

**DELEGATED**

**AGENDA NO**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**9 July 2014**

**REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR,  
DEVELOPMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD  
SERVICES**

**14/1167/FUL**

**5 Wasdale Drive, Egglecliffe, Stockton-On-Tees**

**Proposed single storey extension to side of existing bungalow (creation of additional bedroom in roof including installation of 6.no roof lights) and single storey dining room, garage and car port extension to side and rear (demolition of existing conservatory and garage)**

**Expiry Date : 4 July 2014**

#### **SUMMARY**

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey extension to the side and single storey dining room, garage and car port extension to side and rear (demolition of existing conservatory and garage) at No 5 Wasdale Drive, Egglecliffe, Stockton on Tees.

The application site is a semi-detached bungalow located within the cul de sac of Wasdale Drive and is not within the Egglecliffe Conservation Area. The property is adjoined by No 3 (west) with No's 10 and 12 to the front (south). Beyond the vehicular turning head and public footpath that runs past the eastern boundary of the site are properties along Honister Walk. To the rear (north west) are No's 8 and 10 Uldale Drive.

The Head of Technical Services has raised no objections to the application in terms of highway and pedestrian safety and car parking.

6 objections have been received from neighbouring properties which are set out in the consultation section of the report but in summary include the proposed scheme being out of character with the existing bungalow and surrounding properties, over development of the site, an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and property devaluation.

Subject to the imposition of the relevant planning conditions which address the impacts of the development, the scheme is considered to accord with the general principles of the National Planning Policy Framework, saved Policy HO12 and the guidance within SPG2. The scheme as proposed is therefore not considered to have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the existing bungalow or street scene, or lead to an unacceptable loss of amenity or privacy for neighbouring land users. It is considered that the scheme will not have an adverse impact on highway safety.

The application is recommended for approval accordingly.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That planning application 14/1167/FUL be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives below;

01. *The development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the following approved plan(s);*

<i>Plan Reference Number</i>	<i>Date on Plan</i>
<i>02 REV A</i>	<i>9 June 2014</i>
<i>05 REV A</i>	<i>9 June 2014</i>
<i>06 REV A</i>	<i>9 June 2014</i>
<i>SBC0001</i>	<i>2 May 2014</i>
<i>01</i>	<i>2 May 2014</i>
<i>03</i>	<i>2 May 2014</i>
<i>08(A)</i>	<i>9 May 2014</i>

*Reason: To define the consent.*

**Conditions which will remain in perpetuity**

02. *The external finishing materials shall match with those of the existing building*

*Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory form of development*

03. *Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, a 2m high closed boarded fence shall be erected along the adjacent rear boundaries to both No 3 Wasdale Drive (west) and No 10 Uldale Drive (north) as indicated on plan 05 REV A (dated 9th June 2014) and stained a dark brown colour unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The fences shall remain for lifetime of the development hereby approved unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason; In the interests of the amenity of the neighbouring properties.*

**Conditions to be Implemented**

04. *The garage and car port extension to which the permission relates shall be used for the parking of private motor vehicles and ancillary storage, incidental to the enjoyment of the occupants of the dwellinghouse and no other purpose.*

*Reason : To ensure that the building is not used for a commercial or a self-contained residential use and to ensure that the adjoining residential properties are not adversely affected by the development.*

05. *Notwithstanding the submitted information, the 1no. roof light to be installed within the rear elevation (north) of the single storey side extension hereby approved (serving a bathroom) as indicated on plans 06 REV A (dated 9th June 2014) and 08(a) (dated 9th May 2014), shall be fixed and obscurely glazed using a minimum of type 4 opaque glass and shall remain for lifetime of the development hereby approved.*

*Reason: In the interests of the privacy and amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent neighbouring property.*

**Informative 1: National Planning Policy Framework**

*The Local Planning Authority has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.*

## **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

1. The application site is a semi-detached bungalow located within the cul de sac of Wasdale Drive, Eggescliffe, Stockton on Tees. The property is adjoined by No 3 (west) with No's 10 and 12 to the front (south). Beyond the vehicular turning head and public footpath that runs past the eastern boundary of the site are properties along Honister Walk (east). To the rear (north west) are No's 8 and 10 Uldale Drive.
2. The host bungalow is served by a detached, flat roof garage to the side/rear, adjacent to the public footpath. A single storey conservatory extension is present to the side of the property (east). A low fence encloses the rear garden of the site along the boundary to 10 Uldale Drive (north) and to No 3 Wasdale Drive (west).

