layout

BE1 – Important Green Spaces within settlements

BE2 – Frith Hill Area of Special Environment Quality

BE3 – South Farnham Area of Special Environmental Quality

BE4 – Haslemere Hillside

BE5 – Godalming Hillside

BE6 – Low Density Residential Areas

H4 – Density and Size of dwellings (although superseded by Planning Policy Statement 3)

RD1 – Rural Settlements.

There are also additional policies dealing with specific topics such as trees, listed buildings and conservation areas, which may also apply, depending on the circumstances.

Currently the general strategy, which is derived from existing “saved” Local Plan policies, is that within the larger settlements and the rural settlements identified in Policy RD1, there is not a blanket approach that specifically restricts/prevents the development of garden land as a matter of principle. Under current policies, the development of existing gardens for housing can be acceptable subject to meeting the specific criteria of the individual policies in the Local Plan. There are general policies on design, layout, environmental impact etc. that apply throughout the developed areas (see Policies D1 and D4). There is a specific policy dealing with new development within identified rural settlements (Policy RD1).

There are also policies applying to specific areas within settlements, which have been identified as having a special environmental quality (See policies BE2, BE3, BE4 and BE5). For example, Policy BE3 relates to parts of Farnham that are within the settlement area, but which have a distinct semi-rural character. Policy BE1 seeks to protect important green spaces within settlements. This mainly applies to areas of green space to which there is public access, but very exceptionally may apply to private land which makes an exceptional contribution to the visual character of a settlement. Policy BE6 relates to three specific low density areas (one in Haslemere, one in Farnham and one in Wonersh) that are considered to have a distinct character meriting a specific policy.

It should be noted that the Local Plan did also include Policy H2 relating to the monitoring and phasing of housing development. That policy could be applied in circumstances where the Council was able to demonstrate that it had in excess of 20% more than a 5-year supply of housing land. It related only to large windfall sites (0.4 ha or larger) providing 10 or more net new dwellings, and where the site was of a predominantly open nature, including large areas of garden land. In such circumstances the Council had the option to refuse development of such sites on the grounds of prematurity. The Council applied to “save” the policy, but this was not allowed by the Secretary of State.

8. Have you identified gardens (either individually or through the identification of a broad location) through the plan led system, for future development?

Waverley has not, as yet, specifically identified gardens for future development in the Local Development Framework. The Council is still at an early stage of preparing its LDF Core Strategy. It is working on the issues and options for the Core Strategy DPD, and it has also started work on the site allocations DPD that will include housing sites. The Council has commissioned consultants to carry out a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to inform the work on the Core Strategy. This is nearing completion.

9. Please declare if development on gardens is, or is not, an issue for your authority and why? **If it is not an issue, and your authority is happy to declare this and why** (which could be a combination of the answers to questions 7 and 8 above), then you do not need to provide answers for questions 1-6 (although it would of course still be beneficial to have data from as many authorities as possible).

Most of Waverley Borough Council's housing supply over the last ten years has come from windfall sites, and many of these have involved the intensification of residential garden land within settlements.

There are currently few "allocated" sites in the Local Plan but, given the contribution of windfall sites, the Council has, in the past, been able to meet its housing requirements without the need to release greenfield sites for development. In addition, much of the land outside identified settlements is constrained by national policy designations including Green Belt, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and nature conservation designations.

Concerns are often raised locally about the impact on local character resulting from the development of existing gardens for housing. Some of the developments that have given rise to this concern may have been a result of the prescriptive density policies in the former PPG3. However, development proposals of this type continue to come forward. Some of the concerns have related to schemes where single dwellings are replaced by blocks of apartments. There have also been concerns about schemes where gardens are put together to form development sites and also about smaller infill developments. The Council's recent consultation on the issues and options for the Core Strategy DPD also revealed issues around the matter. The issues have ranged from the need to protect the environment or the character of an area to the lack of infrastructure to support unplanned development.

10. Do you have any other comments?

The Council faces some challenges in deciding how to accommodate the housing required in the South East Plan. It will have to take a view on how much development can continue to be accommodated within settlements, having regard to the concerns about the loss of garden land and impact on local character, and also taking account of PPS3 and its guidance on the role of windfall sites. If the Council were to seek to restrict/prevent the development of garden land then it still has to identify where the required housing development will go. It may have to consider the release of greenfield land, but the options to allocate sites outside built-up areas will be affected by the policy constraints mentioned in Question 9. In addition, the Council does not have significant areas of non-residential urban land (such as redundant industrial/commercial land) that could be re-used for housing.

Even if the Council were to identify enough specific sites, such that it was much less reliant on windfall sites to meet its housing requirements, this will not stop windfall sites, which may involve garden development, coming forward. In such circumstances, the Council would need to consider what options can or should be explored to control/limit these unplanned developments.

Local Authority	Welwyn Hatfield Council Response	
<p>1. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused by the authority (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p> <p>No information see note in response to question 10</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>
<p>2. How many net additional dwellings would be provided have been completed through the planning permissions granted in Question 1 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings completed</p> <p>2003-04 13</p> <p>2004-05 8</p> <p>2005-06 33</p> <p>2006-07 14</p> <p>2007-08 25</p>	
<p>3. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p> <p>No information see note in response to</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>

question 10		
<p>4. How many net additional dwellings would be have been provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings completed</p> <p>2003-04 0</p> <p>2004-05 0</p> <p>2005-06 1</p> <p>2006-07 0</p> <p>2007-08 17</p>	
<p>5. How many net additional dwellings would be provided if the refused planning permissions had been granted in line with questions 1 and 3 above?</p> <p>No information see note in response to question 10</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04</p> <p>2004-05</p> <p>2005-06</p> <p>2006-07</p> <p>2007-08</p>	
<p>6. What is the total number of dwellings provided through planning permissions in each of the last five years?</p>	<p>Total dwellings net completions (by site rather than by dwelling)</p> <p>2003-04 204</p> <p>2004-05 1246</p> <p>2005-06 267</p> <p>2006-07 813</p> <p>2007-08 891</p> <p>Total Completions 2003/4 – 2007/8 = 3421</p> <p>Total completed on garden land = 111</p> <p><u>% on garden land = 3.2%</u></p>	

7. How are applications for each of the categories above considered by the authority? Do any specific policies exist?

There are no specific policies in the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan relating to development in garden land.

8. Have you identified gardens (either individually or through the identification of a broad location) through the plan led system, for future development?

A number of large garden sites have been identified in the emerging Welwyn Hatfield SHLAA, which is not yet published.

9. Please declare if development on gardens is, or is not, an issue for your authority and why? **If it is not an issue, and your authority is happy to declare this and why** (which could be a combination of the answers to questions 7 and 8 above), then you do not need to provide answers for questions 1-6 (although it would of course still be beneficial to have data from as many authorities as possible).

