

HADLEIGH – 13 STATION ROAD.

Erection of two-storey side extension.

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Newman

Case Officer: Richard Collins

BACKGROUND

A panel of Members inspected this site on 28 June 2006 in order to assess the relationship to and impact on the neighbouring properties, and the possible need for felling of trees.

SITE

1. The application site is located on the north side of Station Road, with a width of approximately 18.5 metres, an approximate depth of 47 metres and encompasses an area of approximately 0.09 hectares. The site levels rise from north to south and west to east. The site lies wholly within the built-up area boundary for the town. The site does not lie within any other constraint areas.
2. The application property is a 2 storey red brick dwelling, which is sited approximately 10 metres back from the highway (Station Road). This part of Station Road comprises a mixture of bungalows, chalet bungalows and 2-storey dwellings, all situated well back from the highway. The majority of these properties are situated within spacious plots, with a varying degree of proximity to joint boundary lines.

PROPOSAL

3. This planning application seeks permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension.
4. The two-storey side extension measures 3 metres wide and 6.6 metres deep with a maximum ridge height of 6.8 metres. The extension provides a covered carport area at ground floor, and a bedroom and en-suite at first-floor, and measures approximately 19.8 square metres.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5. 2005 – Planning permission refused for erection of two-storey side extension and front side extension to existing conservatory – B/05/01665. Planning permission was refused as it was considered the proposed extensions did not respect and reflect the design, form and proportions of the host dwelling which would detract from the balanced design, particularly of the front elevation, and would be visually harmful to the amenities of the area.

6. 1998 – Planning permission granted for the insertion of dormer window and raising height of existing roof on south elevation and construction of balcony at first floor level on north elevation (B/98/00784 refers).
7. 1987 – Planning permission granted for the erection of a two-storey side extension to provide additional bedroom over open ground floor structure (B/87/01332 refers – permission not implemented).
8. 1986 – Planning permission granted for the erection of front conservatory and car port (B/86/00140 refers).
9. 1984 – Planning permission granted for the erection of single storey front extension (B/84/00254 refers).

POLICY

Please note that details or extracts of policies are no longer included in reports – see page 4 of these papers.

10. The following adopted Development Plan policies are considered relevant to this application: -

Suffolk Structure Plan 2001

- Policy ENV3 (Design Standards)

Babergh Local Plan Alteration No.2 (2006)

The policy references below relate to the adopted version of the Local Plan - the policy numbers in some cases differ from those in the second deposit draft. Where this is the case, the previous reference number is given in brackets

- Policy HS33 (HS17) (Extensions to existing dwellings)
- Policy CN01 (General Design)

OBSERVATIONS

11. TC – Recommend refusal. TC previously recommended refusal on a previous similar scheme. This new proposal would reduce the amenities and light enjoyed by the neighbouring property and would be out of character in the area.
12. TC – (Revised plans) Recommend refusal. TC still considers that the revisions would not alter the reduction in the amenities and light currently enjoyed by the neighbouring property. The amended proposal would still be out of character in the area.
13. Suffolk Fire Service – Any comments received to be verbally updated at the meeting.
14. CHA – No objection subject to standard condition.
15. Letters - Four letters received (Three letters of objection from No.15 Station Road). The following comprises a summary of the objections and issues raised: -

- Restrict direct sunlight, heat and air flow to western elevation of neighbouring property;
- Impact on flora on neighbouring side of garden;
- Loss of neighbouring hedge and holly tree;
- Building up to boundary line is out of keeping and character of the area;
- Noise, dust and inconvenience during construction works;
- Wouldn't allow scaffolding to be erected on neighbouring property or access to maintain side extension;
- Proposal would over-power and be totally disproportional to neighbouring property and surrounding properties;
- Affect saleability and reduction of market value of neighbouring property;
- Proposal does not reflect or respect neighbouring bungalow;
- Directly impact on neighbouring bungalow due to loss of light and loss of land use;
- Potential fire risk would be created as proposal will give no fire service access to both properties in the event of a fire;
- Overlooking to front garden and conservatory of neighbouring bungalow;
- Balance between 2 storey dwelling and bungalow would be spoilt and totally out of proportion;
- Lot of land available to each dwelling therefore unnecessary to build to boundary line;
- Overlooking of back garden and rear of property of 25 Highlands Rd;
- Private view restricted by two-thirds as a result of proposal;
- Loss of sunlight to rear garden and rear elevation of 25 Highlands Rd.

ASSESSMENT

16. Policies HS33 and CN01 of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No.2 (2006), seek inter alia, to ensure that extended dwellings reflect and respect the relationship of the site and its setting, and those of adjoining dwellings in an acceptable manner, are required to be of an appropriate scale, form and detailed design, should not reduce the level of amenity enjoyed by occupants of neighbouring properties, and should not cause the felling of or damage to any significant trees that contribute to the environmental quality and visual amenity of the locality.

