

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
14th November 2013

APPLICATION NO:	P0043.13	
WARD :	South Hornchurch	Date Received: 29th January 2013 Expiry Date: 26th March 2013
ADDRESS:	58 Edmund Road Rainham	
PROPOSAL:	Single storey rear extension plans amended by applicant 18/10/13)	
DRAWING NO(S):	Block plan Site plan (revised) 58EDMUNDRD.FLOOR PLAN.03 58EDMUNDRD.PROP.ELEVATIONS.02 (amended by applicant 18/10/13 58EDMUNDRD.EX.ELEVATIONS.01 (amended by applicant 18/10/13)	
RECOMMENDATION :	It is recommended that planning permission be REFUSED for the reason(s) given at the end of the report given at the end of the report.	

CALL-IN

The application has been called to Committee by Councillor Tebbutt on the grounds that the 45 degree infringement is minor.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject dwelling is a single storey, detached bungalow which lies on the north side of Edmund Road. The road comprises a very varied mix of residential properties, both in age and design and the subject dwelling is flanked with bungalow properties on either side.

Two off-street parking spaces are available to the front of the property and no trees of any amenity value will be affected by the proposal.

The land level drops somewhat at the rear of the property (north).

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The property has already been partly extended to the rear by nearly 4m with a lower ridge line to the hipped roof than the original property, alongside which is an existing lean-to extension to the same depth with a sloping roof, the highest point of which tucks under the eaves.

It is proposed to demolish the conservatory and construct an extension which will infill the space and extend across the entire width of the property to be roughly 2.8m deeper than at present.

Presently the roof has a maximum height of 5.3m which drops over the existing extension. The new roof over the proposed extension will be raised to the same height as the original property, and hipped in the rear elevation.

RELEVANT HISTORY

ES/HOR/880/50 - Extension to bungalow - Approved

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

No representations have been received.

RELEVANT POLICIES

Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.
DC33 & DC61 - LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The application is not CIL liable.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The proposed extension will not be visible from the front streetscene, therefore no issues arise in this respect.

When viewed in the rear garden environment it will relate satisfactorily to the subject dwelling and will result in no undue rear garden scene issues arising.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

As discussed above, the property has already been extended to the rear and the total depth of extensions will be around 6.8m if the proposed extension is constructed, which is contrary to Guidance which advises single storey extensions to a detached property should not exceed 4m unless special circumstances exist.

Neighbours on either side are also bungalow properties with No.60 having accommodation within its roofspace. Both neighbours have also extended to the rear with No.56 projecting further into the rear garden area than the subject dwelling at present.

It is considered therefore that if the proposed extension projects further than this neighbouring extension it will not be by very much and the impact will be minimal and not sufficient to withhold planning permission.

However, with regards the neighbour to the west (angled slightly north) No.60, the impact will be more serious.

This neighbour does not extend as far into the rear garden environment as the subject dwelling at present and the additional depth proposed will result in the subject dwelling projecting around 6m further into the garden area. Additionally the higher roof ridge over the original bungalow will be continued over the proposed extension which will be exacerbated by the drop in ground level to the rear of the property.

A notional 45 degree line has been drawn at the 4m point on the boundary to assess impact of the development and this is impeded.

Staff consider therefore that the excessive depth and height of the proposed extension will result in an unneighbourly development that will cause unacceptable loss of sunlight and daylight during the morning hours to the rear facing windows and private patio area of this neighbour, and furthermore will appear as a dominant and incongruous element in the rear garden environment, contrary to Guidance.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

No highway issues arise.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

For the reason discussed above, the proposal under consideration is considered to be contrary to the aims and objectives of the above Policies and refusal of planning permission is therefore recommended.

However, it is accepted that this view may not be taken by Members and in the event of this recommendation being turned around to an approval of planning permission, it is recommended that standard conditions be attached to ensure the development is commenced within three years of the date of decision (SC4) and that the use of matching materials is employed (SC10).

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the reason(s) given at the end of the report

1. Reason for refusal - Residential Extensions

The proposed rear extension would, by reason of its excessive depth, height and position, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development, as well as having an adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

APPLICATION NO:	P0648.13	
WARD :	Gooshays	Date Received: 24th May 2013 Expiry Date: 19th July 2013
ADDRESS:	Alicia Cottage Paternoster Row Noak Hill Romford	
PROPOSAL:	Single storey rear extension	
DRAWING NO(S):	2785.02 2785.03	
RECOMMENDATION :	It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report given at the end of the report.	