## **PROPOSAL**

3. This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey extension to the side and single storey dining room, garage and car port extension to side and rear (demolition of existing conservatory and garage) at No 5 Wasdale Drive.
4. The proposed extension to the side would measure approximately 3.6m in width x 9.6m in length x 5.2m in height and would tie into the existing front and rear elevations and the roof height of the existing bungalow. This element would feature 1 window in the front elevation and a set of bi-folding doors in the rear elevation.
5. Following concerns regarding the impact of the original submitted scheme, the applicant has submitted revised plans which show the reduction in length of the proposed dining room, garage and car port extension to the side and rear and the provision of a hipped roof on the rear elevation of this (facing onto the boundary of No 10 Uldale Drive).
6. As a result of these revisions, the proposed dining room, car port and garage element to the side and rear would be set back approximately 6.5m from the front elevation of the bungalow and would measure approximately 7.1m in width x 8.2m in length x 4.7m in height with a dual pitched roof. This element would include a car port element in front of a garage. A single access door would be installed in the rear elevation. A set of bi-fold doors would be installed in the west/side elevation serving the dining room element of the proposed extension. The east elevation of the proposal would be set off the adjacent boundary to the footpath between approximately 0.5m – 1m.
7. The scheme also includes the provision of 3 roof lights in both the front and rear elevations - only the roof lights within the front and rear of the proposed side extension require planning permission and therefore only these elements will be considered as part of the application. The proposed loft conversion, which does not require planning permission, would create an additional bedroom (above the existing bungalow) and a bathroom (above the proposed side extension).
8. One first floor window is to be installed in the gable side elevation of the proposed side extension, which would serve the upper floor bathroom.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

9. The following Consultations were notified and any comments received are set out below:-

## **Head of Technical Services**

### Highways Comments

In accordance with SPD3: Parking Provision for Developments 2011, a 2 bedroom property should have 2 in curtilage car parking spaces. The proposed plan shows the required parking has been provided therefore no highway objections are raised.

### Landscape & Visual Comments

This proposal has no landscape or visual implications.

## **PUBLICITY**

10. Neighbours were notified and comments received are set out below :-

H M Robinson

6 Honister Walk Egglecliffe

I wish to place an objection to the planning application from Mr Peter Hamill for an extension to the bungalow at 5 Wasdale Drive. The grounds for objection are as follows:-

The proposed plans for an extension would not be in keeping with the surrounding properties and would affect the public right of way for the existing properties.

The site would be grossly over developed in relation to the existing floor area of the bungalow.

The size of the proposed extension would indicate that the owner may be intending to use part of the extension for other purposes other than residential.

The size elevation and position will devalue surrounding properties.

The original development was intended for retirement bungalows for the elderly

Mr and Mrs King

8 Uldale Drive Egglecliffe

1. The proposed development is out of all proportion to what is existing. At present you have four bungalows in two pairs, semi-detached. Each have small rear gardens, the proposal of an extension forming a dining room with a pitched roof along the boundary of 5 Wasdale will reduce out line of site and will, in my opinion, reduce the value of our property.

2. The plans appear to show that the present ground area of the present bungalow is doubled in size, with also the provision of a bedroom in the roof space, this is out of all proportion to the present arrangement, greatly overdeveloping a small site

3. The provision of roof lights in the proposed bedroom will affect the privacy of our bungalow and garden.

Mr B Hoggart

Honister Walk Egglecliffe

1. The ground floor area of the proposed extension is greater than that of the original property. In my opinion it is an over-development of the 5 Wasdale Drive site. It will devalue the existing properties including mine.