It has not been identified as an issue in the Council's Core Strategy Issues and Options consultations.

10. Do you have any other comments?

Please see attached spreadsheet for additional information on the data provided.

This information is provided by Hertfordshire County Council Development Monitoring System.

Please note,

- **This information relates to numbers of completed dwellings rather than numbers of permission granted, as we feel this will lead to double counting and inconsistencies in the data. See Hertfordshire County Council's response for further details.**
- **Refused permissions are not currently monitored and therefore no information can be provided at this time.**

It has not been possible to provide more detailed information in the time available. This information has been requested at the 'busiest' monitoring periods of the year, with annual housing and employment land surveys and returns, for AMRs and National Indicators due in April/May.

Local Authority	Westminster			
<p>1. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused by the authority (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	Granted		Refused	
	2003-04	1	2003-04	0
	2004-05	0	2004-05	1
	2005-06	0	2005-06	0
	2006-07	1	2006-07	0
	2007-08	0	2007-08	0
<p>2. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 1 above?</p>	Net additional dwellings			
	2003-04	2		
	2004-05	1		
	2005-06	0		
	2006-07	1		
	2007-08	0		
<p>3. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	Granted		Refused	
	2003-04	0	2003-04	0
	2004-05	0	2004-05	1
	2005-06	0	2005-06	0
	2006-07	0	2006-07	0
	2007-08	0	2007-08	0

<p>4. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>2003-04</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004-05</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-06</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006-07</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007-08</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table>	2003-04	0	2004-05	0	2005-06	0	2006-07	0	2007-08	0
2003-04	0										
2004-05	0										
2005-06	0										
2006-07	0										
2007-08	0										
<p>5. How many net additional dwellings would be provided if the refused planning permissions had been granted in line with questions 1 and 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>2003-04</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004-05</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-06</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006-07</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007-08</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table>	2003-04	0	2004-05	1	2005-06	0	2006-07	0	2007-08	0
2003-04	0										
2004-05	1										
2005-06	0										
2006-07	0										
2007-08	0										
<p>6. What is the total number of dwellings provided through planning permissions in each of the last five years?</p>	<p>Total dwellings</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>2003-04</td> <td>1,209</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004-05</td> <td>1,725</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-06</td> <td>1,286</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006-07</td> <td>788</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007-08</td> <td>1,110</td> </tr> </table>	2003-04	1,209	2004-05	1,725	2005-06	1,286	2006-07	788	2007-08	1,110
2003-04	1,209										
2004-05	1,725										
2005-06	1,286										
2006-07	788										
2007-08	1,110										

7. How are applications for each of the categories above considered by the authority? Do any specific policies exist?

The following specific policies from our adopted UDP are used when considering housing development on gardens ([http://www.westminster.gov.uk/environment/planning/unitarydevelopmentplan/chapter 9](http://www.westminster.gov.uk/environment/planning/unitarydevelopmentplan/chapter%209) environment and chapter 10 urban design and conservation)

POLICY ENV 13: PROTECTING AMENITIES, DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

- (C) The City Council will protect private amenity space, such as gardens, particularly for family sized units.

POLICY DES 12: PARKS, GARDENS AND SQUARES

- (B) Development on or under open spaces

Permission will not be given for development on or under those parks, landscaped spaces and public or private gardens, where the open spaces:

- (1) form an important element in the townscape, part of a planned estate or street layout
- (2) are characteristic features of conservation areas
- (3) provide the setting of a listed building
- (4) are of significant ecological value.

8. Have you identified gardens (either individually or through the identification of a broad location) through the plan led system, for future development?

No.

9. Please declare if development on gardens is, or is not, an issue for your authority and why? **If it is not an issue, and your authority is happy to declare this and why** (which could be a combination of the answers to questions 7 and 8 above), then you do not need to provide answers for questions 1-6 (although it would of course still be beneficial to have data from as many authorities as possible).

Development on gardens **is** an issue for the City of Westminster in relation to basement development underneath and extending for almost the entire length of gardens. Although these do not result in an additional dwelling unit, they effectively destroy many of the qualities and functions of gardens such as drainage and biodiversity.

However, Westminster does not have an issue with new dwellings within gardens as shown by the data provided.

10. Do you have any other comments

Local Authority	Winchester City Council			
<p>1. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused by the authority (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	Granted		Refused	
	2003-04	46	2003-04	45
	2004-05	70	2004-05	39
	2005-06	78	2005-06	49
	2006-07	51	2006-07	28
	2007-08	62	2007-08	43
<p>2. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 1 above?</p>	Net additional dwellings			
	2003-04	227		
	2004-05	281		
	2005-06	381		
	2006-07	170		
<p>3. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	Granted		Refused	
	2003-04	2	2003-04	18
	2004-05	4	2004-05	11
	2005-06	2	2005-06	19
	2006-07	2	2006-07	15
	2007-08	3	2007-08	24

<p>4. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 8</p> <p>2004-05 48</p> <p>2005-06 7</p> <p>2006-07 26</p> <p>2007-08 5</p>
<p>5. How many net additional dwellings would be provided if the refused planning permissions had been granted in line with questions 1 and 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 247</p> <p>2004-05 244</p> <p>2005-06 254</p> <p>2006-07 193</p> <p>2007-08 335</p>
<p>6. What is the total number of dwellings provided through planning permissions in each of the last five years?</p>	<p>Total dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 262</p> <p>2004-05 401</p> <p>2005-06 426</p> <p>2006-07 270</p> <p>2007-08 249</p>

7. How are applications for each of the categories above considered by the authority? Do any specific policies exist?

They make an important contribution to the housing supply (76%) but there is local concern about perceived over-development.

There are no specific policies but we have developed Local Area Design Statements for areas under particular pressure, which have been adopted as supplementary planning documents.

8. Have you identified gardens (either individually or through the identification of a broad location) through the plan led system, for future development?

Not through Local Plan/DPD allocations, but some gardens and 'broad locations' are identified in the draft SHLAA.

9. Please declare if development on gardens is, or is not, an issue for your authority and why? **If it is not an issue, and your authority is happy to declare this and why** (which could be a combination of the answers to questions 7 and 8 above), then you do not need to provide answers for questions 1-6 (although it would of course still be beneficial to have data from as many authorities as possible).

It is a controversial issue but also an important source of housing supply which may enable less Greenfield land to be released. The main concern is for development to be sensitive to its surroundings and to ensure that a proper allowance can be made for such 'windfall' developments in the future.

10. Do you have any other comments?

The figures used for questions 1 – 6 are net gain and includes all sites and not just the small sites as stated in question 1 as Hampshire County Council have clarified that this is what is required.

