

Application No:	17/01987/FUL
Proposal:	Householder application for proposed demolition of existing rear porch, two-storey side & part single-storey front extension; refurbishment of existing dormer windows; replacement external doors and windows throughout; replacement of existing 4ft fence on southern boundary with 6ft fence and removal of existing gated access
Location:	Rose Cottage , Washtub Lane, South Scarle, NG23 7JN
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Faihurst
Registered:	30 October 2017
	Target Date: 25 December 2017
	Extension of Time Agreed until 19 January 2018

This application is presented to the Planning Committee for determination as it has been referred by Councillor D. Clarke at the request of the local residents on amenity and highways grounds.

Description of Site and Surrounding Area

The application property is a detached red brick two storey dwelling situated on a residential road within South Scarle. The property is set back from the roadside with a gravel front garden with grass to the side and rear of the property. The dwelling is located abutting the northernmost boundary of the site and as such has a U shaped garden. The property has two access points off Washtub Lane, one to the east serving the front of the property and one to the south which is a redundant access point.

The current hostdwelling is approx. 7.6 m from the common boundary with the property to the south-east, and meets the common boundary with the property directly to the north. The rear elevation is approx. 14 m from the rear boundary and the side elevation is approx. 19 m from the side boundary and existing access point. The front elevation is approx. 14 m from the front boundary fencing.

Properties in the vicinity are of varying size and design.

Washtub Lane is a horseshoe shape to the east of Main Street and serves multiple properties. The track is narrow and all properties have the provision for off street parking.

Site History

01/01252/OUT - Construction of a detached two bedroom home (dormer bungalow) – Refused 10.09.2001.

96/51553/OUT - Erect two semi-detached starter homes – Refused 05.02.1997.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing rear porch and the construction of a two-storey side & part single-storey front extension; refurbishment of the existing dormer windows; replacement of external doors and windows throughout; replacement of the existing 4ft fence on the southern boundary with 6ft fence and removal of the existing gated access.

The hostdwelling is approx. 7.8 m wide and 8.9 m deep with an eaves height of 3.9 m and ridge height of approx. 6.2 m.

The proposal seeks to extend the front elevation of the hostdwelling with a mono-pitch lean to extension of approx. 2.3 m depth and 7.5 m width. The ground floor extension will be approx. 0.3 m from the boundary fence with the property to the north. The lean to is proposed to be 3.5 m to the ridge and 2.4 m to the eaves with an approx. 3.7 m high open timber gable over the front door.

The two storey side extension is proposed to be approx. 5.8 m wide and span the entire depth of the hostdwelling and front single storey extension at approx. 11.2 m; at first floor the extension will be 8.8 m deep and 5.8 m wide. The extension is proposed to have a 6.2 m ridge height and 3.9 m eaves height. The front elevation of the first floor extension is proposed to have an eaves dormer in the style of those present on the hostdwelling.

The rear porch to be demolished is approx. 1.7m x 3 m in diameter and has a lean to ridge height of approx. 2.5 m and eaves of 1.8 m.

The existing 4ft boundary fence to the southern boundary of the property is proposed to be replaced with a 6ft boundary fence with the existing gated access to be removed from this section of the boundary.

The existing 6ft boundary fence is proposed to be retained on the north common boundary.

Fenestration

On the front (east) elevation the proposal seeks to introduce two additional eaves dormers at first floor, on the side extension the ground floor front elevation is proposed to have a double width garage door. At ground floor the windows on the hostdwelling are to remain with one being reduced in size. The front door is proposed to be replaced with a timber door with two sidelights.

On the rear (west) elevation the rear porch is proposed to be demolished and a window is proposed to be inserted in its place. On the main body of the extension two windows are proposed at both first floor and ground floor of which are in a similar style and size as those present on the hostdwelling.

On the south side elevation two small obscurely glazed windows are proposed at first floor, at ground floor two sets of bi-folding doors are proposed to be positioned towards the rear of the dwelling.

No additional windows are proposed on the north side elevation.

Materials

Materials proposed are slate roof tiles and bricks to match the hostdwelling. Windows and doors are proposed to be timber in keeping with the existing. Corbel brick eaves detailing is proposed to match the hostdwelling. Timber fascia eaves details are also proposed to match the existing property.

Floorspace/CIL

The ground floor portion of the proposal seeks to create 74 m² net additional floor-space and the first floor portion creates a net addition of 45m² - the proposal also includes the demolition of the existing ground floor rear porch which is approx. 5 m². Overall there will be a net additional floor space of 114 m².

Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

The occupiers of 11 properties have been individually notified by letter.