2. Viewed from the Honister Walk footpath and the footpath fronting numbers 5, 6, 7 and 8 Honister Walk the proposed side-elevation has the appearance of an industrial building.

3. The unbroken length of the original garage is at least doubled and made worse by the increased height created by the proposed pitched roof. It is not in keeping with the surrounding residential area.

3. If the front corner of the study (as titled on plan No A2-02) is as close to the curved public footpath as it appears then it could present a hazard to users of that path. I make this statement in view of the very many times that i have seen youngsters tearing round this path on bicycles. I have to think of a child's head smacking into that corner.

4. I do not think that enough time has been allowed for the proposal to be considered by those people that will be affected.

Mr David Kirkham  
14 Birchfield Drive Eaglescliffe

As previous the proposal is an overdevelopment of a very small existing single storey retirement bungalow. The revised plan still means the extended property will be twice the original. It's close proximity to the existing footpath creates a hazard and blind spot on the corner. None of the other properties in the row have had extensions which greatly reduce the rear garden space and impinge on the properties behind.

Sent on behalf of Mrs B Harrison [Mother in law], 10 Uldale Drive .  
Mrs Harrison is 92 and does not need this sort of hassle at her age and is the one most affected by this proposal.

Mrs B Harrison  
10 Uldale Drive Egglecliffe

- 1) The proposed development means the existing bungalow will be of nearly twice its current size, creating twice the footprint on an already small plot. A complete over development.
- 2) The plan gives no indication of how close to the rear boundary within Uldale Drive the development will come but seems to show it up against the existing fence and over-looking the rear of No 10 Uldale.
- 3) The creation of bedroom in the roof with roof lights again overlooking 10 Uldale is not in keeping with the other low level existing properties.
- 4) The length of the garage and side extension runs the whole width of the property and gives the appearance of a work-shop or industrial unit. Will there be any restrictions to the garage units use. The proposed pitched roof also increases the height of the side elevation significantly, again not in keeping with the surrounding bungalows.
- 5) There must be some rule in existing planning law as to how close you are allowed to impinge on existing properties.

Mrs B Fielding  
10 Wasdale Drive Egglecliffe  
Objection received.

## **PLANNING POLICY**

11. Where an adopted or approved development plan contains relevant policies, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that an application for planning permissions shall be determined in accordance with the Development Plan(s) for the area, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the relevant Development Plan is the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and saved policies of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan
12. Section 143 of the Localism Act came into force on the 15 Jan 2012 and requires the Local Planning Authority to take local finance considerations into account, this section s70(2) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended requires in dealing with such an application [planning application] the authority shall have regard to a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application and c) any other material considerations
13. The following planning policies are considered to be relevant to the consideration of this application:-

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 14. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking;

For decision-taking this means:

approving development proposals that accord with the development without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

-any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or -specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

### Core Strategy Policy 3 (CS3) - Sustainable Living and Climate Change

8. Additionally, in designing new development, proposals will:

\_ Make a positive contribution to the local area, by protecting and enhancing important environmental assets, biodiversity and geodiversity, responding positively to existing features of natural, historic, archaeological or local character, including hedges and trees, and including the provision of high quality public open space;

\_ Be designed with safety in mind, incorporating Secure by Design and Park Mark standards, as appropriate;

\_ Incorporate 'long life and loose fit' buildings, allowing buildings to be adaptable to changing needs. By 2013, all new homes will be built to Lifetime Homes Standards;

\_ Seek to safeguard the diverse cultural heritage of the Borough, including buildings, features, sites and areas of national importance and local significance. Opportunities will be taken to constructively and imaginatively incorporate heritage assets in redevelopment schemes, employing where appropriate contemporary design solutions.

### Saved Policy HO12 of the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan

Where planning permission is required, all extensions to dwellings should be in keeping with the property and the street scene in terms of style, proportion and materials and should avoid significant loss of privacy and amenity for the residents of neighbouring properties.

### Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2

#### 2 GUIDING PRINCIPLES.

2.5 Extensions must be designed so that they complement the main house for example through being smaller or set back. Often such designs are more successful in visual terms than large extensions built flush with the front of the house. This will obviously vary depending on the size and shape of the original house. However, in all cases it is necessary to leave a useable amount of private amenity space – approximately two thirds of the plot - and this may limit the size of the extension you can build. The garden space must be a useable shape too. If you really do need a large house it may be more advisable to buy a bigger house to start with rather than try to cram a huge house onto a small plot.

2.6 The shape of the extension will have a significant impact on the appearance, and it may be possible to have a very large extension that complements the house or a relatively small extension that is very obtrusive. Therefore the design is critical to ensure that it fits in with the street scene, but is not judged solely on the size of the footprint.

2.7 Any extension should be sited and designed to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties in terms of light, overlooking and overbearing. However it is the purpose of this guidance note to limit such impacts through good practice advice. It may be necessary to

adjust the dimensions of proposed extensions to compromise between additional space and good neighbourliness. Although every application is assessed on its own merits, the Local Planning Authority would normally seek a minimum separation distance of 21 metres between the windows of the main habitable rooms (for example bedrooms and living rooms) of the proposed extension that face windows of the main habitable rooms of the neighbouring property. Where a side extension would face the rear of the neighbouring property (or a rear extension would face the side of the neighbouring property) a gap of 11 metres is normally required between the windows of the main habitable rooms to prevent overlooking. These standards may be reduced if obscured glazing is used or where the windows are those of secondary rooms (for example bathrooms, hallways and landings).

#### 5 SIDE EXTENSION.

5.1 A side extension will be the one that needs a particularly high standard of design, as it will be visible to everyone who passes by. If you get it right here then the value of your home will rise, but if you get it wrong it could reduce the value of the whole street

5.2 Normally a gap of at least 1 metre is required between the outside wall of the extension and the boundary of your plot to avoid creating a terracing effect. Alternatively it may have to be set back from the front of the house by as much as 2 metres for the same reason.

5.3 The shape of the roof is also an important aspect, and one that can make or break the scheme. It is best practice to copy the shape and orientation of the main roof to ensure it fits in well. Flat roofs or other alien shapes are highly obtrusive and significantly lower the value of your extension, as well as creating potential maintenance problems

#### 6 REAR EXTENSION.

6.1 Building around the back does not mean that you can ignore the need for good design! Although fewer people will see it on a daily basis, a poorly designed extension to the rear will still lower the value of your house. The same broad principles for shape, materials and neighbour impact that apply for extending to the side of your house, also apply to extending to the rear of your house.

6.2 From experience it is found that a reasonable compromise between impact on neighbours and the need for space allows about a 3-metre extension at the back, although it will vary from plot to plot. Any extensions that project further than 3 metres will be subject to the 45 and 60 degree rules as explained below.

6.3 In order to assess the impact of a single storey extension on a neighbouring property, the Council will apply the '60 degree rule'. This is simply a line drawn at 60 degrees from the centre of your neighbour's nearest window of a habitable room. Your extension should not cross that line otherwise there could be an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property.

6.4 For a two-storey extension or upper floor extension the same principle applies, but this time the angle is reduced to 45 degrees as there would be significantly more bulk to block out light and increase overlooking.

### **MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

14. The material planning considerations in respect to this application are the impact on the existing bungalow and street scene, the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and highway safety.

#### **Impact on existing bungalow and street scene**

15. A number of objections received have commented that the proposed development is out of scale with the original bungalow and character of the area and that the proposal would result in an over-development of the site.