Every effort has been made to only include developments within existing curtilages, however as this is not recorded on the Development Control system, the information is not readily available and several hundred applications have had to be searched manually.

Several applicants which have been refused have subsequently been granted permission, so there is an element of double counting in the figures.

Local Authority	Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	
<p>1. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused by the authority (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04 63 sites</p> <p>2004-05 63 sites</p> <p>2005-06 34 sites</p> <p>2006-07 18 sites</p> <p>2007-08 22 sites</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04 26 sites</p> <p>2004-05 42 sites</p> <p>2005-06 43 sites</p> <p>2006-07 13 sites</p> <p>2007-08 17 sites</p>
<p>2. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 1 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 117 dwellings</p> <p>2004-05 117 dwellings</p> <p>2005-06 55 dwellings</p> <p>2006-07 44 dwellings</p> <p>2007-08 29 dwellings</p>	

<p>3. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04 3 sites</p> <p>2004-05 4 sites</p> <p>2005-06 5 sites</p> <p>2006-07 8 sites</p> <p>2007-08 9 sites</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04 5 sites</p> <p>2004-05 17 sites</p> <p>2005-06 16 sites</p> <p>2006-07 17 sites</p> <p>2007-08 7 sites</p>
<p>4. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 16 dwellings</p> <p>2004-05 12 dwellings</p> <p>2005-06 17 dwellings</p> <p>2006-07 19 dwellings</p> <p>2007-08 23 dwellings</p>	
<p>5. How many net additional dwellings would be provided if the refused planning permissions had been granted in line with questions 1 and 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings (refused + dismissed)</p> <p>2003-04 52 + 8 = 60 dwellings</p> <p>2004-05 69 + 47 = 116 dwellings</p> <p>2005-06 73 + 30 = 103 dwellings</p> <p>2006-07 38 + 54 = 92 dwellings</p> <p>2007-08 24 + 22 = 46 dwellings</p>	

6. What is the total number of dwellings provided through planning permissions in each of the last five years?

Total dwellings

2003-04 608 dwellings

2004-05 838 dwellings

2005-06 368 dwellings

2006-07 314 dwellings

2007-08 283 dwellings

7. How are applications for each of the categories above considered by the authority? Do any specific policies exist?

Applications for development on garden land, or part redevelopment where an existing dwelling is being proposed for demolition/replacement, will be considered according to the location, context within adjacent residential areas, access and overall impact on the local area ie. normal development control considerations. Any particular constraints, such as flooding, loss of important green space, ecological impacts (SSSSIs, SPAs etc) will be dealt with according to existing relevant planning policies.

A number of saved policies are of relevance within the RBWM Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations) (Adopted 2003):

Residential Character: Policy H11 protects against schemes which introduce a scale or density which would be incompatible with or cause damage to the character and amenity of the area. Garden land would not be excluded. This is perhaps the key policy directly relevant to the development of such land where intensification/inappropriate use of curtilage land could lead to refusal.

Affordable Housing: Policy H3 refers to affordable housing within urban areas. On sites over 0.5 HA or proposing 15 or more dwellings, suitable schemes may be acceptable and could in theory include garden land. Likewise, Policy H4 (Affordable Housing within Rural Areas) does not discount against garden land, the provisos relating to affordable housing within the recognised settlements of the Green Belt; proven need; development size limits and having no other conflict with other Plan policies.

Green Belt: Policies GB1 lists acceptable development in the Green Belt. Residential development is acceptable only in accordance with other Green Belt Policies GB3-5. Policy GB2 refs to unacceptable development in the Green Belt (in relation to impact on openness and purposes of the Green Belt and harm to the character of the countryside. Only proposals for a new dwelling which relate to the creation of a subordinate dwelling, could in theory, under the terms of Policy GB3 be permitted in the Green Belt on 'garden land' (through the conversion of an existing building) subject to meeting other policy requirements in the Plan, including GB1 and GB2. The other means by which garden land could possibly be built on in the Green Belt is where the proposal relates to the infilling within the boundaries of a recognised settlement (however this has been very rare). Policy GB4 of the Plan refers to extensions to existing dwellings in the Green Belt while Policy GB5 protects the Green Belt from proposals to extend private gardens into non-residential land.

8. Have you identified gardens (either individually or through the identification of a broad location) through the plan led system, for future development?

Yes, some garden areas have been identified as part of the site identification work undertaken for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The work of the SHLAA will be developed further and the next stage will involve the identification of the housing potential of broad locations within the developed parts of the Borough. The SHLAA study will be updated on an annual basis to take account of changes both in site availability together with new sites that have come into scope.

9. Please declare if development on gardens is, or is not, an issue for your authority and why? **If it is not an issue, and your authority is happy to declare this and why** (which could be a combination of the answers to questions 7 and 8 above), then you do not need to provide answers for questions 1-6 (although it would of course still be beneficial to have data from as many authorities as possible).

Development on garden land is an important issue in the Borough. Whilst infill development on urban land and PDL will continue to be an important part of the Borough's land supply, this has to be conditioned with the need to protect the quality of the urban environment through controls on harmful infill through poor design, excessive densities, or other unacceptable impacts through more intensive development. We have recently been carrying out a detailed townscape study which is due for completion shortly, and which will inform any future detailed policy towards the development of garden land.

The Royal Borough is 83% Green Belt, and the residents of the Borough have shown that they value the protection of the countryside and Green Belt setting. However, there are important choices to be made which the Council is exploring through its work on the Local Development Framework. To some extent the pressures on garden land may be eased through other land allocations, but they will not go away. It will always be attractive for developers to develop small infill sites which are easy to develop and do not carry with them the high costs of new infrastructure associated with greenfield sites. Therefore it will be important for the Council to be able to control unacceptable infill and for this to be supported where applications go to appeal.

The Council is particularly aware of local residents concerns regarding the loss of garden land in urban areas, a concern which was brought about through a series of redevelopment proposals where houses in spacious grounds were being replaced by apartments resulting in the loss of garden space, not only through enlarged buildings, but also through the accommodation of hard standings/parking areas. The Council's administration have a manifesto pledge to address these concerns and prevent the inappropriate development of garden land. Until the Local Development Framework is in place decisions can only be guided by the existing policies, however, the Council is well placed in terms of its five year housing land supply. This in conjunction with ongoing work to identify land requirements over the longer term should provide the context for short term decisions which may prejudice the eventual approach towards spatial growth within the Borough. The Council would particularly welcome the government's support in preventing the wholesale loss of green spaces within built areas.

