

Area North Committee – 25 April 2012

## Officer Report on Planning Application: 12/00129/FUL

<b>Proposal :</b>	Alterations and rear extensions to the dwelling including the installation of a first floor side window (GR: 349104/117340)
<b>Site Address:</b>	Coverdale, Montacute Road, East Stoke
<b>Parish:</b>	Stoke Sub Hamdon
<b>ST MICHAELS Ward (SSDC Member)</b>	Mrs. Jo Roundell Greene (Cllr)
<b>Recommending Case Officer:</b>	Lee Walton Tel: (01935) 462324 Email: lee.walton@southsomerset.gov.uk
<b>Target date :</b>	9th March 2012
<b>Applicant :</b>	Mr & Mrs T H Fryer
<b>Agent: (no agent if blank)</b>	David Parkin 4 Wilton Road, Yeovil BA21 5XP
<b>Application Type :</b>	Other Householder - not a Change of Use

### REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

This application is referred to the committee at the request of the Ward Member with the agreement of the Area Chairman to enable the comments of the neighbour(s) to be fully debated.

### SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL



Coverdale was built in the 1950s and is constructed in red brick under a hipped tiled roof. It is the fifth from last property at the eastern end of a long stretch of roadside ribbon development on the south side of the main road.

The proposal seeks a part single, part two-storey rear extension with an attached flat-topped garage. The existing dwelling is modestly proportioned being 6 metres deep and 9.2metres wide. The two-storey extension measures 6 metres deep by 4.7metres alongside a ground floor extension measuring 5.7metres by 3.9metres. The eaves of the two-storey extension stand at 5.5metres and match those of the existing dwelling although with a reduced ridge with a hipped roof design facing the rear garden.

## HISTORY

None.

## 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 accords significant weight to 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:

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

Policy STR1 - Sustainable Development

Policy STR6 Development Outside Towns, Villages and Rural Centres.

Save policies of the South Somerset Local Plan:

Policy ST5 - General Principles of Development

Policy ST6 - The Quality of Development

Policy ST3 Development Area

Regard shall also be had to:

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012):

Chapter 6 - Delivering a Wide Choice of High Quality Homes

Chapter 7 - Requiring Good Design

South Somerset Sustainable Community Strategy

8 and 9

## CONSULTATIONS

**Stoke Sub Hamdon Parish Council** - The majority of the development is at the rear of the existing house and therefore has no impact to the area. However, this development does double the ground floor.

**County Highway Authority** - no observations.

**Area Engineer** - No comment.

## REPRESENTATIONS

One objection has been received:

- Site plan inaccuracy. Note: A revised plan has been received that clarifies the relationship.
- First floor side window impact with overlooking and loss of privacy. Note: A revised plan has been received that shows this to be obscure glazed and now serves a bathroom.
- Loss of morning sunlight
- Scale of development, depth of two-storey extension
- Sense of enclosure
- Harmful to living conditions

## CONSIDERATIONS

There is no objection in principle given the site's location and the type of development sought; namely, an extension to a dwelling. Accordingly the main considerations concern character and appearance and impact on neighbours. A revised block plan was submitted to take account of the inaccuracies in the original to show the relationship between the application site and The Croft.

### **Character and Appearance:**

Although large, with the ground floor area doubling the existing floor area, the extension and increased scale, including the two storey element are considered acceptable with no detrimental effect on character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

### **Neighbour Amenity:**

The occupants of The Croft consider the two-storey extension results in the loss of morning sunlight as seen from the half landing on the staircase and kitchen window; and refers to a sense of enclosure compounded by their other neighbour's dwelling that is set back in its site that presents a large blank wall and blocks evening sunlight. The neighbour's rear garden is full of mature planting that reduces light levels; the location of the proposed two storey extension is on the other side of adjacent garages and, with this degree of separation, the proposed development is not considered to have any unduly harmful impact on the neighbours garden area and rear outlook.

The main impact is on the flank openings that serve a toilet, landing and kitchen. The kitchen window is alongside a single storey projection attached to the corner rear elevation of the neighbour's dwelling. There would be a 7.5metre gap between the kitchen side window and the proposed extension.

The kitchen window is already compromised by an original side / rear addition to the neighbour's own building. While there would be some loss of outlook this is not considered sufficient to warrant refusal of the application. Any further impact arising from the proposed extension on other windows would not be so significant as to justify withholding planning permission.

### **Other Matters:**

The neighbour has questioned: Why the two storey and single storey elements cannot be reversed to remove the two storey further away from their property. This would have the advantage of being located alongside the adjacent neighbour's dwelling that is set

back from the road and with a blank flank wall no harm would prevail. While this would be a possible solution such a scheme does not form part of the current application. The applicants have given reasons why such a scheme is not practical for them. A decision therefore needs to be based on the proposal before us, rather than a possible alternative.

**Conclusion:**

Notwithstanding the comments received the two-storey extension would not unduly overshadow or lead to an unacceptable loss of light. The two-storey extension is not considered overbearing given the space between the buildings and any impact on neighbours is not considered sufficient to warrant the refusal of the application.

**RECOMMENDATION****GRANT CONDITIONAL PERMISSION**

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 policy ST6 of the South Somerset Local 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: Location plan and roof plan, and Proposed received 12 January 2012, Block Plan received 8 March 2012, and floor plan, Elevations received 1 March 2012.  
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
03. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (including any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, with or without modification) the first floor windows in the west elevation shall be glazed in obscure glass and shall be of a design not capable of being opened below a height of 1.7m above the finished floor level of the floor to which they relate. Thereafter, the said windows shall be retained and maintained in the approved form.  
Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain adequate control over such detail, in the interests of neighbour amenity and loss of privacy, further to policy ST5 of the South Somerset Local Plan.