

Area North Committee – 23 November 2011

Officer Report On Planning Application: 11/03267/FUL

Proposal:	Erection of a single storey and second storey extension to dwellinghouse (GR: 346175/119581)
Site Address:	21 Birch Road, Martock, Somerset
Parish:	Martock
MARTOCK Ward (SSDC Members)	Mr G H Middleton (Cllr) Mr Patrick Palmer (Cllr)
Recommending Case Officer:	Dominic Heath-Coleman Tel: 01935 462643 Email: dominic.heath-coleman@southsomerset.gov.uk
Target date:	18th October 2011
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Steve Thorne
Agent: (no agent if blank)	Mr Ben Trippick Rugg Farm Stables, Limington, Yeovil BA22 8EQ
Application Type:	Other Householder - not a Change of Use

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

This application is before the committee, at the request of the ward member and the Area Vice Chair, to enable the merits of the design to be considered further.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL



The proposal seeks permission for the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey front extension. The property is a two storey semi-detached house constructed from reconstituted stone, with white UPVC window frames and a concrete tiled roof. The property has been previously extended with the addition of a single storey extension to the rear, a single storey porch to the front, and a single storey garage to the side. The proposed two storey element will be built above the existing garage. The proposed extensions will be constructed from materials to match the existing building. The house is located within a development area as defined by the local plan.

HISTORY

90/01707/FUL - The erection of an extension to garage - Application permitted with conditions 01/05/1990

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 Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review, and the saved policies of the South Somerset Local Plan.

The policies of most relevance to the proposal are:

Saved policies of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review 1991-2011:

Policy STR1 - Sustainable Development

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

Policy ST5 - General Principles of Development

Policy ST6 - The Quality of Development

National Guidance

PPS1 - Sustainable Development

PPS3 - Housing

South Somerset Sustainable Community Strategy

Goal 3 - Healthy Environments

Goal 4 - Services and Facilities

Goal 8 - High Quality Homes

Material Consideration

Application allowing construction of similar extension approved on neighbouring property, 19 Birch Road, Martock:

07/04264/FUL - Alterations and two storey side extension and associated works, flat roof and safety rail (revised application) - Application permitted with conditions 31/10/2007

CONSULTATIONS

PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL - Do not recommend approval on the grounds of the loss of light to the neighbouring property, the angle of the building and the concerns over drainage.

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY - No observations

AREA ENGINEER - No comment

REPRESENTATIONS

Two letters of objection received from the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Objections were raised on the following grounds:

- The proposal will render the objector's property an end of terrace rather than a semi-detached property, which will be out of keeping with the rest of the estate and will devalue the objector's property.
- Damp problem could be created between properties as extension will be very close to neighbouring property.
- Eaves may protrude over boundary line.
- Loss of light to rear bedroom window.
- No subservience in proposal. This was required on objector's similar extension.
- Possible issue with relationship between objector's boiler exhaust and proposed new window.
- Concern that property is 'buy to let' or conversion into two flats.

CONSIDERATIONS

Residential Amenity

The proposed two storey extension will sit immediately adjacent to an existing balcony area above a single storey extension to the rear of the neighbouring property. It is considered that due to the relative orientation of the properties there will be no significant increase in the overshadowing of the neighbouring property. There could be argued to be an overbearing impact on the balcony area of the adjoining property. However, as the balcony is at the first floor level it is considered that the proposal will have no more impact than a single storey extension would have on ground floor accommodation, and as such the impact will not be significant enough to warrant refusal of the scheme. A neighbour has objected on the grounds that the proposed extension will cause a loss of light to their bedroom window and the parish council have also raised a concern in this regard. However, it is considered that due to the orientation of the properties there will be no significant loss of light. A neighbour has also raised a concern that the eaves of the extension will overhang their property and the proximity may cause damp problems. However, no projection over neighbouring properties is shown on the submitted plans and any resulting maintenance issues would be a matter that should be resolved between the interested parties and should not constrain the development.

Visual Amenity

The proposed extension is considered to be of an appropriate design and detailing that would have an appropriate relationship with the main dwelling in terms of scale and design. The materials are stated as being to match the existing property. A neighbour has raised an objection on the grounds that the proposed extension will have a terracing effect out of keeping with the character of the area and devaluing the objector's property. However, it is considered that although there will be a terracing effect, the

visual gap that will be lost is not significant and the impact on the predominantly semi-detached character of the area will not be significant enough to warrant refusal of the scheme. The impact on the value of the objector's property cannot be considered as part of the planning process and should not constrain the development. A neighbour has also raised a concern over the lack of subservience between the proposed extension and the original property. However, the plans have since been amended to achieve such subservience. On this basis it is not considered that it would harm the character of the property or have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area.

Other Matters

A neighbour has raised a concern that the flue on the objector's property may interfere with a window on the proposed extension. This is not a matter that can be considered here and should be dealt with under building regulations.

The parish council has raised a non-specific concern over drainage. However the SSDC engineer has raised no such concern and any specific drainage matter should be dealt with under separate legislation.

A neighbour raised a final concern that the property may be used as a 'buy to let' property or converted into two separate flats, thereby reducing the value of the objector's property. However, a conversion to two separate properties would need separate planning permission, which has not been applied for and so cannot be considered here, and the use of the property as a rental property is not a matter that can be considered as part of the planning process in this context.

Conclusion

It is considered that any impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers will not be significant enough to warrant refusal of the scheme. There will be a negative impact on the character of the area due to the terracing effect of the proposal, in an area where the character is dominated by semi-detached properties. However, whilst the merits are finely balanced, the impact is not considered to be significant enough to warrant refusal of the scheme.

Accordingly the proposal is considered to comply with policies ST5 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Permission be granted for the following reason:

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 ST6 and ST5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (Adopted April 2006) and Policy STR1 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan.

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: 25/517 P02 A received 19 September 2011

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 be those as identified within the planning application 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) and Policy STR1 of the Somerset and Exmoor National park Joint Structure Plan.
