DELEGATED REPORT

FILE REFERENCE: SMD/2016/0341

MAIN ISSUES:

Whether or not the proposal amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
The impact on the character and appearance of the area and on residential amenity.

PUBLICITY/REPRESENTATIONS:

Parish Council: Support
One letter of objection has been received from a neighbouring resident who considers the scheme of extensions (including the conversion of the roof) would lead to overshadowing of her property and also lead to loss of light and the impact would be even greater with existing extensions to other neighbouring properties.

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT:

This is a revised scheme of extensions and a replacement roof for a bungalow in a suburban area of the Green Belt. Planning permission was granted for the replacement roof and extensions under SMD/2015/0066. These also form part of this new application but the only changes are the addition of a single-storey rear extension comprising a dining room with pitched roof and adjoining flat-roofed conservatory with roof lantern, just to the side of an existing rear garage projection (to be converted into a playroom).

Green Belt policy resists the disproportionate enlargement of buildings. The previous approved scheme would have added 122 cu.m of volume to the original 666 cu.m of the original house. The new additions proposed under this current application would add a further 100 cu.m to give a total enlargement of 222 cu.m which equates to a 33.3% enlargement of the original house. I do not consider the new scheme to amount to a disproportionate enlargement of the original building and therefore the proposal complies with the Green Belt policies.

In terms of design, the proposed rear extensions would not harm the character and appearance of the house and would not be visible the public highways.

With regard to the letter of objection, the objectors property, Stanley View, lies to the east side of the application site. The proposed single-storey rear extensions added to the already approved scheme would not have any further impact on the residential amenities of that property as the existing side wing of the bungalow, a rear outbuilding and a boundary fence and hedging would lie between the proposed rear extensions and the dwelling and rear garden at Stanley View, helping to screen this property from the proposed extensions. As these would be single-storey structures, these would not be high enough or close enough to Stanley View to lead to any significant further loss of light or overshadowing affecting this property.

With regard to the residential amenities at other neighbouring properties, the proposed rear extensions would also be a sufficient distance from the rear boundary and would not cause overshadowing or loss of light to the properties to the north. Although there would be rear-facing windows, harmful views into the properties to the north would be largely avoided by the presence of a rear boundary fence and large conifer trees (in the neighbouring gardens).

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE

Date 28/07/2016 **Signed** _____
Chris Johnston

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANAGER COMMENTS:

Date **Signed** _____