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a detached dwelling located on the west side of Paternoster Row which is situated within the Metropolitan Green Belt. There are previous extensions to the cottage including a two storey side addition, a first floor rear extension and also a rear conservatory.

Ground level gently rises from the back of the house towards the rear garden. There is also an outbuilding to the north of the house with at least two car parking spaces directly to the front on hardstanding. No trees will be affected.

The surrounding area comprises of similar and also larger residential properties sparsely arranged along Paternoster Row, which set back towards areas of open land.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The applicant is seeking planning consent to remove/replace an existing rear conservatory with a single storey rear extension.

The proposed extension is 4 metres deep by 4.8 metres wide, and will feature a pitched roof including two rooflights which is set 2.8 metres high to the eaves and 3.5 metres high to the ridge. Plans indicate that the extension will be used as a Sun Lounge.

RELEVANT HISTORY

D0198.12 - Certificate of lawfulness for a detached garden room to rear garden
PP not required 13-12-2012

P2134.05 - Proposed first floor rear extension
Apprv with cons 11-01-2006

P0104.95 - Single storey rear extension
Apprv with cons 31-03-1995

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Letters were sent to 9 neighbouring properties. No responses have been received.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

CP14 - Green Belt
DC33 - Car Parking
DC45 - Appropriate Development in the Green Belt
DC61 - Urban Design
SPD4 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

OTHER

LONDON PLAN - 7.16 - Green Belt
LONDON PLAN - 7.4 - Local character
LONDON PLAN - 7.6 - Architecture
NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

N/A

STAFF COMMENTS

Environmental Health - No representations received.

GREEN BELT IMPLICATIONS

The application site falls within the Metropolitan Green Belt however, this does not preclude extensions to residential properties in principle. National and local policies refer to a presumption against inappropriate development in Green Belt areas. Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that the extension or alteration of a building may be acceptable in the Green Belt provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

The original dwelling had a volume of approximately 331 cubic metres. Planning permission was granted in 1988 for the erection of a two storey side extension. Further planning consents were granted in 1995 for the rear conservatory, and also in 2005 planning permission was granted for a first floor rear extension. The existing dwelling has an overall volume of approximately 550 cubic metres which is an increase of approximately 66% to the original dwelling. The proposed extension would add an additional 13 cubic metres (approx.).

In this case, the proposed development would amount to a total increase of 563 cubic metres which is approximately 70% over and above the original dwelling, which is clearly in excess of what would normally be acceptable. Nonetheless, the written justification to the policy makes it clear that more substantial extensions may be appropriate subject to there being no harm to the Green Belt.

Given that the footprint of the existing conservatory will be increased by 1 metre in depth, which will increase the volume of the existing dwelling by approximately 4%. Therefore, staff conclude that the proposed replacement of the existing rear conservatory would not be excessive and the impact on the Green Belt would be negligible. Staff also recognise that this is a balanced decision and Members may feel that the proposed single storey rear extension in combination with previous additions to the property may result in unacceptable harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

Replacing the existing rear conservatory with the proposed single storey rear extension will

increase the footprint of the existing rear extension by 1 metre in depth. However, in terms of its bulk, scale and massing, the 1m increase in depth is not considered excessive, and does not project beyond 4 metres of the rear building line in accordance with the Councils 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' SPD. In addition, the proposed pitched roof design, set 2.8 metres high to the eaves and 3.5 metres to the ridge also complies with the above Council guidance. The extension is also considered to reflect the design and character of the main house. Furthermore, the extension is not publicly visible and there would be no impact on the character of the surrounding area.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

The surrounding neighbouring properties are sparsely set away from each other at a fair distance, and thereby the proposed rear extension is not considered to impact upon the amenity of the surrounding neighbouring properties.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

Sufficient space would remain on-site for vehicle parking, in line with policy guidelines. It is considered that the proposal would not create any highway or parking issues.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal will have a volume that results in development to the property being greater than the 50% normally permitted by Policy DC45 and its acceptability is a matter of judgement. Based upon the size of the original property and on merit, Staff consider the proposal would not harm the openness of the Green Belt, as the proposal to replace the existing conservatory would result in a negligible increase to the existing house. It is considered that the proposal would not be harmful to the streetscene or the amenity of neighbouring properties. In light of the above, it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report

1. SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:-

To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. SC10 (Matching materials)

All new external finishes shall be carried out in materials to match those of the existing building(s) to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

3. SC32 (Accordance with plans)

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason:-

The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

INFORMATIVES

1 Approval - No negotiation required

Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

APPLICATION NO:	P0708.13	
WARD :	Hacton	Date Received: 13th June 2013 Expiry Date: 8th August 2013
ADDRESS:	69 Suttons Avenue Horchurch	
PROPOSAL:	Two storey side, single storey rear & front extensions (revised plans received 22/10/13)	
DRAWING NO(S):	1319/1 1319/2A (revised)	
RECOMMENDATION :	It is recommended that planning permission be REFUSED for the reason(s) given at the end of the report given at the end of the report.	

CALL-IN

The application has been called into Committee for decision by Councillor Nic Dodin on the grounds of consistency of similar built extensions to properties in the same road and adjoining roads in the area.

SITE DESCRIPTION

Two-storey, hipped roof, semi-detached dwelling. An existing detached garage is accessed from Connaught Road and one off-street parking space is available to the front of the property. The land is fairly level. No trees will be affected by the proposed development.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Two storey side, single storey rear and front extensions.

At the side of the property is proposed a two storey extension measuring 2.7m wide by 6.8m deep (to the rear wall of the house), which will be setback 1m from the main front wall of the property at first floor level. The extension will have a hipped roof 7.85m high to the same eaves height as existing.

In the front elevation the ground floor of the side extension will adjoin a 1.2m deep porch and a 3.8m high, sloping roof will be provided over both elements which will be hipped close to the side boundary.

At the rear is proposed a 4m deep extension to the entire width of the extended dwelling which will have a 3.2m high flat roof into which a roof lantern will be constructed.

RELEVANT HISTORY

None.

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

No objections have been received.

RELEVANT POLICIES

Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.
DC33 & DC61 - LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

Not CIL liable.

STAFF COMMENTS

The two storey side extension, as originally submitted, proposed the flank wall to be constructed directly on the border with the side public highway. This is contrary to Guidance which advises that the flank wall of side extensions to corner properties must be set back at least one metre from the back edge of the footway and should not project forward of the building line of properties along the adjoining street in order to maintain the building line.

The Agent was requested to provide a full 1m separation but has declined to do so. Revised plans have however been received with the width of the extension reduced slightly and the high timber fence to the side reinstated.

The roof of the proposed single storey front extension has also been hipped to reduce bulk.

The proposal will now be assessed as revised.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

Suttons Avenue is a fairly major road within the borough which carries considerable vehicular traffic through from Station Lane to Abbs Cross Lane.

Site inspection reveals that this side of Suttons Avenue is characterised by mainly semi-detached, two storey houses of broadly similar design, scale and massing. Houses on the opposite side of the road however differ in design and are interspersed by bungalows further to the west. On the opposite side of the road junction, No.67, is of similar design as the subject property and benefits from a flat roof single storey side extension with a separation gap of about 1m to the flank boundary. In all, this part of Suttons Avenue has a pleasant, generally open and spacious, residential ambience.

The proposed development is considered to relate acceptably to the subject dwelling and has been designed in sympathy with the character of the existing dwelling, with an appropriate roof design, materials and fenestration. As required by Guidance, the first floor of the side extension has been setback 1m from the front building line, with a lower roof line, to create a subservient impression.

It is noted however, that its attached neighbour, No.71, will not be able to construct a similar development due to the restrictions of its site and the pair, therefore, will appear unbalanced in the streetscene.

Although it is noted the proposed side extension will be forward of the front building line of properties in Connaught Road, contrary to Guidance, staff consider this will be acceptable in this instance due to the separation distance of around 33m.

As discussed earlier, the agent has been requested to provide a 1m separation from the boundary with the public highway, but following discussions with the applicant, has declined to do so. In support of this decision the applicant has provided the addresses of five properties in

the borough that he considers have set a precedent for development constructed on the boundary with the public highway.