Planning Policy Framework

The Development Plan

Newark and Sherwood Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2011)

Core Policy 9: Sustainable Design

Allocations & Development Management DPD

Policies relevant to this application -

Policy DM5: Design

Policy DM6: Householder Development

Other Material Planning Considerations

- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- Planning Practice Guidance 2014
- Householder Development SPD 2014

Consultations

South Scarle Parish Council – No comments have been received to date.

NCC Highways – “The proposed development will have negligible impact on the public highway. Therefore no objections are raised.”

Local Residents - Comments have been received from local residents. On the initial proposal 5 comments were received in objection and 7 were received in support of the proposal. Revised plans were submitted and the local people were offered a second opportunity to comment on the plans. 3 letters were received reiterating comments in objection. Comments in objection include:

- Overbearing impact upon neighbouring properties
- Loss of neighbouring amenity
- Proposal is the same as an application for a new dwelling
- Detrimental impact upon the character of the area

- Impact upon the highway due to more cars anticipated
- Loss of a view
- Loss of light
- Pressure on existing village services

Comments of the Business Manager

Principle of Development

Householder developments are accepted in principle subject to an assessment of numerous criteria outlined in Policy DM6. These criteria include the provision that the proposal should respect the character of the surrounding area. The overall shape, size and position of an extension must not dominate the existing house or the character of the surrounding area. Policy DM5 accepts development providing that it does not unacceptably reduce amenity in terms of overbearing impacts, loss of light and privacy.

Impact on Character of Area

Policy DM6 of the DPD states that planning permission will be granted for householder development provided that the proposal reflects the character of the area and existing dwelling in terms of design and materials.

The hostdwelling is sited along Washtub Lane, a residential road, and is set back from the roadside with a gravel front garden with grass to the side and rear of the property. The dwelling is located abutting the northernmost boundary of the site and as such has a U shaped garden. The property has two access points off Washtub Lane, one to the east serving the front of the property and one to the south which is a redundant access point. It is noted that the property is approx. 25 m south of the South Scarle Conservation Area, however, given the degree of separation and location of the dwelling on Washtub Lane it is not considered that the host dwelling would have any impact upon the conservation area that would need to be considered within this appraisal.

It is acknowledged that the properties on Washtub Lane are of varying character and appearance, with a more modern development opposite the hostdwelling to the east that are more uniform in style.

The host dwelling is set approximately 12 m back from the highway and at present, the boundary abutting the highway is treated with a 4ft (approx.) high boundary fence. Permission is being sought to remove the access point that lies to the south of the property and given the dwelling has an established access point to the east which serves the driveway, the removal of this secondary access point is not considered to impact the character or appearance of the area.

With regards to the extensions proposed to the host dwelling, the proposed development would result in the re-modelling of the current dwelling which is considered to be of no special architectural merit and has been unsympathetically albeit functionally extended previously. The proposed development would introduce a relatively symmetrical frontage with eaves dormer windows replicated on the side extension to match the hostdwelling. The extension is proposed to be constructed in materials to match the existing property and this is considered to be acceptable and will ensure the extension assimilates well with the host. The extension also seeks to introduce an integrated double garage to the property with a large boarded garage door.

The property is not aligned with other neighbouring dwellings and set back from the roadside towards the northernmost boundary giving the dwelling a U shaped garden area. As such most of the dwelling is visible within the public realm from the side and front boundaries. The neighbouring dwelling to the south-east sits within the plot for the hostdwelling but is bound by an approx. 4 ft boundary fence and dense vegetation and trees. The proposal seeks to increase the southern boundary of the site to a 6ft fence and this is considered to be acceptable.

I am mindful that the proposal seeks to substantially extend the footprint of the host-dwelling. I note that the host-dwelling has a substantial curtilage and in my view the extension to the dwelling would still retain a reasonable amount of private amenity space commensurate to the size of the dwelling. I acknowledge that the Householder Development SPD advises that additions must respect the hostdwelling so that they are balanced with the scale and proportions, I note that the SPD also advises that additions are acceptable where they are well related in characteristics of the application site. Given the aforementioned design complements the front elevation of the property I am satisfied that the well related characteristic of the extension would negate the harm of an extension and therefore conclude that the extension would not present as an incongruous addition to the hostdwelling.

The SPD advises that additions must have a roof style and pitch which is sympathetic to that of the hostdwelling; I note that the proposal is to tie in with the ridge and eaves of the hostdwelling. I note that the applicant has revised the proposal in line with previous concerns and has removed the front protruding gable element which no doubt reduces the bulk of the addition. In this particular instance I do not consider it necessary to reduce the eaves and ridge height. The Council's SPD states additions should be successfully integrated with the host dwelling and surrounding area, and should also be balanced with the host dwelling and its proportions (para 7.4). I consider that even though the height hasn't been reduced, it would not unduly unbalance the overall appearance of the resulting dwelling.