10. Do you have any other comments?

This survey is only measuring developments on garden land of less than 10 gross dwellings, but a significant percentage of garden land development within our Borough falls within the 10-14 dwellings. Had the survey not specified an upper limit on dwellings, the return would have been as shown below:

<p>1. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused by the authority (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04 68 sites not 63</p> <p>2004-05 76 sites not 63</p> <p>2005-06 36 sites not 34</p> <p>2006-07 22 sites not 18</p> <p>2007-08 24 sites not 22</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04 29 sites not 26</p> <p>2004-05 51 sites not 42</p> <p>2005-06 60 sites not 43</p> <p>2006-07 13 sites as before</p> <p>2007-08 18 sites not 17</p>
<p>2. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 1 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 166 dwellings not 117</p> <p>2004-05 263 dwellings not 117</p> <p>2005-06 77 dwellings not 55</p> <p>2006-07 89 dwellings not 44</p> <p>2007-08 50 dwellings not 29</p>	
<p>3. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04 4 sites not 3</p> <p>2004-05 15 sites not 4</p> <p>2005-06 9 sites not 5</p> <p>2006-07 13 sites not 8</p> <p>2007-08 12 sites not 9</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04 6 sites not 5</p> <p>2004-05 21 sites not 17</p> <p>2005-06 22 sites not 16</p> <p>2006-07 24 sites not 17</p> <p>2007-08 7 sites as before</p>

<p>4. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 27 dwellings not 16</p> <p>2004-05 146 dwellings not 12</p> <p>2005-06 90 dwellings not 17</p> <p>2006-07 72 dwellings not 19</p> <p>2007-08 79 dwellings not 23</p>
<p>5. How many net additional dwellings would be provided if the refused planning permissions had been granted in line with questions 1 and 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings (refused + dismissed)</p> <p>2003-04 $98 + 18 = 116$ dwellings not 60</p> <p>2004-05 $164 + 89 = 253$ dwellings not 116</p> <p>2005-06 $298 + 102 = 400$ dwellings not 103</p> <p>2006-07 $38 + 137 = 175$ dwellings not 92</p> <p>2007-08 $37 + 22 = 59$ dwellings not 46</p>
<p>6. What is the total number of dwellings provided through planning permissions in each of the last five years?</p>	<p>Total dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 608 dwellings</p> <p>2004-05 838 dwellings</p> <p>2005-06 368 dwellings</p> <p>2006-07 314 dwellings</p> <p>2007-08 283 dwellings</p>

Local Authority	Woking Borough Council
------------------------	------------------------

<p>1. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused by the authority (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04 - 16</p> <p>2004-05 - 29</p> <p>2005-06 - 16</p> <p>2006-07 - 36</p> <p>2007-08 - 29</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04 - 16</p> <p>2004-05 - 12</p> <p>2005-06 - 17</p> <p>2006-07 - 19</p> <p>2007-08 - 23</p>
<p>2. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 1 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 - 61</p> <p>2004-05 - 102</p> <p>2005-06 - 66</p> <p>2006-07 - 171</p> <p>2007-08 - 96</p>	
<p>3. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04 - 3</p> <p>2004-05 - 1</p> <p>2005-06 - 3</p> <p>2006-07 - 2</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04 - 4</p> <p>2004-05 - 6</p> <p>2005-06 - 5</p> <p>2006-07 - 4</p>

curtilage.	2007-08 - 8	2007-08 - 4
<p>4. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 - 9</p> <p>2004-05 - 3</p> <p>2005-06 - 3</p> <p>2006-07 - 8</p> <p>2007-08 - 11</p>	
<p>5. How many net additional dwellings would be provided if the refused planning permissions had been granted in line with questions 1 and 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 - 63</p> <p>2004-05 - 45</p> <p>2005-06 - 90</p> <p>2006-07 - 61</p> <p>2007-08 - 142</p>	
<p>6. What is the total number of dwellings provided through planning permissions in each of the last five years?</p>	<p>Total dwellings</p> <p>Total Permitted – net)</p> <p>2003-04 - 640</p> <p>2004-05 - 536</p> <p>2005-06 - 350</p> <p>2006-07 - 1310</p> <p>2007-08 – 1011</p> <p>Total Completed (net)</p> <p>2003-04 - 349</p> <p>2004-05 - 279</p> <p>2005-06 - 636</p> <p>2006-07 - 470</p> <p>2007-08 – 320</p>	

7. How are applications for each of the categories above considered by the authority? Do any specific policies exist?

The Woking Borough Local Plan 1999 contains policy HSG22 which states:

HSG22 • Plot Subdivision - Infilling and Backland Development

The sub-division of existing housing plots to provide either infill development along a frontage or rear garden development will be permitted where all the following criteria are met:

- (i) The existing and proposed building plots are of a sufficient dimension to meet the criteria set out in policy HSG19
- (ii) The proposed layout and spacing of dwellings reflects the prevailing pattern of housing development in the area and does not result in any tandem form of layout or loss of privacy to surrounding residential amenity land; (see also policy HSG 21)
- (iii) Any access road into the proposed development does not create an unacceptable disruption to the character and appearance of the existing road frontage;
- (iv) Any access road or parking area is sufficiently separated or screened from existing residential development so as not to adversely affect these properties through noise or visual intrusion;
- (v) The development does not prejudice the opportunity to develop adjoining land with similar potential.

JUSTIFICATION

6.94 Infilling and backland development may be a useful source of land for additional housing supply but will not necessarily be considered favourably. Through successive developments the character of an area can be radically altered and may eventually result in cramped forms of development which greatly reduce the outlook and landscape amenity currently afforded to existing dwellings. The insertion of narrow or awkward access drives to serve land to the rear can greatly disrupt a street scene or affect adjoining properties through the noise or visual intrusion of traffic movements.

6.95 Where there is sufficient land to provide development to the rear of properties care should be taken in the design and layout to avoid any overlooking of existing properties or their gardens. Small groups of buildings which form informal culs-de-sac with a sense of place may provide an acceptable solution. "Tandem" development, involving the placing of one dwelling immediately behind another, will not be acceptable.

8. Have you identified gardens (either individually or through the identification of a broad location) through the plan led system, for future development?

No land of this type was identified in the Local Plan 1999 however garden land already in the public consciousness (through previous planning applications, etc) has been included in the draft SHLAA. We have not included or targeted back gardens as a significant potential source of housing land.

9. Please declare if development on gardens is, or is not, an issue for your authority and why? **If it is not an issue, and your authority is happy to declare this and why** (which could be a combination of the answers to questions 7 and 8 above), then you do not need to provide answers for questions 1-6 (although it would of course still be beneficial to have data from as many authorities as possible).