The history of the properties have been researched and the following has been found:

No.45 Suttons Avenue - P1832.03 - a resubmission of an earlier refusal which was considered to be acceptable as the two storey side extension would only project to the rear wall of the property. (Planning permission granted prior to current guidance).

No.149 Suttons Avenue - P1600.01 - Approved (prior to current guidance).

No.67 Park Drive, Upminster - P0610.11 - Refused, allowed on appeal.

No.103 Cranston Park Avenue, Upminster - P1484.12 - Refused, allowed on appeal.

No.126 Chelmsford Avenue, Collier Row - P0545.12 - Refused, allowed on appeal.

The properties in Upminster and Collier Row are considered to be too far removed from the subject dwelling to be taken into consideration as they do not form part of the immediate vicinity of the subject dwelling and in any event were allowed on appeal and the two in Suttons Avenue were granted planning permission prior to current guidance.

Revised plans now propose the side extension to be brought slightly off the side boundary to enable the reinstatement of the high boundary fence and also the roof of the proposed front extension has been hipped away to reduce bulk.

However, although to be welcomed, Staff consider these changes do not overcome previous concerns that the proposed development will unacceptably reduce the openness of this part of Suttons Avenue and particularly will result in an uncharacteristic and harmful sense of enclosure at the junction with Connaught Road.

In support of this view, further inspection of recent Council records for two storey side extensions which were refused planning permission has been carried out and it has been found that several appeal decisions this year have been dismissed and this Authority's decision has been upheld.

Firstly, No.72 Crowlands Avenue proposed only a single storey side extension which would have been built right on the boundary with Jutsums Avenue, reference P1475.12. The Inspector considered that it would appear as an intrusive and incongruous feature on a prominent corner plot, harmful to the street scene.

Secondly, No.26 Rosewood Avenue proposed a two storey side and first floor rear extension, reference P1024.12. It would have maintained a full 1m separation to the boundary with the public highway of St Andrews Avenue but the Inspector agreed with this Authority's view that the extension would have created a dominant and visually intrusive entrance point into Rosewood Avenue.

Thirdly, P0161.13 - 99 Billet Lane, set within the Langton's Conservation Area. A two storey side and single storey rear extension was proposed which maintained at least a 1m separation to the boundary. However, it was considered an unacceptably detrimental impact on the pattern of development in the area would occur, which would result in a failure to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The Inspector supported this view and dismissed the appeal.

Lastly, 35 Park Drive proposed a single storey side extension, reference P1876.07, which would have been built right on the boundary with the public highway. This was a resubmission of an earlier, refused proposal for a two storey side extension, reference P0269.07 which was refused planning permission. The single storey extension was the subject of an appeal and the Inspector agreed with this Authority and dismissed the appeal.

A subsequent resubmission, reference P1552.12, for a two storey and single storey side extension and single storey rear extension was submitted to this Authority and although it maintained a 1m separation from the public highway of Leasway, it was refused planning permission due to its position well forward of the front building line of properties in Leasway and also because it

would have appeared as an unacceptably dominant and intrusive feature within the streetscene, and would detract from the relatively open and spacious character of this particular road junction.

Although the Inspector did not agree with all the reasons as to why the proposal was unacceptable, he did agree that given the prominence of the site within the streetscene, the impact of the development would be unacceptably intrusive, causing significant harm to the character of the area.

It is considered, therefore, that the proposal now under consideration is unacceptable and no special circumstances exist to warrant an exception to Guidance in this instance.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

The side extension would not be visible to the attached neighbour at No.71 and would therefore have no impact on the amenity of the occupiers of this property.

With regards the single storey rear extension, at a height of 3.2m it does slightly exceed Guidance of 3m, but is considered to be acceptable in this instance as this attached neighbour has already extended at the rear in a similar manner and will not be affected.

No other neighbouring properties will be affected by the proposed development.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

No highway issues arise.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is considered to be contrary to the aims and objectives of the above Policies and Guidance. Refusal of planning permission is accordingly recommended .

However, it is accepted that this view may not be taken by Members and in the event of this recommendation being turned around to an approval of planning permission, it is recommended that standard conditions be attached to ensure the development is commenced within three years of the date of decision (SC4) and that the use of matching materials is employed (SC10).