16. With respect to the proposed side element that would tie in flush with the existing front and rear elevations of the host bungalow, although the proposal would be visible within the street scene and would be situated within close proximity of the adjacent footpath, consideration is given to the modest scale and design of the proposal which is considered to respect the proportions of the original bungalow, and the setting of the host bungalow within the corner of the cul de sac where views would be limited to directly from the front of the site (as opposed to the wider street scene).
17. With respect to the proposed dining room, car port and garage extension to the side/rear, this would be set back from the proposed side extension by over 6m and taking into account the different roof type (dual pitch with a gable front), it is considered that this would assist in breaking up the massing of the scheme when viewed from the front. Furthermore, it is noted that No 1 Wasdale Drive and No 6 Uldale Drive to the west of the site are situated at a different orientation to the host bungalow (and No 3 Wasdale Drive) which are considered to assist in breaking up the uniform appearance of the street scene.
18. As noted above, it was considered necessary for the scale of the dining room and garage element of the scheme to be reduced in length with the provision of a hipped end (on the rear element), which are further considered to reduce the overall scale and visual impact of the proposal, particularly when viewed from the adjacent footpath (east).
19. A satisfactory amount of garden area will remain within the plot to both the front and rear of the site and the scheme is not considered to constitute over development in this instance
20. Taking the above considerations into account, it is considered that on balance the proposed scheme will not adversely affect the character and appearance of the existing bungalow or the surrounding area, or introduce significant incongruous features into the street scene as to warrant a refusal of the application.
21. A planning condition can ensure that the materials of the proposed extension match those of the existing bungalow, which is further considered to reduce the visual impact of the development.

### **Impact on Residential Amenity**

22. A number of objections have commented that the proposed scheme would result in a loss of amenity and privacy as a result of the massing and close proximity of the scheme to neighbouring properties.

#### No 3 Wasdale Drive (west)

23. The proposed side extension would not project beyond the existing front and rear elevations of the host bungalow and No 3. Following the revised scheme, the projecting dining room, car port and garage element to the side/rear would project approximately 4.9m beyond the existing rear elevation of the host bungalow and would be set in approximately 10m from the adjacent rear boundary to No 3 (west). As a result of this distance, the proposal would accord with the 60 degree guidance as set out in SPG2. The provision of the hipped end on the rear element of this proposal would further assist in reducing the massing of the proposal. The proposal would feature a set of bi-folding doors in the side/west elevation and in view of the existing low boundary fence to No 3, it is considered necessary to erect a 2m high fence along this boundary to prevent any direct overlooking. This can be secured by a planning condition. In view of the above considerations, it is considered that the proposal will not result in an adverse loss of amenity or privacy for existing and future occupiers of No 3.



#### Properties to front (south)

24. The front elevation of the proposed extensions, including the provision of the roof light in the front elevation, would be sited approximately 24m from the nearest properties to the front of the site (south) along Wasdale Drive. This distance accords with that set out in SPG2 and it is considered that the proposed scheme will not result in an adverse loss of amenity or privacy for existing and future occupiers of properties to the front/south of the site.

#### No's 8 and 10 Uldale Drive (north)

25. The rear elevation of the proposed side extension would tie into the original rear elevation of the host bungalow with the provision of bi-folding doors. This element would be sited approximately 9m from the adjacent rear boundary to the north, and approximately 15m from the rear elevation of No 10 Uldale Drive.
26. Following the reduction in length of the proposed side/rear element (dining room, car port and garage), this element would now be set approximately 4.3m off the rear boundary and sited at an oblique separation distance of approximately 10m from the rear elevation of No 10 Uldale Drive and approximately 15m from the rear elevation of No 8 Uldale Drive. It is considered that this reduction in length, the provision of a hipped end roof and the siting of this element away from the immediate rear elevation (and rear garden area) of No 10 Uldale Drive, would assist in reducing the massing of the proposed extension when viewed from the rear elevation and immediate rear garden area of No 10 Uldale Drive.
27. In view of the provision of bi-folding doors within both the main rear elevation of the host bungalow and within the side (west) elevation of the side/rear extension, it is considered necessary for a 2m high closed boarded fence (which could be erected under permitted development) along the rear boundary to No 10 Uldale Drive (north).
28. In view of the above considerations and the required 2m high fence, it is considered that the proposal will not result in an adverse loss of amenity or privacy for existing and future occupiers of No's 8 and 10 Uldale Drive or neighbouring properties to the rear of the site (north and north west).