Woking Borough is 60% Green Belt and also constrained by SPA, flood zones, etc. Being located in the South East, there is a lot of pressure for housing development and limited space so development on gardens are seen as a potential source of housing land by developers. This is an issue for Woking Borough Council as this type of development is unpopular with Residents' Associations and Members.

10. Do you have any other comments?

Without water-tight definitions it is very difficult to complete this survey. I have included ALL possible permissions granted in this, including (for example):

2006/1243

Demolition 1 house + 5 flats and erection of 2 buildings comprising 23 2-bed apartments

2005/0998

Demolition of existing dwellings and erection 23 flats.

Therefore the numbers may be over-stated. As you have not defined exactly what you mean by "regeneration or renewal schemes" it is difficult to know what to include and what to exclude. All permissions have been included where the previous land use was residential with the exception of conversions. In some cases where one large dwelling has been demolished and replaced a block of flats however we do not monitor if the footprint of the new buildings is greater than that of the original dwelling.

Local Authority	Wokingham Borough Council
------------------------	---------------------------

Please note that the data for **planning permissions granted (by the authority and on appeal)** is based solely on new permissions granted during the specific monitoring year (1 April to 31 March). This is to avoid double counting i.e with revised applications that supersede previous permissions.

1. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many new planning permissions were granted or refused by the authority (on all sites), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.	Granted	Refused
	2003-04 44	2003-04 75
	2004-05 55	2004-05 92
	2005-06 40	2005-06 133
	2006-07 22	2006-07 125
2. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted (on all sites) in Question 1 above?	Net additional dwellings	
	2003-04 124	
	2004-05 210	
	2005-06 124	
	2006-07 98	
3. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (on all sites), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.	Granted	Refused
	2003-04 11	2003-04 25
	2004-05 4	2004-05 22
	2005-06 12	2005-06 29
	2006-07 12	2006-07 39
	2007-08 14	2007-08 40

<p>4. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted (on all sites) in Question 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 109</p> <p>2004-05 24</p> <p>2005-06 84</p> <p>2006-07 86</p> <p>2007-08 130</p>
<p>5. How many net additional dwellings would be provided if the refused planning permissions had been granted in line with questions 1 and 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 545</p> <p>2004-05 616</p> <p>2005-06 995</p> <p>2006-07 879</p> <p>2007-08 766</p>
<p>6. What is the total number of dwellings provided through new planning permissions on all sites (not just development on garden land) in each of the last five years?</p>	<p>Total net dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 1344</p> <p>2004-05 720</p> <p>2005-06 698</p> <p>2006-07 340</p> <p>2007-08 979</p>
<p>7. How are applications for each of the categories above considered by the authority? Do any specific policies exist?</p> <p>WOKINGHAM DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN</p> <p>On the 25th September 2007, the Council received the response from the Secretary of State to its request to save the Wokingham District Local Plan (WDLP) policies. All policies that the Council outlined to be saved in the report that went to the Council's Executive on 25 January 2007 were granted by the Secretary of State. The policies that were not saved officially expired on Thursday 27 September 2007.</p> <p>This WDLP can be viewed on the Council's website at:</p> <p>http://www2.wokingham.gov.uk/environment/planning/localplan</p>	

The following policies have been saved and are relevant to assessing housing development on garden land:

Housing Development in and/or adjoining identified settlements

Policy WOS2 (Housing Development Principles) of the adopted WDLP (March 2004) states:

When determining new housing development proposals a sequential approach will be applied whereby:

- A) Previously developed land and buildings within the boundaries of Category A Settlements (those that possess a range of services, facilities and public transport opportunities) will be developed first.
- B) Secondly, land and buildings on the edge of Category A Settlements that are served by good public transport corridors will be considered.
- C) Lastly, development proposals for land and buildings in Category B Settlements (those that possess a lower range of services) will only consist of very limited infilling and small windfall development.

The Council also refer to Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing). Policy WOS2 amplifies and is in general conformity with the Government approach to locating development in the most sustainable locations (PPS3, paragraph 38).

Housing development in designated countryside

Policy WCC1 category (G) (Development in the Countryside) of the adopted WDLP states that 'it may be acceptable for the sensitive infilling of one or two dwellings in a small gap in an otherwise built up frontage.'

WOKINGHAM BOROUGH SUBMISSION CORE STRATEGY

The Council submitted its Core Strategy to the Secretary of State on 20 August 2008. Between 17 March and 30 April 2009 there were 15 separate Hearing Sessions to examine the Core Strategy. The Inspector has indicated that his report should be published in September/ October 2009. If found sound by the Inspector, the meeting of the Executive on 29 October 2009 could recommend to Council to adopt the Core Strategy. This would then mean that the Core Strategy could be adopted at the meeting of Council on 10 November 2009.

The Wokingham Borough Submission Core Strategy can be viewed on the Council's website at:

<http://www2.wokingham.gov.uk/environment/planning/ldf/core-strategy/core-strategy-consultation>

The Submission Core Strategy has a similar approach to that of the WDLP in that development will be concentrated in those towns and villages that either have a significant range of infrastructure including facilities and services now or will have them as a result of the development proposed. The adopted South East Plan indicates that Wokingham Borough has to deliver 12,460 dwellings in the period 2006 to 2026. The housing targets for the borough, as indicated in Policy CP18 (Housing delivery) of the Submission Core Strategy, are based on achieving the overall requirements of the South East Plan target along with the backlog against the requirements of the Berkshire Structure Plan (772 dwellings) at April 2006. The bulk of the housing target (10,000 units) will be delivered through four separate Strategic Developments Locations (SDL):

Policy CP19 – Arborfield Garrison SDL (3,500 dwellings)

Policy CP20 – South of the M4 SDL (2,500 dwellings)

Policy CP21 – North Wokingham SDL (1,500 dwellings)

Policy CP22 – South Wokingham SDL (2,500 dwellings)

The subsequent Site Allocations and Development Management DPD will allocate sites for an additional 1,000 dwellings (and reserve sites for 500 dwellings) across the Borough. Between 1 April 2006 to 31 March 2008, there have already been 1,506 dwelling completions in the Borough.

The approach of the Core Strategy makes no allowance for windfalls or development on unidentified sites (as indicated in the figures highlighted in Policy CP18). This is in line with paragraph 59 of PPS3 (Housing) which states that allowances for windfalls should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply. The Council is committed to allocating housing sites to fulfil the housing target.

However, the Council recognises that speculative planning applications will still be submitted to the Council. These will be assessed on their own merits against existing policy and guidance at that specific time, in particular on design. Development on garden land will need to have specific emphasis on design and must respect the character, ensure the sense of place is retained and be of high quality. These development proposals will also need to proportionately contribute to affordable housing and infrastructure (including services and facilities) – **see also the Council’s response to Question 10**. The Submission Core Strategy provides guidance on infill development.