Given the amendments to the proposal and lack of uniformity within the surrounding area I am of the view that the side extension will appear sympathetic to the design of the property. It is considered that the proposed extensions are proportionate to the main dwelling and garden plot and would not be incongruous additions and as such the proposal is not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the visual amenity of the original dwelling, or on the surrounding street scene.

It is accepted that the form and appearance of the proposed extensions results in a markedly different appearance to the existing building, with the front road facing design increasing by 5.8 m and including a large double garage. The altered dwelling will appear bulkier, with a matching pitched roof; however it is acknowledged that the proposal seeks to improve the hostdwelling and has been designed in keeping with the properties original features. The proposal incorporates the refurbishment and replacement of existing windows with new timber windows which is considered to be a welcomed feature to the property.

I am conscious that the proposed extensions will result in a significant increase in floor space, 114 m², however it is acknowledged that this includes the demolition of the existing rear porch. I am aware that the dwelling will therefore appear substantially larger than existing. However I note that the surrounding area is characterised with properties of varying sized and styles set within varying plots sizes and therefore I am of the view that the proposal is not significantly out of keeping with the local area and that the plot can accommodate such an increase in footprint without undue harm to the character and appearance of the area.

In conclusion it is considered that the proposed extended dwelling would overall be seen as an architectural improvement. The proposed development would result in a dwelling with a more cohesive appearance of some architectural merit which is considered to be an improvement on the currently unsympathetically altered property. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposal is for a significant extension to the dwelling and would be prominent within the street scene, the overall appearance of the extension is not, in my view, overbearing upon the character of the dwelling nor the street scene, particularly given the design to complement and balance the frontage of the host dwelling. It is not considered that the proposed development would detract from the character of the area and would in my opinion accord with policies SP9, DM5, DM6 and DM9 of the Development Plan.

Impact upon Amenity

The NPPF seeks to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Policy DM6 of the DPD states planning permission will be granted for householder development provided it would not adversely affect the amenities of the adjoining premises, in terms of loss of privacy or overshadowing.

In addition, the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) gives further advice in relation to the assessment of neighbour and occupier amenity. The SPD advises that when considering the potential for overbearing and overshadowing, regard should be given to the height and depth of the proposal, the orientation of the proposed addition and the positioning of the proposal in relation to the principal windows of habitable rooms in neighbouring properties as well as the level of separation from neighbouring properties.

The Council's SPD states that for two storey additions "*it may be necessary to apply the 45 degree approach to assess whether the proposed depth will lead to unacceptable neighbour impact*" (para 8.4). Given that the two storey addition is on the side elevation that is separated from neighbouring dwellings and approx. 2 m from the common boundary with the property to the South-East and is screened by the approx. 6 ft boundary treatment I do not anticipate that any issues will occur as a result of this extension with regards to overshadowing.

There are four additional windows proposed on the west rear elevation however I consider these to be appropriate and would not harm neighbour amenity from adverse overlooking given the separation distances and positioning of the property approximately 21 m from the property to the rear (Blaven). The rear boundary is also treated with an approximately 4ft high boundary fence of which will provide adequate ground level screening.

Two additional eaves dormer windows are proposed on the east facing front elevation as well as sidelights either side of the front door. The closest property across the highway is in excess of 19 m from the front elevation of the host dwelling and as such I do not anticipate any privacy issues will occur. No additional windows are proposed on the north facing side elevation.

On the south side elevation one large window is present at first floor and one window is present at ground floor towards the east of the property close to the SE neighbouring dwelling. The proposal seeks to remove the ground floor window and reposition the windows at ground floor towards the westerly side of the side elevation. Sliding/folding doors are proposed here. At first floor two small obscurely glazed windows are proposed to serve bathrooms. Given the alignment of the host dwelling within its plot I do not anticipate any privacy issues will occur as a result of the insertion of these windows. The surrounding properties are orientated away from this elevation

and are in excess of 30 m from the side elevation and screened by multiple boundaries. I do however think that it is appropriate to condition that the two windows on the S elevation at first floor serving the bathrooms be obscurely glazed to respect privacy of the occupier and neighbouring dwelling.

The proposal would not cause any detrimental impacts from overlooking, overbearing or loss of light to adjoining residential properties by virtue of their separation. The nearest affected neighbour would be Washtub Cottage to the south-east of the site. However this dwelling is set approx. 10 m forward from the application dwelling and due to the positioning of windows and boundary treatment, I do not anticipate that the proposal will result in significant harm to their amenity.