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the reason(s) given at the end of the report

1. Reason for refusal - Streetscene

The proposed development would, by reason of its position close to the boundary with the public highway, unacceptably reduce the openness of this part of Suttons Avenue and particularly will result in an uncharacteristic and harmful sense of enclosure at the junction with Connaught Road. The development is therefore considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and is contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

APPLICATION NO:	P0761.13	
WARD :	St Andrew's	Date Received: 21st June 2013 Expiry Date: 16th August 2013
ADDRESS:	2 Link Way Hornchurch	
PROPOSAL:	Proposed first floor side extension	
DRAWING NO(S):	VGAS/691/B VGAS/691/5 VGAS/691/6 VGAS/691/7 VGAS/691/2A VGAS/691/3A VGAS/691/4A	
RECOMMENDATION :	It is recommended that planning permission be REFUSED for the reason(s) given at the end of the report given at the end of the report.	

CALL-IN

This application has been called into Committee for decision by Councillor John Mylod due to the special needs of the family with regard to a disabled son. Councillor Mylod is of the opinion that this is an acceptable scheme in it's present form.

SITE DESCRIPTION

A semi-detached property located at the junction between Link Way and Glebe Way. The property has a hipped roof and is finished in light painted render. Inspection reveals that the dwelling benefits from a single storey side extension incorporating a pitched roof. At the front there is an inset porch and a hard standing to provide off street parking together with an small area of soft landscaping.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The proposal is for a first floor side extension that will sit above the existing single storey side extension that extends three metres to the rear elevation.

The first floor side extension measures 9.60m in depth, 3.80m in width narrowing to 2.30m to the front elevation. The hipped roof ridge height measures 7.50m lowering to 6.80m towards the rear.

RELEVANT HISTORY

L/HAV 1077/70 - Conservatory - Approved
P1497.85 Living and bedroom extension - Approved
P0427.87 - Kitchen/dining ground floor extension - Approved

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Nine letters of consultation were sent to neighbouring properties with no representations received.

RELEVANT POLICIES

Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.
DC33 & DC61 - LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan

Document.

London Plan - 7.4 - Local Character
London Plan - 7.6 - Architecture

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

N/A

STAFF COMMENTS

This proposed development is for the benefit of a disabled family member who has special needs. In this instance, although consideration has been afforded to the special circumstances of the family only limited weight can be afforded since such needs are by their very nature temporary and can change at any time.

The proposal is positioned above an existing single storey side extension, very close to the side boundary adjacent to the public highway. This is contrary to Guidance which advises that the flank wall of side extensions to corner properties must be set back at least one metre from the back edge of the footway and should not project forward of the building line of properties along the adjoining street in order to minimise the visual impact and maintain the open character of the street scene.

The applicants have submitted a supporting statement with photos of similar developments as examples. Although these are not visible from the subject site, investigations reveal that the developments to these properties were carried out pre-current policy guidance.

20 Link Way - No recent planning history found
70 Link Way - No recent planning history found
3 Glebe Way - No recent planning history found
4 Glebe Way - P1082.02 Two storey side extension and single storey side and rear extensions
Approved

Alternative proposals were suggested by staff involving the possibility of a first floor rear extension or a loft conversion, both suggestions have been declined.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The subject property is sited on a corner plot at the junction of Link Way and Glebe Way and as such occupies a particularly prominent position within the streetscene. The land level slopes slightly upwards from east to west along Glebe Way to the north side of the property.

The property has previously been extended to the side with a single storey hipped roof development that matches well with the original dwelling.

Inspection reveals there to be a pleasant open aspect within the streetscene especially to the rear of the properties in Link Way and when viewed from the east and west in Glebe Way. In Staff view the proposed development would unacceptably reduce the pleasant openness of the area that currently exists on this junction and appear obtrusive and overbearing.

The Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD, paragraph 6.12 states that the flank wall of side extensions must be set back at least one metre from the back edge of the footway and should not project forward of the building line of properties along the adjoining street in order to maintain uniformity. In this respect, the proposal fails to comply with adopted guidelines.

The proposed development will sit above the existing single storey side development that extends approximately 3m to the rear elevation and in doing so creates significant additional bulk. The proposal has not been set away from the flank boundary by the required one metre and this additional bulk will result in a greater impact to that which already exists within the streetscene and garden environment. The development will also be positioned forward of the building line of the properties that lie north west in Glebe Way.

