

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 JANUARY 2019

Application No:	18/01699/FUL	
Proposal:	Householder application for erection of a single storey side extension and porch	
Location:	151 Kirklington Road, Rainworth, Nottinghamshire, NG21 0LA	
Applicant:	Mr Mark Ward	
Registered:	6 September 2018	Target Date: 1 November 2018

This application is referred to the Planning Committee for determination by the Local Ward Member (Cllr L Tift) in the interests of fairness and the planning issues raised being the impact on the neighbouring property and loss of privacy due to the differences in the levels.

The Site

The application site is a rectangular plot on the southern side of Kirklington Road within the Service Centre of Rainworth and is surrounded predominantly by other residential properties.

The site hosts a brick and tile semi-detached two storey property with a dual-pitched roof sloping away from the highway (to the north). The attached dwelling is located to the west side of the host property and is set with its gable end facing the highway. This neighbouring property is on the corner of Kirklington Road and Rufford Avenue.

The neighbouring dwelling to the east is a semi-detached chalet bungalow (6 Forest Close) with a steep roof pitch and similar ridge height to 151 Kirklington Road. This neighbouring property and the next two along are of the same design and are set forward of the host property by approx. 9m which results in the front elevation of the host dwelling being in line with the rear elevation of number 6 Forest Close. This neighbouring property is set between 0.2-0.5m lower than the application site due to a change in land levels.

The rear of the property is bound by the rear garden of an adjacent dwelling. The side boundary with 6 Forest Close is made up of a c.1m high wood panel fence; it is noted that several conifer trees have recently been removed along this boundary, opening up the visibility into the sit from the east. The front boundary with the highway is made up of fencing and gates at approx. 1.5m height.

The property benefits from a mostly hard surfaced frontage which provides off street car parking with amenity space to the eastern side of the property closed off with a fence and gate at C2m height. The area behind this gate (where the side extension is proposed) is hard surfaced.

Relevant Site History

No planning history.

The Proposal

The proposal is for a single storey side extension that would feature a small front projection and a fully hipped pitched roof as well as a porch.

The extension would measure a maximum of 3m in width and 6.9m in length (including 0.8m projection from main front elevation), with a height of 2.4m high to eaves level and 3.8m to the ridge of the proposed lean-to roof.

The proposed porch would measure 1.2m length and 2.2m in width with a height of 2.4m high to the eaves and 3m to ridge of the pitched roof.

It is proposed that the extensions would be constructed using materials to match the host dwelling.

The initial application was for a two storey side extension and porch. Following concerns raised by the Officer, the applicant has submitted a revised scheme which has reduced the proposal to a single storey addition. Consultations on this revised scheme have taken place. This report and recommendation relates to these amended plans which were submitted on 1st November 2018.

Submitted Documents

The following documents accompany the application:

- Site Location Plan
- Block Plan (received 1st November 2018)
- Levels Plan (received 10th December 2018)
- Existing and proposed elevations and existing floor plans - RRS251018 (received 1st November 2018)
- Proposed floor plans and sections - RRS261018 (received 1st November 2018)
- Photographs x2

Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of 8 neighbouring 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 (adopted July 2013)

- Policy DM5 – Design
- Policy DM6 – Householder Development
- Policy DM12 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Other Material Planning Considerations

- National Planning Policy Framework 2018
- Planning Practice Guidance
- Householder Development SPD 2014

Consultations

Rainworth Parish Council – Support Proposal

Neighbours/interested parties - Two letters have been received from a third party objecting to the proposal in its original two storey form and the revised single storey proposal. These comments can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed extension would overshadow a neighbouring garden a rear ground floor windows reducing light;
- The extension would impact on neighbouring privacy due to the view created from the side facing door and;
- The application site is on higher land than a neighbouring property and the extension would overbear the neighbouring garden even more due to this extension.

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, as well as protects the amenity of neighbouring

residents. The overall shape, size and position of an extension must not dominate the existing house or the character of the surrounding area.

Furthermore Policy DM6 also addresses amenity accepting development providing that it does not unacceptably reduce amenity in terms of overbearing impacts, loss of light and privacy.

