DELEGATED REPORT

FILE REFERENCE: SMD/2016/0191

MAIN ISSUES:

Design considerations;
Impact on residential amenity;
Impact on highway safety.

PUBLICITY/REPRESENTATIONS:

Brown Edge Parish Council – No objection.

Representations: I no letter of representation has been received from the occupiers of 'Breahaed', which raises objection to the proposal. The salient points being:

- Loss of light to habitable rooms;
- Impact on the visual amenity of the village; and
- Impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Matters raised in respect of the maintenance of the boundary is a civil matter and not a planning consideration.

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT:

This application site is a detached two storey dwelling which is located within the development boundary for Brown Edge as defined by the Core Strategy Policies Map. The dwelling is set within an L-shaped plot and adjoined by dwellings to the east, south and west. The land beyond the northern boundary of the site is located within the Green Belt.

This application seeks to address the reasons for refusal of planning reference SMD/2014/0821 that can be summarised as follows:

1. The extension fails to be a subordinate addition to the dwellinghouse and as such would be an unsympathetic form of development causing harm to the character and appearance to the host dwelling;
2. By virtue of siting and scale and proximity to the site boundary would the extension would represent a prominent form of development which would be out of context with its surroundings;
3. The scale and proximity to the boundary is such that the proposal would significantly erode the outlook enjoyed and result in an unacceptable overbearing and overshadowing impact.

The revised scheme proposes a part single storey part two storey side extension.

Principle of Development: The application site is located within the development boundary for Brown Edge where householder development is acceptable as a matter of principle. The main issues in this instance are whether the proposals are of appropriate design, would result in amenity issues for surrounding residents, or result in highway safety issues.

Design: Policy DC1 (Design Considerations) outlines that all development should be of a high quality and add value to the local area and also be designed to respect the site and surroundings, through scale, density, layout, siting, landscaping, character and appearance, in line with the Council Design SPG. The SPG, with reference to extensions confirms that extensions should be subordinate to the existing building so that the original building dominates.

The application site is positioned on the north western side of Old Lane and comprises of a circa 1970's detached two storey dwellinghouse. The side slopes upwards from the highway and accordingly the dwellinghouse holds a relatively elevated position within the street scene. The application site is bound by residential properties to the north east and south west. It is noted that the application dwelling sits forward

of the building line established by Breahead, Hunters Lodge and Hobbs House which are located to the north east.

As with application reference SMD/2015/0821, the proposed extension would enclose the gap that currently exists between the host dwelling and the north eastern site boundary. At ground floor level the proposed extension would sit in line with the principle elevation of the host dwelling. At first floor level a step back of 1m is proposed and step down is also proposed at ridge level. The overall design of the scheme would allow the extension to appear subordinate in nature to the host dwelling, in accordance with the design principles outlined within the Council's Design SPG.

The immediate locality is characterised by dwellings of varying age, type and architectural design. The proposed extension has been designed to respect the scale and proportions of the host dwelling and an appropriate material palette is proposed. Taking account of the subordinate nature of the development it is not considered that the extension would appear unduly prominent or visually intrusive in its setting.

Amenity: Policy DC1 states that new development should protect residential amenity in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and soft landscaping. The application site is adjoined by dwellings on three sides.

No.4 Old Lane and Ivy Cottage are considered to be located sufficient distance away from the development to not result in an unacceptable sense of overbearing impact, loss of light or privacy. No representations have been received from these neighbouring occupiers.

Breahead is located to the north west of the application site and will be affected the most by the development proposed. The application dwelling is positioned approximately 5m forward of the principle elevation of this neighbouring property. There are a number of principle habitable room windows located within the front elevation of Breahead. It is also noted that there are 2 no. secondary high level windows located within the south west elevation. The submitted drawings demonstrate that the first floor element of the proposed extension would not cross the 45 degree line taken from the centre point of the first floor bedroom window. This is the smallest window of the two closer windows located within the front elevation of Breahead. I am therefore satisfied that the extension would not cross the 45 degree line taken from the centre point of the living room window located at ground floor level and it is therefore considered that the proposal sufficiently accords with the Councils Space About Dwellings SPD and would not result in an unacceptable loss of light to these rooms.

By virtue of the proximity of the extension relative to the shared site boundary, it is clear that the extension would still have a level impact on the amenity space located to the front of the dwellinghouse. However, Breahead is located on a slightly higher ground level to the application site and the area of garden impacted upon would be limited. This space does not constitute private amenity space and having considered the proposal in context of the wider site and external amenity space that serves this neighbouring property, it is not considered that a refusal on such grounds could be sustained.

The objections raised by this neighbouring property are considered to sufficiently accord with policy DC1 and the Council's Space About Dwellings SPD.

Highways: Policy DC1 states that development proposals should provide for safe and satisfactory access while also meeting the parking requirement for the necessary car use. The scheme proposes the widening of the existing driveway and point of access which is considered to be acceptable. The proposed dwelling would be served by 2 off street parking spaces on the driveway and one in the garage which is an appropriate provision for the scale of the dwelling.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to conditions.

Date 19/05/2016 **Signed** _____

Lisa Howard

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANAGER COMMENTS:

Date **Signed** _____