DELEGATED REPORT

FILE REFERENCE: SMD/2016/0242

MAIN ISSUES:

The impact on the character and appearance of the area and on residential amenity.

PUBLICITY/REPRESENTATIONS:

An objection has been received from a neighbour who considers the building will be too intrusive and visible from his property. He also considers it would have an impact on the value of his property and that the difference in ground levels could cause ground instability affecting his property. Finally, the objector adds that a new bungalow in the garden would be out of keeping with the character of the area.

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT:

The application seeks to replace a standard detached flat-roofed single garage in the rear garden of a semi-detached bungalow with a considerably larger single-storey annex building (with pitched roof) in the same position. It would have a width of 3.5 metres (0.9 metres wider than the current garage) and a length of 10.9 metres. There would also be a central section which projects 1.6 metres towards the centre of the garden. It would be placed alongside the side boundary with No.13 and also close to the rear boundary. All windows would be placed on the side elevation facing the garden of No.17 to the east (the adjoining semi-detached dwelling). It would comprise an L-shaped seating/kitchen area and a bedroom with en-suite bathroom.

With regard to the character of the area, the building would be largely screened from the road and only the front of the building would be visible from the road and would not be much more prominent than the garage to be replaced. The building would not have an excessive height for a single storey annex due to the low-pitched roofs and the height is also not excessive for a standard outbuilding (of which there are many in the area). It would provide a small annex which is also not excessive in size for its purpose and is much smaller than a standard bungalow. There are other single-storey structures in the area (i.e. the street comprises primarily of bungalows) and there are also outbuildings in the rear gardens of properties on this road so therefore I do not consider the building would be out of keeping with the character of the area. There is a central projecting feature with large amounts of glazing (including above eaves height) which would slightly dominate the building and does not particularly harmonise with the more low-key modest design of the rest of the building and is not a feature found on other buildings in the area (which have a more traditional appearance). However, this feature is well screened from the public realm and therefore does not impact on the visual amenities of the area.

With regard to residential amenity, the points raised by the objector are noted. However, this building would be screened from the objectors dwelling and rear garden by the presence of a garage building (within the objectors property) adjacent to the shared side boundary between nos. 13 and 15 and which would remain adjacent to the proposed annex. Only a small part of it would be visible from the objectors dwelling (and outdoor amenity area) and would not appear significantly intrusive. The points relating to impact on house values and ground instability are civil matters and are not material planning considerations. The proposal would not harm the residential amenities of No.13. The proposed windows would face No.17 but this property (comprising a semi-detached bungalow with rear garden) is screened from No.15 by side boundary treatment. I do not consider the impact on privacy at No.17 would be any worse than the current use of the outdoor amenity area/garden at No.15 for the enjoyment of the occupants of that property.

A condition can be added to restrict the building for the use of the residents of the application site only and prevent it being turned into a separate unit of accommodation/separate dwelling (although this may be unlikely to happen in any case due to the limited size of the building). I also consider permitted development rights, which would otherwise allow further outbuildings or extensions to the outbuilding to be erected in the garden without planning permission, should be removed and this can also be achieved by way of a planning condition.

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE

Date 06/06/2016 **Signed** _____
Chris Johnston

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANAGER COMMENTS:

Date **Signed** _____