Paragraph 3.7 states:

“... Infill development will be rigorously assessed against national and local policies on compatibility with the character of the area and the need for development to be of high quality”

Paragraph 3.20 states:

“...Within the existing settlements, the main opportunities for development are likely to come from previously developed sites, particularly in residential use. Proposals on such sites will need to accord with the overall vision including respecting the character and ensuring that a sense of place is retained.”

Policy CP9 (Scale and location of development proposals) of the Core Strategy will supersede Policy WOS2 of the WDLP. Policy CP9 requires the scale of development proposals must reflect the existing or proposed levels of facilities and services at or in the location, together with their accessibility.

Policy CP11 (Proposals outside Development Limits (including countryside)) of the Core Strategy will supersede Policy WCC1 of the WDLP. Policy CP11 does not include reference to infilling of one or two dwellings in a small gap in an otherwise built up frontage. The approach of Policy CP11 is consistent with PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas).

WOKINGHAM BOROUGH DESIGN GUIDE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) (adopted July 2007)

Council policy is to protect the character of the existing urban areas. The Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD provides guidance on infill and backland development schemes. Section 1.1.1 states that:

“Infill and backland development is often implemented on a site by site basis. The cumulative impact of this, over time, can lead to the breakdown of the streetscene and the loss of character in an area. To avoid this, a more comprehensive approach should be taken that will result in a positive addition to the urban structure through the addition of a new street, preferably a new through route.

Where a connecting street cannot be created, and where the character of the area will not be harmed, a discreet backland scheme may be acceptable.”

8. Have you identified gardens (either individually or through the identification of a broad location) through the plan led system, for future development?

No, The approach of the Core Strategy makes no allowance for windfalls or development on unidentified sites (as indicated in Policy CP18). This is inline with paragraph 59 of PPS3. The Council is committed to allocating housing sites via the Local Development Framework to fulfil the housing target.

LOCAL PLAN SURVEY (LPS) 1 – REVIEWING SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES OF THE WDLP

In October 2005, the Council's Executive agreed the final approach for reviewing the settlement boundaries in Wokingham Borough. In summary, one of the key elements of the approach is to try to restrict back garden development (where they are on the existing edge of the settlement boundary) (see paragraph 4.10 of LPS1) by bringing in the settlement boundary closer to the back of the dwelling house (in particular for properties with large gardens) meaning that a greater proportion of the curtilage is within countryside and subject to more restrictive planning policy. It also looks at the density of properties and includes an approach for removing properties with low densities from the settlement boundary. The curtilage (i.e garden) of these properties could be suitable for housing development and by removing the property from the boundary will also mean that a potential proposal is subject to more restrictive countryside policy. These approaches will not be of use to properties that are **not** on the edge of existing settlement boundaries.

LPS1 and further information of the review of settlement boundaries can be viewed on the Council's website at:

<http://www2.wokingham.gov.uk/environment/planning/ldf/settlement-review>

The revised settlement boundaries (to be called development limits) will be revised through the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. Where appropriate, the development limit will also be revised to include allocated sites.

9. Please declare if development on gardens is, or is not, an issue for your authority and why? **If it is not an issue, and your authority is happy to declare this and why** (which could be a combination of the answers to questions 7 and 8 above), then you do not need to provide answers for questions 1-6 (although it would of course still be beneficial to have data from as many authorities as possible).

Yes. Development on gardens is a key issue for Wokingham Borough. Through the approach taken in the Submission Core Strategy, the Council has identified that it can deliver the South East Plan housing target together with the backlog against the requirements of the Berkshire Structure Plan through allocating sites.

The Council can therefore deliver the housing target with no reliance on speculative development proposals i.e development on garden land.

The settlement boundary review and the guidance in the Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD provides further evidence that development on garden land is an issue for the Borough.

10. Do you have any other comments?

Cumulative impact

Development on garden land occurs in an incremental way, mainly on small sites. A problem is the cumulative impact of these small sites and capturing the appropriate infrastructure. Cumulatively these schemes can put extra burden on local infrastructure such as schools and the highway network. Small schemes individually cannot indicate demand but can generate a need.

As stated in the Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD, the cumulative impact of this, over time, can lead to the breakdown of the streetscene and the loss of character in an area.

These schemes can impact on local biodiversity due to the potential loss of a variety of habitat and tree cover. Development on garden land can also result in the loss of private greenspace and also impact on local water pressure and the adequacy of local drainage. The planning system cannot easily address cumulative impacts of this kind in an incremental manner.

Planning Advice Note: Infrastructure Impact Mitigation Contributions to New Development (introduced in June 2006).

This advice note provides guidance on the triggers and contributions required to mitigate the impact of planning proposals in Wokingham Borough. The note explains what the Council will do when dealing with a planning application for new residential development in accordance with the approach set out in the WDLP.

This advice note is in two parts; the first explains the approach adopted by the Council and the financial contributions involved, the second sets out the justification for each contribution. This advice note was introduced in June 2006 and reviewed in February 2007 and July 2008.

The Council now seeks contributions **in relation to all new residential dwellings (net)**; though affordable housing will be dealt with as per Policy WH12 of the WDLP.

This Advice Note is in line with paragraph 35 of Circular 05/2005 (Planning Obligations) which indicates that standard charges and formulae applied to each development should reflect the actual impacts of the development or a proportionate contribution to an affordable housing element.

The Advice Note can be viewed on the Council's website at:

<http://www.wokingham.gov.uk/environment/planning/guidance/pre-application-advice-developer-contribution/>

Affordable Housing:

Many schemes for development on garden land are sufficiently small to fall below the threshold that triggers the requirement for affordable housing. There are several examples of planning applications for development on garden land that have been submitted to the Council for 14 dwellings. This is because Policy WH12 (Affordable Housing) requires schemes in large settlements and of 15 dwellings or more to provide 26% affordable housing. The Council's approach is inline with paragraph 29 of PPS3 which states that 'the national indicative minimum site size for affordable housing is 15 dwellings.'

