

APPLICATION NO: 14/01667/FUL	OFFICER: Miss Chloe Smart
DATE REGISTERED: 17th September 2014	DATE OF EXPIRY: 12th November 2014
WARD: Up Hatherley	PARISH: Up Hatherley
APPLICANT:	Mr And Mrs Perks
AGENT:	Mr Phillip Thomas
LOCATION:	331 Hatherley Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire
PROPOSAL:	Erection of entrance porch, two storey side extension and part two storey and single storey rear extension (Following demolition of single storey rear extensions, detached rear garage and side car port)

Update to Officer Report

1. OFFICER COMMENTS

1.1. Determining Issues

1.2. The main considerations relating to this application are the design and the impact of the proposal on neighbouring amenity.

1.3. Design

1.4. Local Plan Policy CP7 requires development to be of a high standard of architectural design and to complement and respect neighbouring development.

1.5. The application dwelling is a semi-detached property with generous space to the side. The neighbouring dwelling at no. 329 Hatherley Road has not extended to the side and therefore there are no issues relating to the loss of any important visual gap between properties.

1.6. The Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Alterations and Extensions emphasises the importance of subservient extensions to existing dwellings; it is one of the five basic design principles. The guidance states;

1.7. *An extension should not dominate or detract from the original building, but play a 'supporting role'.*

1.8. Having assessed all elements of the application in its current form, officers consider the proposal is contrary to the adopted guidance in relation to residential extensions.

1.9. The proposed two storey side extension projects 2.7 metres from the side wall of the original property. The principle of this extension is considered acceptable. Members will be aware that the SPD referred to above advises that two storey extensions are required to be set back from the front elevation of the property. More specifically, the guidance relating to side extensions to semi-detached properties *normally* requires a recess of at least one metre.

1.10. The purpose of the set back is to ensure the evolution of the parent dwelling is understood. In this instance, the applicant proposes a set back of 550 mm which is less than the standard requirement within the SPD. Having considered the proposal, officers are of the view that this is an instance in which the guidance allows for flexibility. Firstly, the applicant has proposed a set back, albeit less than one metre; but this still ensures the

extension can be differentiated from the parent dwelling. Secondly, the original property benefits from a generous eaves overhang, which extends beyond the projecting bay at the front. The importance of this is that the side extension reads as a more subservient addition than it would without this roof overhang. Finally, the side extension still achieves a generous reduction in ridge height to the parent dwelling as a result of the deep overhang of the original roof and therefore would be clearly distinguishable as a later addition.

- 1.11. In light of the above, whilst it is not truly compliant with the guidance within our SPD, on balance and as a stand alone entity, the proposed side extension is considered acceptable.
- 1.12. In addition, the applicant proposes a porch to the front of the property. This would be positioned within the recess between the bay window and projecting ground floor garage proposed. The overall scale and design of this aspect of the proposal is considered to complement the character of the original property and respect the surrounding street scene.
- 1.13. The proposed two storey rear extension would extend 4.95 metres beyond the rear wall of the original property and would have a width of 5 metres. The applicant has engaged in pre-application discussions regarding extensions to the application site. Throughout this process and also as part of a previously withdrawn application, officers have consistently raised concerns about the overall scale and mass of the rear extension in particular.
- 1.14. As a result of these discussions, the proposal has been reduced in size and improvements made to the overall design, but officers consider the proposed two storey extension remains overly large and would overwhelm and dominate the building, contrary to the guidance.
- 1.15. In the context of the original dwelling, the two storey element of the rear extension would have a width only 750 mm less than the original property itself. In addition, the submitted floor plans demonstrate the proposed rear bedroom would be considerably larger than any of the existing bedrooms in the property, thereby suggesting the original proportions of the dwelling have not been respected as part of this proposal.
- 1.16. The ground floor of the proposed extension would project 6.1 metres from the rear wall of the original property (4.7 metres from the rear wall of the existing single storey extension). Officers have considered this aspect of the proposal and as a standalone, this is acceptable. The neighbouring property has a generous single storey rear extension and therefore there would be no amenity issues arising from this aspect of the proposal.
- 1.17. Throughout the pre-application process and the previously withdrawn application, the applicant has been advised on the adopted guidance and whilst some changes have been made, these do not overcome the concerns previously raised. Officers are fully supportive of the principle of extending this property and this has not been in dispute throughout the pre-application and planning application process. Indeed, within this report there is recognition that certain elements of the proposal are acceptable as standalone extensions.
- 1.18. Notwithstanding this, officers are unable to support the overall scale of the two storey rear extension in its current form. It fails to comply with the relevant policy and guidance in terms of responding to and not dominating the scale of the original dwelling. The extension would be significantly larger than those permitted to similar dwellings in the locality and would overwhelm the original property.
- 1.19. In light of all of the above, the proposal is considered unacceptable in design terms, fails to comply with Local Plan Policy CP7 and the adopted SPD.