It is acknowledged that a new low wall is proposed along the flank boundary to join the existing front pillars and existing high brick wall to the rear, thus creating a visual break in the development when viewed along Glebe Way. On the other hand, the property is located in a highly visible position on the corner of a junction of Glebe Way and the existing single storey extension already appears as a prominent feature within the streetscene. Staff consider the incorporation of this detail is not sufficient to reduce the visual harm caused by this additional development.

Although examples of two storey side developments have been submitted, most appear to have been constructed pre-current policy and were not visible from the subject site. They have little impact therefore on the character and appearance of the area immediately surrounding the subject dwelling.

The proposed development due to scale and bulk would appear obtrusive, overbearing and intrusive to the appearance of the streetscene. The proposal would close the pleasant openness that exists within the streetscene and would be detrimental and harmful to the surrounding streetscene.

The proposal is therefore considered to exacerbate the existing harmful impact within the streetscene and rear garden environment to an unacceptable level.

This recommendation is based on failure to comply with a 1m separation from the boundary with the public highway and a level of judgement of the unacceptable appearance within the streetscene. The building line has already been compromised and as such is not considered to hold enough weight to be included.

In support of this view, further inspection of recent Council records for two storey side extensions which were refused planning permission has been carried out and it has been found that several appeal decisions this year have been dismissed and this Authority's decision has been upheld.

Firstly, No.72 Crowlands Avenue proposed only a single storey side extension which would have been built right on the boundary with Jutsums Avenue, reference P1475.12. The Inspector considered that it would appear as an intrusive and incongruous feature on a prominent corner plot, harmful to the street scene.

Secondly, No.26 Rosewood Avenue proposed a two storey side and first floor rear extension, reference P1024.12. It would have maintained a full 1m separation to the boundary with the public highway of St Andrews Avenue but the Inspector agreed with this Authority's view that the extension would have created a dominant and visually intrusive entrance point into Rosewood Avenue.

Thirdly, P0161.13 - 99 Billet Lane, set within the Langton's Conservation Area. A two storey side and single storey rear extension was proposed which maintained at least a 1m separation to the boundary. However, it was considered an unacceptably detrimental impact on the pattern of development in the area would occur, which would result in a failure to preserve and enhance

the character and appearance of the conservation area. The Inspector supported this view and dismissed the appeal.

Lastly, 35 Park Drive proposed a single storey side extension, reference P1876.07, which would have been built right on the boundary with the public highway. This was a resubmission of an earlier, refused proposal for a two storey side extension, reference P0269.07 which was refused planning permission. The single storey extension was the subject of an appeal and the Inspector agreed with this Authority and dismissed the appeal. A subsequent resubmission, reference P1552.12, for a two storey and single storey side extension and single storey rear extension was submitted to this Authority and although it maintained a 1m separation from the public highway of Leasway, it was refused planning permission due to its position well forward of the front building line of properties in Leasway and also because it would have appeared as an unacceptably dominant and intrusive feature within the streetscene, and would detract from the relatively open and spacious character of this particular road junction.

Although the Inspector did not agree with all the reasons as to why the proposal was unacceptable, he did agree that given the prominence of the site within the streetscene, the impact of the development would be unacceptably intrusive, causing significant harm to the character of the area.

It is considered, therefore, that the proposal now under consideration is unacceptable and no special circumstances exist to warrant an exception to Guidance in this instance.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

The attached neighbouring property to the south is unlikely to be affected by the proposal as the development will be sited on the opposite side to the north of the property.

With regard to the surrounding neighbouring properties in Glebe Way, it is considered that the proposal will cause no greater impact to that which already exists.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

There is sufficient parking to the front of the property and no highway issues are raised.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is not considered to be in accordance with the above-mentioned policies and guidance and refusal is recommended.

However, it is accepted that in coming to this view it is recognised that an element of judgement is involved and that different weight may be apportioned to the harm arising from the scheme. This being the case and in the event that Members are minded to grant planning permission for the development it is recommended that standard conditions be imposed to ensure the development is commenced within three years of the date of decision (SC4) and that the use of matching materials is employed (SC10).

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the reason(s) given at the end of the report

1. Reason for refusal - Streetscene

The proposed development would, by reason of its height, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

1 Refusal - No negotiation

Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.