DELEGATED REPORT

FILE REFERENCE: SMD/2016/0266

MAIN ISSUES:

Design considerations;
Impact on residential amenity.

PUBLICITY/REPRESENTATIONS:

Leek Town Council – Not unneighbourly
Neighbours – No representations received

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT:

This application relates to no.137 Haregate Road, situated within a predominantly residential area. The site is located on the northern side of the highway and comprises of a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse. A landscaped garden is located to the front and rear of the dwellinghouse. A detached garage and driveway are located adjacent to the east site boundary.

Planning approval is sought for the demolition of an existing single storey porch extension and for the construction of a larger single storey extension in its place. The extension is to project approximately 2m beyond the principal elevation and will measure 7.5m in width. A mono-pitched roof is proposed. Amended plans have been received to reinstate the south western corner of the extension and to omit a feature gable located centrally within the south elevation. External building materials are to match those of the existing dwelling.

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.

Haregate Road is characterised by dwellings of a similar ilk, however it is evident that a number of properties have benefitted from single storey extensions to the front elevation. Extensions within the street scene vary in scale and form and accordingly detract from the symmetry that would have existed at the time of the original residential estate development. Having considered the proposal in context it is not considered that the proposal would appear out of character in its setting or significant detract from the appearance of the wider streetscene.

Policy DC1 states that new development should protect residential amenity in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and soft landscaping. No.135 Haregate Road bounds the application site to the west and forms the other half of the semi-detached pair. A hedge measuring approximately 1.8m in height serves the shared boundary that separates the application site from this neighbouring property. The proposed extension as amended will not cross the 45 degree line take from the centre point of the nearest habitable room window that serves this neighbouring property. Furthermore, the principle elevation ofno.135 faces due south. Accordingly it is unlikely that the development would cause an undue loss of daylight or sunlight to this neighbouring property. Additionally, taking account of the scale and proportions of the proposed extension it is not considered that the proposal would lead to an undue sense of enclosure or overbearing impact. It is therefore not considered that the proposal would likely cause undue injury to the residential amenity of no.135 Haregate Road.

No.139 Haregate Road bounds the application site to the east. A distance of approximately 5.5m would exist between the proposed extension and this neighbouring dwellinghouse. The driveway that serves the application site will remain to separate the application dwelling and this neighbouring property. The east site boundary is served by a timber fence. Having considered the scale and positioning of the proposed extension relative to this neighbouring property, it is not considered that the proposal would cause harm to the amenity of no.139 Haregate Road.

A distance of 21m would exist between the proposed extension and neighbouring properties located opposite the application site to the south. At this distance it is not considered likely that the proposal would result in a significant loss of privacy, appear overbearing or intrusive.

In accordance with policy DC1 the existing on-site parking provision is considered sufficient to serve the parking need arising from the development.

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE

Date 16/06/2016 **Signed** _____
Lisa Howard

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANAGER COMMENTS:

Date **Signed** _____