Local Authority	Wycombe District Council		
<p>1. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused by the authority (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04 32</p> <p>2004-05 60</p> <p>2005-06 53</p> <p>2006-07 64</p> <p>2007-08 62</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04 8</p> <p>2004-05 18</p> <p>2005-06 15</p> <p>2006-07 21</p> <p>2007-08 29</p>	
<p>2. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 1 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 101</p> <p>2004-05 203</p> <p>2005-06 200</p> <p>2006-07 201</p> <p>2007-08 312</p>		
<p>3. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	<p>Granted</p> <p>2003-04 2</p> <p>2004-05 5</p> <p>2005-06 6</p> <p>2006-07 7</p> <p>2007-08 11</p>	<p>Refused</p> <p>2003-04 7</p> <p>2004-05 12</p> <p>2005-06 9</p> <p>2006-07 10</p> <p>2007-08 16</p>	

<p>4. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 6</p> <p>2004-05 11</p> <p>2005-06 31</p> <p>2006-07 49</p> <p>2007-08 34</p>
<p>5. How many net additional dwellings would be provided if the refused planning permissions had been granted in line with questions 1 and 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 45</p> <p>2004-05 56</p> <p>2005-06 70</p> <p>2006-07 173</p> <p>2007-08 193</p>
<p>6. What is the total number of dwellings provided through planning permissions in each of the last five years?</p>	<p>Total dwellings</p> <p>2003-04 789</p> <p>2004-05 480</p> <p>2005-06 1,068</p> <p>2006-07 626</p> <p>2007-08 1,439</p>

7. How are applications for each of the categories above considered by the authority? Do any specific policies exist?

There are specific policies in a range of Council-approved documents which inform the determination of applications for development of back gardens. In particular:

- policies in the Wycombe Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted July 2008), in particular on securing quality new development.
- saved policies in the Wycombe District Local Plan to 2011 on design issues and securing quality, which are supported by design appendices to the Local Plan, including specific guidance on residential design. This includes guidance, for instance, on backland development.
- The Council published specific guidance on Residential Intensification as a supplementary planning document in 2005. This includes a step by step approach to considering residential intensification proposals. It is referred to specifically as an example of a “positive and planned approach” to intensification in the South East Plan (see para 12.7, page 155).
- Our emerging Delivery and Site Allocations DPD also includes a policy on the principle of housing development and quality issues.

Applications are considered (and appropriate pre-application discussions are undertaken) by the case officer and advice is also sought from specialist (in-house) urban designers in some instances, to ensure that appropriate schemes are to the highest standard of design.

8. Have you identified gardens (either individually or through the identification of a broad location) through the plan led system, for future development?

Some residential intensification sites involving gardens are identified in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (March 2009), but only where we have some indication that the site may come forward (eg due to developer/landowner interest). These are not carried forward as draft site allocations as there is an enabling policy in our emerging Delivery and Site Allocations document that facilitates such proposals of the right quality without the need for an allocation.

Our previous Urban Capacity Study (2005) included a broader assessment of potential for residential intensification but this has not been carried forward at present, but may be reviewed in the future if needed.

9. Please declare if development on gardens is, or is not, an issue for your authority and why? **If it is not an issue, and your authority is happy to declare this and why** (which could be a combination of the answers to questions 7 and 8 above), then you do not need to provide answers for questions 1-6 (although it would of course still be beneficial to have data from as many authorities as possible).

It is an issue for the authority. A significant element of our housing supply has come from these types of sites in recent years and there have been concerns from those living in areas where intensification has occurred about its impact on the character of the area. That is why we have specifically prepared planning guidance on the issue and why we use specialist urban design advice where appropriate to ensure schemes are of high quality.

10. Do you have any other comments?

Some of the questions seeking data in this questionnaire were unclear as to exactly what was being sought. We attempted to seek clarification on these issues but did not receive full clarification. As a result we have attached a breakdown (see below) of the figures we have supplied and set out the assumptions that we have used.

Assumptions:

Residential intensification - Backland is defined as land within residential curtilages which is developed for new dwellings without demolishing the existing dwelling(s).

Residential intensification – Redevelopment is defined as residential curtilages which are redeveloped after the demolition of existing dwellings.

It was not clear whether developments on both these types of sites were required so the table below separates the data. If only backland data is required, please use the figures in the “backland” columns.

The table above adds both types of residential intensification (using data in bold type in the table below).

All sites with planning applications that have been superseded by subsequent applications have been deleted. Only the most recent application has been counted. This includes sites with subsequent applications made since 1st April 2008.

It has been assumed that question 6 refers to the number of dwellings **granted** planning permission in each year and not subsequently superseded, not the number of dwellings **provided** (i.e. built) that year. Information about the number completed each year is available in our Annual Monitoring Report with further details in Development Trends.

Housing Developments in Gardens

	granted			refused		
	backland	Redevelopment	all residential intensification	backland	Redevelopment	all residential intensification

Question 1

2003-04	21	11	32	6	2	8
2004-05	39	21	60	15	3	18
2005-06	31	22	53	10	5	15
2006-07	33	31	64	13	8	21
2007-08	45	17	62	21	8	29

Question 2

2003-04	35	66	101
2004-05	81	122	203
2005-06	106	94	200
2006-07	80	121	201
2007-08	155	157	312

Question 3

2003-04	1	1	2	7	0	7
2004-05	1	4	5	11	1	12
2005-06	3	3	6	7	2	9
2006-07	5	2	7	4	6	10
2007-08	6	5	11	10	6	16

Question 4

2003-04	1	5	6
2004-05	2	9	11
2005-06	7	24	31
2006-07	26	23	49
2007-08	16	18	34

Question 5

2003-04	37	8	45
2004-05	48	8	56
2005-06	24	46	70
2006-07	48	125	173
2007-08	72	121	193

Question 6

	residential intensification		other permissions	total permissions
	permissions	appeals		
2003-04	101	6	682	789
2004-05	203	11	266	480
2005-06	200	31	837	1,068
2006-07	201	49	376	626
2007-08	312	34	1,093	1,439

Local Authority	Wyre Borough Council
------------------------	----------------------

1. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused by the authority for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.	Granted		Refused	
	2003-04	25	2003-04	15
	2004-05	13	2004-05	8
	2005-06	13	2005-06	8
	2006-07	22	2006-07	8
	2007-08	23	2007-08	4
2. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 1 above?	Net additional dwellings			
	2003-04	67		
	2004-05	118		
	2005-06	37		
	2006-07	41		
	2007-08	65		
3. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate, for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.	Granted		Refused	
	2003-04	3	2003-04	5
	2004-05	0	2004-05	4
	2005-06	1	2005-06	1
	2006-07	0	2006-07	1
	2007-08	0	2007-08	3

<p>4. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <table> <tr> <td>2003-04</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004-05</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-06</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006-07</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007-08</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table>	2003-04	4	2004-05	0	2005-06	1	2006-07	0	2007-08	0
2003-04	4										
2004-05	0										
2005-06	1										
2006-07	0										
2007-08	0										
<p>5. How many net additional dwellings would be provided if the refused planning permissions had been granted in line with questions 1 and 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <table> <tr> <td>2003-04</td> <td>39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004-05</td> <td>33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-06</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006-07</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007-08</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </table>	2003-04	39	2004-05	33	2005-06	18	2006-07	23	2007-08	42
2003-04	39										
2004-05	33										
2005-06	18										
2006-07	23										
2007-08	42										
<p>6. What is the total number of dwellings provided through planning permissions in each of the last five years?</p>	<p>Total dwellings</p> <table> <tr> <td>2003-04</td> <td>71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004-05</td> <td>118</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-06</td> <td>38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006-07</td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007-08</td> <td>65</td> </tr> </table>	2003-04	71	2004-05	118	2005-06	38	2006-07	41	2007-08	65
2003-04	71										
2004-05	118										
2005-06	38										
2006-07	41										
2007-08	65										