1.20. Impact on neighbouring property

1.21. Local Plan Policy CP4 requires development to protect the existing amenity of neighbouring land users and the locality.

1.22. There have been no letters of representation received in relation to the application. Whilst no letters of objection have been received, officers have visited the site and considered the proposal from an amenity perspective.

1.23. The adjoining property benefits from a single storey rear extension. As a result of this existing extension, the proposal does not fail the light test. This confirms there would be no unacceptable loss of light to the neighbouring properties.

1.24. Notwithstanding this, it is the overbearing impact of the extensions which is considered unacceptable. This would be slightly mitigated by the existing extensions to the neighbouring property; however, officers consider the overall scale and mass of the rear extension would be oppressive and imposing. As such, the two storey rear extension would fail to protect the existing amenity enjoyed by neighbouring properties, contrary to Local Plan Policy CP4.

1.25. Ecology

1.26. Notification has been received from Gloucestershire Centre for Environmental Records regarding species of conservation importance recorded within a 250m search area of the application site. Due to the small scale nature of the proposal, it is not considered that there would be any negative impact on the ecology of the area.

2. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

2.1. To conclude, officers are firmly of the view that the proposed extension fails to comply with local plan policy CP7 and the advice contained within the supplementary planning document titled 'Residential alterations and extensions'. The proposal fails to respond to the original dwelling in terms of its scale and massing, and therefore lacks the necessary subservience.

2.2. The principle of extending the original dwelling is not disputed; however the current proposal does not comply with the relevant policies and is therefore not an acceptable means of extending this property.

2.3. Finally, despite a lack of objection from neighbours, the proposed two storey rear extension would have an oppressive and overbearing impact on the adjoining property, by virtue of its scale and mass.

2.4. It is recommended that members resolve to refuse planning permission based on the analysis set out within this report, and for the reason set out below.

3. REFUSAL REASONS

- 1 The cumulative impact of the proposed extensions is considered harmful to the character of the original dwelling, by virtue of their overall scale and mass.

In particular, the proposed two storey rear extension is considered is overly wide and deep, which as a result, lacks subservience to the original dwelling and would have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties.

The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document titled 'Residential Alterations and Extensions' (Adopted 2008) , together with the aims and objectives of Local Plan Policies CP4 and CP7, and national guidance set out within the NPPF.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 In accordance with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2012 and the provisions of the NPPF, the Local Planning Authority adopts a positive and proactive approach to dealing with planning applications and where possible, will seek solutions to any problems that arise when dealing with a planning application with the aim of fostering the delivery of sustainable development.

At the heart of this positive and proactive approach is the authority's pre-application advice service for all types of development. Further to this however, the authority publishes guidance on the Council's website on how to submit planning applications and provides full and up-to-date information in relation to planning applications to enable the applicant, and other interested parties, to track progress.

In this instance, having had regard to all material considerations, the authority cannot provide a solution that will overcome the design and amenity concerns with this development.

As a consequence, the proposal cannot be considered to be sustainable development and therefore the authority had no option but to refuse planning permission.