17. Planning application B/05/01665 was refused as it was considered the proposed extensions, particularly the side extension to the conservatory at the front of the property, did not respect and reflect the design, form and proportions of the host dwelling which would detract from the balanced design, particularly of the front elevation, and would be visually harmful to the amenities of the area. This current application has omitted the side extension to the conservatory, and is now only seeking permission for a two-storey side extension. Although the width and depth of the side extension is the same as the previous refusal, the design has been amended from a gable fronted extension to a flank wall fronted extension, thereby not competing with the main front gable of the host dwelling and respecting and reflecting the design features of the host dwelling. It may be worth noting that the current design solution of the proposal is now similar to that planning application approved in 1987 (B/87/01332) for a two-storey side extension, however this permission was never implemented. This change in design has also resulted in the two-storey extension being lowered in height by approximately 0.3 metres.

18. Concerns of overlooking from the proposed development have been expressed. Amended plans received have now included a first floor rear elevation en-suite window, in lieu of a bedroom window. With appropriate conditions to retain this window in obscure glass, it is envisaged that no overlooking of the rear gardens of neighbouring properties would occur. However this design change has now involved a bedroom window at first floor level in the front elevation of the proposal. Concerns have been expressed of overlooking of the front garden area and conservatory of No.15 Station Road. Notwithstanding these concerns, a bedroom window is not considered a principle habitable room where excessive overlooking would occur to neighbouring properties. It is not considered, therefore, that the proposed development will result in any significant adverse impact on the residential amenity due to overlooking.
19. No.15 has raised concerns due to the impact on the side of their property, and the hedge and holly tree situated on their side of the boundary line. It is important to note that no windows are situated in the side elevation of the bungalow at No.15 facing the boundary line, it is considered, therefore, that the development would not result in any significant adverse impact on residential amenity due to a loss of light. The objector has raised an issue with regards to loss of direct sunlight, heat and air flow to the western elevation of his bungalow should planning permission be granted. The bungalow at No.15 is approximately 2.3 metres from the boundary line with No.13. This objection is not considered such as to warrant a refusal of planning permission.
20. The joint boundary line between Nos. 13 and 15 Station Road is formed by metal posts with a low chicken wire fence. Concerns have been raised due to the impact on the hedge and holly tree which are within the ownership of the neighbouring property. The proposal would be positioned approximately 0.1 metres (10cm) from this boundary line. Policy HS33 states that planning applications should not cause the felling of or damage to any significant trees that contribute to the environmental quality and visual amenity of the locality. In this location it is considered that the holly tree is not a significant tree, and together with the hedge do not contribute to the environmental quality and visual amenity of the locality due to both properties at Nos. 13 and 15 having large frontage hedges. Although it is acknowledged should permission be granted there would be an impact upon the holly tree and hedge, it is considered that the tree is not worthy of protection, and planning laws would allow for the erection of a 2 metre high brick wall on this boundary line without the need for planning permission which would equally impact upon the hedge and tree.
21. Concerns have been raised as to the proposal being built up to the boundary line next to a bungalow, and that this would be out of character with the locality, and disproportionate to its setting. It is worth noting that this part of Station Road comprises a mixture of bungalows, chalet bungalows and 2-storey dwellings, all situated well back from the highway. The majority of these properties are situated within spacious plots, with a varying degree of proximity to joint boundary lines. The other 2-storey property in this locality 'Pettimoor', although not extended, is situated close to its boundaries. It is also worth noting that the topography of the land results in the land rising in height from west to east, therefore the bungalow at No.15 is set on higher ground, thereby reducing any visual impact on the bungalow which is also helped by the frontage boundary which screens the development within the street scene. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not result in a significant adverse impact upon the character or appearance of the area that a refusal of planning permission could be warranted.

22. Concerns have been raised as to the potential inability for the Fire Service to access both Nos. 13 and 15 in the event of a fire. Suffolk Fire Service have been consulted, and their comments will be verbally updated at the meeting if available.
23. Concern have also been raised by the owners of No.25 Highlands Road with regards to loss of sunlight to their rear garden and rear elevation of their property. It is considered that as there is a distance of 35 metres from the proposal to the rear elevation of No.25 Highlands Rd, there would not be a significant adverse impact upon their residential amenity in terms of a loss of light that a refusal of planning permission could be warranted.
24. In view of the above and having regard to the relevant Development Plan and its policies, the following recommendation is made -

REASON FOR APPROVAL

The proposal, for the erection of two-storey side extension, is considered to be in accordance with the provisions of policies HS33 and CN01 of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No.2 (2006). In particular, the extension blends with the scale, form and design of the host building, and respects its setting. Furthermore, owing to its siting, scale and fenestration layouts, the extension would not reduce the amenities enjoyed by occupants of neighbouring properties and would not result in the loss of any significant trees.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

- Materials, detailing and finishes to match existing dwelling;
- First floor window on rear elevation (serving en-suite) to be glazed and retained in obscure glass.
- CHA standard condition.

DECISION