7. How are applications for each of the categories above considered by the authority? Do any specific policies exist?

Each application is considered on its own merits and is considered against the (now saved) policies of the adopted Wyre Borough Local Plan

The relevant policies are:

SP14 – Standards of Design and Amenity

This deals with issues including compatibility with adjacent land uses, scale, massing, style, siting, use of materials, car parking, access, traffic generation, landscaping, crime reduction

ENV7 – Trees on Development Sites (where relevant)

ENV9 – Conservation Areas (where relevant)

ENV13 – Development and Flood Risk

Also SPG 4 – Spacing Guidance for New Housing Layouts

8. Have you identified gardens (either individually or through the identification of a broad location) through the plan led system, for future development?

Whilst there are a number of garden areas identified in the draft SHLAA there is no intention to identify specific sites as allocations.

9. Please declare if development on gardens is, or is not, an issue for your authority and why? **If it is not an issue, and your authority is happy to declare this and why** (which could be a combination of the answers to questions 7 and 8 above), then you do not need to provide answers for questions 1-6 (although it would of course still be beneficial to have data from as many authorities as possible).

It is an issue in that the redevelopment of small sites occupied by a single (or sometimes two) dwellings for multiple dwellings or flats is a common form of application which the council has been experiencing for a few years. Concern is raised by the public and by members of the council's Planning Committee, particularly in respect of the loss of garden land and many members find it difficult to comprehend that such development comprises 'brownfield' development particularly where the original extent of actual built development on site, (the original dwelling) is small in relation to the amount of generally undeveloped garden land.

Members have refused such schemes in the past on issues such as scale, only for appeals to be upheld.

10. Do you have any other comments?

No

Local Authority	WYRE FOREST DISTRICT
------------------------	-----------------------------

<p>1. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused by the authority (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	Granted		Refused	
	2003-04	29	2003-04	20
	2004-05	23	2004-05	13
	2005-06	19	2005-06	26
	2006-07	25	2006-07	15
	2007-08	20	2007-08	23
<p>2. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 1 above?</p>	Net additional dwellings			
	2003-04	45		
	2004-05	36		
	2005-06	30		
	2006-07	45		
	2007-08	58		
<p>3. Over the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2008 - how many planning permissions were granted or refused on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings), for housing development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling house – but only where these applications have, will, or could have, resulted in a net increase in dwellings within the existing curtilage.</p>	Granted		Refused	
	2003-04	0	2003-04	7
	2004-05	1	2004-05	3
	2005-06	2	2005-06	6
	2006-07	4	2006-07	6
	2007-08	0	2007-08	5

<p>4. How many net additional dwellings would be provided through the planning permissions granted in Question 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <table> <tr> <td>2003-04</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004-05</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-06</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006-07</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007-08</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table>	2003-04	0	2004-05	1	2005-06	6	2006-07	9	2007-08	0
2003-04	0										
2004-05	1										
2005-06	6										
2006-07	9										
2007-08	0										
<p>5. How many net additional dwellings would be provided if the refused planning permissions had been granted in line with questions 1 and 3 above?</p>	<p>Net additional dwellings</p> <table> <tr> <td>2003-04</td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004-05</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-06</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006-07</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007-08</td> <td>41</td> </tr> </table>	2003-04	67	2004-05	28	2005-06	53	2006-07	30	2007-08	41
2003-04	67										
2004-05	28										
2005-06	53										
2006-07	30										
2007-08	41										
<p>6. What is the total number of dwellings provided through planning permissions in each of the last five years?</p>	<p>Total dwellings</p> <table> <tr> <td>2003-04</td> <td>395</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004-05</td> <td>141</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-06</td> <td>348</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006-07</td> <td>308</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007-08</td> <td>500</td> </tr> </table>	2003-04	395	2004-05	141	2005-06	348	2006-07	308	2007-08	500
2003-04	395										
2004-05	141										
2005-06	348										
2006-07	308										
2007-08	500										

7. How are applications for each of the categories above considered by the authority? Do any specific policies exist?

Saved Local Plan Policy – H.6 Backland Development. States that within residential areas, proposals for backland development will only be permitted where there is no significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring property; where there would be no significant impact on the character of the area and that the proposal would not constitute tandem development.

Saved Local Plan Policy D.3 – Local Distinctiveness – Development proposals must have regard to the local distinctiveness of the area and clearly relate to the appearance and character of the surrounding townscape and landscape to complement the surrounding buildings and spaces.

Adopted Design SPG – Residential Design Guide.

8. Have you identified gardens (either individually or through the identification of a broad location) through the plan led system, for future development?

- A number of sites have been looked at through the SHLAA, including 2 back garden sites which are known to have been assembled as potential housing sites by developers. It is possible that these 2 sites may be put forward as potential residential allocations in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD. Over recent years, a number of garden sites which are washed over as residential in the Local Plan have come forward as windfalls.

9. Please declare if development on gardens is, or is not, an issue for your authority and why? **If it is not an issue, and your authority is happy to declare this and why** (which could be a combination of the answers to questions 7 and 8 above), then you do not need to provide answers for questions 1-6 (although it would of course still be beneficial to have data from as many authorities as possible).

A number of responses were received on the LDF Core Strategy Consultation relating to the issue of garden development. The figures identify that although this is not a major issue for the District it has certainly become more prevalent in recent years. It is also a high profile issue for the District, particularly in the main towns of Kidderminster and Bewdley and this was recognised in a number of responses.

13% of current permissions (189 dwellings) at April 1st 2009 are on garden land. In Bewdley, almost a third of commitments are on garden land and in Kidderminster the figure is almost one fifth.

The constraints / limited dimensions of garden plots often leads to pressure for tandem / backland development which can have an adverse impact for urban design and residential amenity and can erode heritage settings.

10. Do you have any other comments?

Think that this is a key issue that should be considered through Strategic Core Strategy Policies relating to local distinctiveness.

There is also scope for a policy on Housing Mix and Density to relate to limiting garden development through Local Development Frameworks.

The definition of gardens as 'previously developed' in PPS3 seems at odds given that in many instances they have not had any form of development on them. Paradoxically, barn conversions are considered to be Greenfield.