#### Properties to east along Honister Walk

29. The proposed side/rear elevation of the proposal would be sited at an oblique separation distance of approximately 12m from No 5 Honister Walk (north east).
30. The single storey side element would be sited approximately 16m from the two storey gable side wall of No 7 Honister Walk (east). The side elevation of the proposed garage/car port element would be sited approximately 9m from the front and side elevations of No 7 Honister Walk (east). The proposed garage/car port would also feature a pitched roof that would slope away from the adjacent boundary and the properties along Honister Walk (and the adjacent footpath). The first floor window to be installed within the proposed side extension would be sited approximately 16m from the two storey side gable wall of No 7 Honister Walk, of which this distance accords with that set out in SPG2.
31. In view of the above considerations, it is considered that the proposal will not result in an adverse loss of amenity or privacy for existing and future occupiers of properties along Honister Walk (north east and east).

#### Loft conversion works

32. As set out above, the proposed plans indicate a proposed loft conversion of which the siting of 3 roof lights in both the front and rear elevations. With respect to the roof lights in the rear elevation, a minimum separation distance of approximately 19m would remain between these windows and the rear elevations of No's 8 and 10 Uldale Drive (north), which does not accord with the distance set out in SPG2. However, as set out above, 2 of the 3 roof lights to be installed within the original roof line do not require planning permission and there is therefore no control over these windows (and any associated impact). With respect to the roof light to be installed within the rear of the proposed side extension, this would serve a non-habitable room, however a condition can ensure that the window is fixed and obscurely glazed.
33. In respect of the 3 roof lights to be installed within the front elevation, again only 1 of the 3 roof lights requires planning permission (the window to be installed within the front elevation of the proposed side extension). A satisfactory separation distance would remain between this window and surrounding properties to the front of the site.
34. In view of the above, it is considered that this element of the proposal will not result in an adverse loss of amenity or privacy for adjoining or surrounding neighbouring properties.

### **Highway safety**

35. Objections from 14 Birchfield Drive and 5 Honister Walk have raised concerns regarding pedestrian safety as a result of the siting of the proposed side extension that would project close to the adjacent footpath. Concerns are also raised in respect of the potential use of the garage.
36. The Head of Technical Services has raised no objections to the scheme in respect of highway and pedestrian safety. A planning condition can ensure that the garage and car port element shall be used for purposes ancillary to that of the host bungalow. The scheme is considered to be acceptable in this respect.
37. The proposal would not affect any Public Rights of Way.

### **Residual matters**

38. Property devaluation is not a material planning consideration.

### **CONCLUSION**

39. The impacts of the proposal have been considered against national and local planning guidance. Material considerations have been considered in detail and the development as proposed is considered to be acceptable including design and layout, highway safety and it does not adversely impact on the amenity neighbouring properties as to warrant a refusal of the application.
40. It is recommended that the application be Approved with Conditions for the reason(s) specified above.

**Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services**  
**Contact Officer Mr Daniel James Telephone No 01642 528551**

### **WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS**

**Ward**                      **Eaglescliffe**  
**Ward Councillor**      **Councillor A L Lewis**

**Ward**                      **Eaglescliffe**  
**Ward Councillor**      **Councillor Mrs M. Rigg**

**Ward**                      **Eaglescliffe**  
**Ward Councillor**      **Councillor Phillip Dennis**

## **IMPLICATIONS**

Financial Implications:  
As Report

Environmental Implications:  
As Report

Human Rights Implications:  
The provisions of the European Convention of Human Rights 1950 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report.

Community Safety Implications:  
The provisions of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report

### **Background Papers**

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

National Planning Policy Framework

Stockton on Tees Local Plan Adopted Version June 1997

Core Strategy Development Plan Document March 2010

Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2: Householder Extension Design Guide (2004)

Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments (2011)