On the basis of the above the proposed extension is not considered to affect the residential amenity of any neighbouring residents including loss of light, privacy or overbearing impacts, in accordance with Policy DM6. I assess the impact of the proposal on amenity to be neutral and therefore satisfy policy DM5 & DM6.

Impact upon the Highway

Spatial Policy 7 indicates that development proposals should be appropriate for the highway network in terms of the volume and nature of traffic generated and ensure the safety, convenience and free flow of traffic using the highway are not adversely affected; and that appropriate parking provision is provided. Policy DM5 of the DPD requires the provision of safe access to new development and appropriate parking provision.

I note that concerns have been raised by the local residents about the impact the extension may have on the highway. I appreciate these concerns and note that the proposal seeks to increase the number of bedrooms within the property from 4 to 5. However I also acknowledge that the proposal has made the provision for 2 additional parking spaces within the double garage and that the site has an ample amount of off street parking to provide for a dwelling of this size. Whilst I acknowledge that Washtub Lane is a narrow road that serves a number of dwelling I do not feel that this proposal to extend Rose Cottage will exacerbate any highways issues or have a detrimental impact upon the highway. Indeed the Highway Authority have raised no objection and have stated "The proposed development will have negligible impact on the public highway. Therefore no objections are raised"

Given the comments from Highway Authority, I am of the opinion that the proposal would not lead to a significant impact on highway safety and would not conflict with aims of Spatial Policy 7 and Policy DM5.

Flooding/Surface Water

The site is not located within a medium or high risk flood zone as defined by the Environment Agency data and the proposal constitutes minor development of under 250m² in floor area. I consider the site has adequate drainage provision within it and sufficient porous surfacing to not increase the surface water run off elsewhere. I do not consider the proposal would cause any detrimental impacts to neighbours or the surrounding area from surface water run off or flooding impacts from the development.

Other Matters

Comments have been received from neighbouring occupiers which object to the proposal and they have been duly taken on board. The comments raised which relate to the impact upon the amenity of the local people, impact upon the character of the area and impact upon the highway have been assessed above. I note that a comment has been received regarding the scale of the proposal and that it constitutes the creation of a new dwelling within South Scare. I appreciate that the proposal seeks to significantly extend the dwelling; however the extension is considered to be proportionate to the existing dwelling and site and is not considered to be an over intensification of development. Splitting the site to create an additional dwelling would require a separate planning application in its own right.

I note that the concerns over 'loss of a view' within the wider area and from the properties to the east are also not material planning considerations.

Additionally, as the application relates to the creation of more than 100m² of additional floor space, it will be CIL liable. The site is located within the designated 'Collingham' area in accordance with the Council's CIL Charging Schedule and as such a CIL levy of £70 per square metre applies. Details of CIL requirements will be included as a note to applicant on the decision notice. Net additional gross internal floorspace following development: 114 m²

Conclusion

Whilst I am mindful that the scale and proportions of the extension to this dwelling are extensive, I acknowledge that the applicant has amended the design to balance the front elevation of the extension to propose an extension that would not unduly impact the character of the hostdwelling or surrounding area, and would also not detrimentally impact the amenity of neighbouring properties. As such it is considered that there are no material considerations why planning permission should not be granted.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

01

The development hereby permitted shall not begin later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

02

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the following approved plan references

- Site Location Plan - 16032.01 REV A
- Amended Proposed Plans – 16032.03J
- Amended Proposed Elevations – 16032.04K

unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority through the approval of a non-material amendment to the permission.

Reason: So as to define this permission.

03

The development hereby permitted shall be constructed entirely of the material details submitted as part of the planning application, stated in Section 11 of the application form, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

04

The two first floor window openings on the south elevation shall be obscured glazed to level 3 or higher on the Pilkington scale of privacy or equivalent and shall be non-opening up to a minimum height of 1.7m above the internal floor level of the room in which it is installed. This specification shall be complied with before the development is occupied and thereafter be retained for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard against overlooking and loss of privacy in the interests of amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties

Informative

01

This application has been the subject of discussions during the application process to ensure that the proposal is acceptable. The District Planning Authority has accordingly worked positively and pro-actively, seeking solutions to problems arising in coming to its decision. This is fully in accordance with Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010 (as amended).

02

The applicant is advised that all planning permissions granted on or after the 1st December 2011 may be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Full details of CIL are available on the Council's website at www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk

The proposed development has been assessed and it is the Council's view that CIL is PAYABLE on the development hereby approved as the gross internal area of new build is more than 100 square metres.

Background Papers

Application case file.

For further information, please contact Honor Whitfield on ext. 5827.

All submission documents relating to this planning application can be found on the following website www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk.

Kirsty Cole
Deputy Chief Executive

Committee Plan - 17/01987/FUL

