

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2016/0699
Valid 08/11/2016

HEATHFIELD COTTAGE
TYTHE BARN
ALTON

2 STOREY SIDE EXTENSION
WITH A SINGLE STOREY
REAR EXTENSION AND
PORCH AT THE FRONT.

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Impact of proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and wider street scene, impact on residential amenity and highway safety.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is a semi-detached property constructed from red facing brickwork with render above under a plain clay tile roof which occupies a wedge shaped corner plot. On the opposite side of Tythe Barn lie two storey dwellings of differing styles and designs whilst to the north west of the site lies 35 Shirley Drive, a detached bungalow.

PROPOSAL

This is a householder application which seeks consent for the erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and front porch.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

S01 Spatial Objectives
SS1 Development Principles
SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
SS6a Larger Villages Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Chapter 7 Requiring Good Design

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice posted and ten neighbours notified.

Public Comments

One letter of objection received which raises issues of contravention of planning laws, loss of light, overshadowing and concern over loss of privacy through side windows.

Town / Parish Comments

No objections.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

This application relates to a site located within an established residential area within the Alton development boundary, as identified by the Core Strategy Policies Maps. It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in principle subject to matters of detailed design, amenity and highway safety.

Design

Policy DC1 (Design Considerations) states 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's Design SPG. The SPG with reference to extensions confirms that extensions should be subordinate to the existing building so that the original house dominates.

The submitted scheme proposes an extension whose ridge and eaves level are coterminous with that of the main dwellinghouse. It is also flush with the front elevation and not inset. The effect of this is that there is no differentiation between the original building and the extension is therefore detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the pair of semis of which it forms a part. The provision of a twin gable arrangement also results in an unnecessary complicated and awkward roof profile. The single storey wrap around rear extension is also poor in terms of its form and the overall design of the submitted fails to respect the detail of the host building. These issues have been raised with the applicant's agent and amended plans have been received as part of this application. The twin gable arrangement has been omitted in favour of a much simpler projecting gable arrangement which not only results in a visual improvement in terms of how it relates to the main building it also helps effectively screen an existing two storey flat roof extension which is visible from the public highway. The extension has also been set

back off the front extension and therefore has a secondary ridge line. This means that the proposed two storey extension is subservient to the main dwellinghouse and that it better reflects the design details of the extension on the adjoining semi as well resulting in a more cohesive sense of development. The wrap around extension at the rear has been broken up into two separate lean to extensions which are much more appropriate in terms of form and the overall design and appearance of the extension has been improved with the reduction in windows so that it better reflects the detail and solid to void ratio of the main dwelling.

Amenity

Policy DC1 states that all new development should protect residential amenity in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and soft landscaping. One letter of representation has been received which raises concerns regarding overshadowing and loss of privacy. Whilst it is accepted that the proposed extension will bring the level of built development closer to the shared boundary with 35 Shirley Drive the buildings have an indirect relationship with each other and it is considered that an adequate separation distance remains. The adjacent bungalow lies to the north west of the application site and the location of the proposed extension would be on the south west gable. This means that there may be a loss of some mid morning sun. However the juxtaposition of the dwellings means that this is already experienced with the existing dwelling and the modest width of the proposed extension would mean that any further loss would be marginal. Two windows have been proposed in the upper floor of the proposed side extension. One of these will serve an en-suite bathroom and can be conditioned to be obscure glazed. The second serves a bedroom. This room is already served by a window on the front elevation of the dwelling and whilst the side window has been retained so as to maintain the appearance of the development it will not have any glazing to prevent any issues of overlooking.

Highway Safety

In accordance with policy DC1 all new development should provide for safe and satisfactory access and make a contribution to meeting the parking requirements arising from the development. The submitted application does not propose any alterations to the existing vehicular access or parking arrangements. The entire front garden has already been laid with tarmac and will provide adequate parking and turning provision for the dwellinghouse as extended.

Other Issues

The letter of representation from the adjoining neighbour also makes reference to the fact that the proposal would contravene planning laws as it would not be more than 7m from the rear boundary. Whilst the laws referred to have not been referenced I can only assume that the reference is made with regards to the General Permitted Development Order as this is one of a number of criteria which must be met in order for a development to benefit from deemed consent. The applicant recognises that the development does not comply with the regulations in the GPDO and has therefore quite correctly submitted an application for planning permission. The starting point for consideration of any planning application is whether the proposal

accords with the planning policies in the development plan. These issues have therefore been addressed under the headings above.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The amended plans adequately address the case officer's original concerns and the size, scale, form and design of the extension is considered to be appropriate as it respects and reflects that of the host building. The proposed development is not, subject to a planning condition requiring the first floor window to be obscure glazed, considered to raise any amenity issues nor will it be detrimental to highway safety.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : **APPROVE subject to conditions relating to statutory time limit, amended plans, matching materials and obscure glazing to the upper first floor window**

Case Officer: Teresa Critchlow

Recommendation Date: 26th January 2017

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Haywood, Ben

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council