

Officer Report on Planning Application: 14/04613/FUL

Proposal :	Erection of a single storey extension to south wing of building (GR 371217/128486)
Site Address:	South Somerset District Council Churchfield Wincanton
Parish:	Wincanton
WINCANTON Ward (SSDC Member)	Cllr N Colbert Cllr C Winder
Recommending Case Officer:	Dominic Heath-Coleman Tel: 01935 462643 Email: dominic.heath-coleman@southsomerset.gov.uk
Target date :	8th December 2014
Applicant :	SSDC Property Services
Agent: (no agent if blank)	
Application Type :	Minor Other less than 1,000 sq.m or 1ha

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

The application is before the committee as the applicant is South Somerset District Council.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL





The proposal seeks permission for the erection of a single storey extension to the south wing of the building. The property is a three storey building in use as council offices and as a police station. The building is finished in natural stone. The proposed extension will be finished in materials to match the existing building. The site is located close to various residential properties. The site is located within a development area and a conservation area as defined by the local plan.

HISTORY

08/00898/FUL - Alterations and extension to be used as a cell to provide facility for police service (re-submission) - Application permitted with conditions 17/04/2008

08/00511/ADV - Display of one non-illuminated free standing directional sign - Application withdrawn 05/03/2008

07/05543/FUL - The installation of external hatch phone/screed unit - Application permitted with conditions 29/02/2008

07/04529/FUL - Alterations and extension to be used as a cell to provide facility for police service - Application permitted with conditions 26/11/2007

POLICY

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 repeats the duty imposed under S54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and requires that decision must be made in accordance with relevant Development Plan Documents unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

For the purposes of determining current applications the local planning authority considers that the relevant development plan comprises the saved policies of the South Somerset Local Plan.

The policies of most relevance to the proposal are:

Saved policies of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006):

Policy EH1 - Conservation Areas

Policy ST5 - General Principles of Development

Policy ST6 - The Quality of Development

National Planning Policy Framework

Chapter 1 - Building a Strong, Competitive Economy

Chapter 7 - Requiring Good Design

South Somerset Sustainable Community Strategy

Goal 3 - Healthy Environments

Goal 4 - Services and Facilities

Goal 8 - High Quality Homes

CONSULTATIONS

Town Council - Recommends approval

County Highway Authority - Refers to standing advice

SSDC Conservation Officer - No objections. Materials should strictly match those used on the existing building.

SCC Archaeology - No objections

REPRESENTATIONS

One letter received from the occupier of a neighbouring property was regarding the lack of information included in the application, but raising no concerns as to the actual scheme.

Letters of objection have been received from the occupiers of four neighbouring properties. Objections were raised on the following grounds:

- Concern that a high solid fence along the path to access 24, 25 and 26 Churchfields will make the already dark path even darker and unsafe.
- Concern over the loss of parking for residents of Churchfields, which will exacerbate an existing difficult situation.
- Concern over any increase in traffic on the cul-de-sac, which is already problematic.
- Any alterations to the building or change of use would be unacceptable.

CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed extension is considered to be of an appropriate design and detailing that would have an appropriate relationship with the existing building on site in terms of scale and design. The conservation officer was consulted and raised no objections as to the impact on the surrounding conservation area. The materials are considered to be appropriate, subject to a condition to ensure that they exactly match the existing building. On this basis it is considered that it would not harm the character of the property or have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the conservation area.

The proposed extension is very modest in size and situated well away from neighbouring properties. Due to the existing slope of the land, the extension is very low in comparison to the closest residential properties. As such, it is unlikely to cause demonstrable harm to residential amenity by way of overlooking, overshadowing, or overbearing. A neighbour has raised a concern that a high boundary fence to the east boundary of the site would make an already dark path darker and therefore unsafe. However, no fence is proposed as part of the scheme. Although a new fence is noted on the submitted plan, no details are given and it is not mentioned in description of development. A fence in this location up to two metres in height would be permitted development. As such, it is not considered reasonable to constrain development due to a notation on a site layout plan, and it is not considered appropriate to remove permitted development rights in this regard.

The highway authority has referred to their standing advice. There will be no impact on the existing access and parking arrangements. As such, it is considered that the proposal is in general accordance with this advice. A number of concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the proposal on local traffic and parking arrangements. However, all change of use elements have been removed from the scheme, and the proportionally very modest extension is unlikely to have any significant impact on the number of vehicle movements to and from the site. As such, it is not considered that the proposal will have any significant impact on the existing parking and traffic issues in the cul-de-sac.

A neighbour has raised an objection that any alterations or change of use to the building would be objectionable. However, as discussed above, there are no planning reasons to refuse the development.

Accordingly the proposal is considered to comply with policies EH1, ST5 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

01. The proposal, by reason of its size, scale and materials, respects the character of the area, and causes no demonstrable harm to residential amenity in accordance with the aims and objectives of Policies EH1, ST6 and ST5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006) and the aims and provisions of the NPPF.

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

01. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1289-200 received 02 October 2014 and 1289-50 received 29 October 2014

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

03. The materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall match the materials used on the existing building and no other materials unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policy ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006).