Impact on visual amenity

Core Policy 9 and Policy DM6 of the DPD require new development to achieve a high standard of sustainable design and layout that is of an appropriate form and scale to its context, complementing the existing built and landscape environments. The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

The area consists of a mix of dwellings in terms of age and design and as such the principle of a side extension in this location is considered unlikely to have any detrimental impact on visual amenity. It is accepted that due to its location, the side extension would be visible from the public realm, however I considered the extensions to be subservient due to its single storey nature and the fully hipped lean to roof would further limit the mass of the extension. Additionally, proposed materials would match the existing dwelling. The proposal is therefore not considered to substantially alter the street scene due to its position the side of the dwelling and its small scale.

Turning to the proposed porch, this would be constructed of matching material and represent a modest front extension. I also consider the porch to provide some interest to the flat front elevation in a subservient way.

Overall I consider that the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact upon visual amenity and therefore the proposal complies with Policy DM6 of the DPD and Policy DM9 in this regard.

Impact on Residential Amenity

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, light or over-bearing impacts.

I note the comments received regarding the amenity impact of the proposed extension but on balance I am of the view that the proposal would be acceptable and cause no significant undue impact with regard to amenity.

In considering neighbours to the rear, front and west I find that due to the separation distances that would exist and the relatively low height of the extension, the proposed extension would cause no undue impact with regard to the amenity of neighbours in these locations.

Given the proximity of the proposal to number 6 Forest Close and the change in land levels between the sites, I have considered this relationship carefully. I am mindful that the extension would sit at a higher level than the neighbouring property given the change in land levels; the eaves height to the lowest point of the neighbouring property would be 2.9m. Whilst this may present a slight overbearing impact, I do not consider this height to be so overbearing so as to warrant refusal of the application, particularly given that the roof slope would slope away from the eastern boundary of the site and the minimum separation distance from the shared boundary of 0.9m (increasing to 1.5m due to the shape and layout of the plots).

Furthermore, I do not consider this extension likely to have a significant impact in terms of overshadowing; although I note that the host property is adjacent to the rear garden of number 6 I find it noteworthy that this garden faces south and any loss of sunlight as the sun move westward is unlikely to be any greater than that already caused by the existing building within the application site (as the extension would not extend beyond the existing rear building line of the host dwelling).

In considering the comments received regarding privacy I note that a revised drawing has been submitted which indicates the side door containing privacy glass. This is considered acceptable to protect amenity and this can be controlled via a suitably worded condition for clarity should Members be minded to approve the application.

Turning to the proposed porch, this addition would be modest in scale and located to front of the property, allowing a substantial distance from any neighbour so as not to cause any undue amenity impact.

Overall I am satisfied that the proposed extension would be subservient in scale and would not unacceptably impact upon existing neighbouring amenity. The proposal would therefore accord with policy DM6 of the DPD.

Other matters

For the awareness, Members may wish to note that if the front 0.8m projection of the side extension were to be omitted from the scheme, the side extension would accord with permitted development for Householder Development. Furthermore a permitted development scheme could be built right up to the shared side boundary. On this basis I consider that there is a very reasonable fall-back position available to the applicant and that this is weighted in the planning balance. As discussed above I find that the proposal is acceptable in terms of amenity and consider that this fall-back position further strengthens the acceptability of the scheme.

Conclusion

The proposal is acceptable in principle, the design is appropriate for the location and the development would not be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable and complies with local and national planning policies.

RECOMMENDATION

That full planning permission is approved subject to the following 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 plans:

- Site Location Plan
- Block Plan (received 1st November 2018)
- Existing and proposed elevations and existing floor plans - RRS251018 (received 1st November 2018)
- Proposed floor plans and sections - RRS261018 (received 1st November 2018)

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 materials details submitted as part of the planning application unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

04

Any glazing within the east facing door of the hereby approved extension shall be obscured glazed to level 3 or higher on the Pilkington scale of privacy or equivalent. 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

Informatives

01

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/cil/

The proposed development has been assessed and it is the Council's view that CIL is not payable on the development hereby approved less than 100m² floorspace is proposed.

02

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).

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application case file.

For further information, please contact Nicolla Ellis on ext 5833.

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

Matt Lamb

Business Manager Growth and Regeneration

Committee Plan - 18/01699/FUL



