Application No: 11/1359N

Location: 8, Chidlow Close, Hough, CW2 5RE

Proposal: Two Storey Side Extension, Ground Floor Garage and Utility, First Floor Bed with Ensuite and the Existing Garage to be Converted to Playroom/Store and single storey rear extension

Applicant: Mr E Potts

Expiry Date: 02-Jun-2011

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION – Approve with conditions

MAIN ISSUES

- Impact on the host dwelling
- Impact on the streetscene
- Amenity impact on neighbouring property
- Impact on highway safety

1. REFERRAL

This application would usually be dealt with under the Council's delegation scheme. However, the application has been called into the Southern Planning Committee by Councillor Janet Clowes for the following reasons,

'a) Loss of daylight / natural light to neighbouring property's upstairs window (9, Chidlow Close)

b) Overshadowing of neighbouring property (9, Chidlow Close)

c) Impact of development on functionality of the 'shared' driveway between this property and its immediate neighbouring property (9, Chidlow Close)

d) Over-development of site and of a residential cul-de-sac'

2. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

The proposal site is situated within the settlement boundary for the village of Hough, which is located to the south of Crewe. The existing dwellinghouse is situated on a small modern culde-sac, near to the end turning area. The existing house is a semi-detached property with a detached garage within the rear garden which is accessed off a driveway to the side of the dwelling.

3. DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The proposal is for a two storey side extension, and a single storey rear extension and the incorporation of the existing garage building within the habitable ground floor of the dwelling. The proposed extension will create a new garage/storage area, utility, kitchen, play room and storage area at ground floor level and a master bedroom and ensuite at first floor level.

The amended plans received on the 20th June 2011 show the two storey extension having a width of 2.35m, a length of 8m and a maximum ridge height of 7.5m. The proposed single storey rear extension will have a projection of 3.3m off the rear elevation, a width of 6.4m and a maximum height of 3.8m. It is noted that there are some discrepancies within the plans, and these issues will be raised within the relevant sections of the report; however these discrepancies will not have a material impact on the decision made.

The proposal also includes the removal of the existing soft landscaping to the front garden area to be used as hardstanding for car parking.

4. RELEVANT HISTORY

No relevant planning history

5. POLICIES

The development plan includes the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West of England (RSS), and the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011 (LP).

The relevant development plan policies are:

Local Plan Policy

BE.1 (Amenity)BE.2 (Design Standards)BE.3 (Access and Parking)RES.11 (Improvements and Alterations to existing Dwelling)

Other Material Considerations

PPS1, Delivering Sustainable Development Extensions and Householder Development SPD

6. CONSIDERATIONS (External to Planning)

Highways: No highways objection

7. VIEWS OF THE PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL:

Planning application 11/1359N has been viewed and discussed in detail by Hough & Chorlton Parish Council.

Local residents also attended the meeting to express opposition and concerns to the proposed plans.

The Parish Council's views are that the proposed building is out of keeping with its surroundings and represents a considerable over development of the site. It is felt that the proposed building work encroaches on, and up to, adjoining properties and would have a negative effect upon them. There are also concerns that the extension would impact on neighbours privacy and reduce the amount of natural light available to them.

It is the Parish Council's view that this planning application needs to be refused on the above grounds.

8. OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of objection have been received from the occupants of 7, 9 and 16 Chidlow Close, Hough. The main issues raised are;

- Loss of practical parking space to shared access at No,9.
- Loss of light to No.9's living room, landing window, conservatory and bedroom windows.
- Extension will be overdominant and intimidating, and will have an un-neighbourly and overbearing impact,
- Front car parking area if tarmacced will make the Close look like a car park,
- Wheelie bins will be left on the front of due to restricted access to the rear which will look displeasing,
- Lack of drainage due to front garden being removed, and used as a car park,
- Lack of privacy due to overlooking windows,
- Will hide views of the Close from No.9,
- The conservatory window and front window would be facing the new wall only 6ft away not the recommended 13 meters,
- Lack of parking on the Close increased,
- Permission will not be given for footing on adjacent neighbours properties, and are not within the 1m ruling
- The proposed garage is too small to be used as a functional garage,
- The proposed extension will double the size of the property, creating an over dominant dwelling and a terrace effect within the streetscene,
- Would create a double fronted house which is not in-keeping within the adjacent semi's,
- Creating a driveway at No.8 will reduce the amount of on-street parking available within the Close,
- Close proximity of the rear extension will leave a gap too small to practically clean and maintain the side elevation of No.7's conservatory,
- Currently an issue with surface water drainage leading to flooding, and the increase in area caused by the proposed extension will have an increased impact on the risk of flooding,
- Proposal will have a negative impact on the value and saleability of adjacent dwellings.

9. APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING INFORMATION - None received

10. OFFICER APPRAISAL

Principal of Development

The principal of householder development within the settlement boundary is considered to be acceptable provided that it accords with Local Plan polices BE.1 (Amenity), BE.2 (Design Standards) and RES.11 (Improvements and Alterations to existing Dwellings).

Design

The proposed two storey extension is to be positioned on the side elevation of the dwelling adjacent to the boundary with No.9 Chidlow Close. The amended plans show the proposed extension having a ridge height which is 0.225m lower than the ridge of the original dwellinghouse. The extension will be sited 0.2m back from the front elevation of the original dwelling, and will extend the full length of the original dwellinghouse. The front elevation of two storey extension will have a bedroom window at first floor level and a garage door at ground floor level with a canopy above which will span across the original front elevation of the dwelling. The proposed two storey element of the extension has been designed in such a way as it will appear as a subordinate extension to the original dwellinghouse, designed inline with the guidance set out in the Councils Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document. There is a another dwelling further up the Close, No.5A which has also had a two storey side extension approved, however this dwelling is sited up a long driveway and is less visible within the streetscene.

The proposed extension will not more than double the width of the existing dwellinghouse, and whilst there are not any other two storey extensions within the immediate location it is considered that the proposed extension respects the size and character of the original dwellinghouse and the surrounding streetscene.

The proposed rear extension will span almost the whole width of the rear elevation, with the amended plans showing the side elevation adjacent to the adjoining property No.7 Chidlow Close, moved 150mm away from the boundary. This single storey extension will have a lean-to design and will incorporate the existing garage within the extension. The proposed extension is of typical lean-to design, although the incorporation of the existing garage is unusual it is not considered that this is will equate to an overdevelopment of the site, and is unlikely to be visible from the surrounding public vantage points.

Furthermore, whilst the loss of the soft landscaping to the front of the dwelling is regrettable, this could be carried out under permitted development (Part 1 Class F) provided that the hard surfacing is made of porous materials or the run-off water from the hard surface is directed to a permeable or porous material within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse.

Therefore it is considered that the proposed development complies with Policies BE.2 (Design Standards) and RES.11 (Improvements and extensions to existing dwellinghouses), and the guidance set out in the Extensions and Householder Development SPD, and therefore is acceptable in design terms.

Amenity

The proposed two storey extension will be sited on the side elevation of the original dwellinghouse, adjacent to the boundary with No 9 Chidlow Close. The proposed extension is to project 2.35m off the side elevation of the dwelling towards No.9. There is currently a shared driveway between the two properties and No.9 Chidlow Close is set back approximately 4m further back in the plot than the proposal site.

The proposed two storey side extension slightly breaches the 45 degree code from the front elevation of the adjacent property (No.9); however this is a minor breach which would not have a significant impact on the neighbour's amenity. Only the roof area would encroach upon the 45 degree code as set out in the Councils SPD on Extension and Householder development and therefore is considered that this will have a minimal impact on light entering habitable rooms with principal windows. It is considered that, due to the separation distance and the staggered nature of the dwellings the proposed extension would not have an overbearing impact upon the neighbouring property.

The proposed two storey extension is proposed to have a high level ground floor window on the side elevation facing towards the side elevation of No.9. On the side elevation of No.9 there is a landing window which is obscure glazed, this is not a principal window to a habitable room and therefore the distance of 2.5m between this window and the proposed side elevation of the dwelling will be suitable in this position, particularly as they are not within the same build line.

It is therefore considered that the proposed two storey extension to the side of No.8, is of a suitable design and position that although it will have some impact on the adjacent neighbours at No.9 it will not have a detrimentally significant impact that would justify refusing the proposal.

The proposed extension to the rear will project 3.3m off the rear elevation of the existing dwelling and would be set in from the common boundary by 0.15m, and will have a pitched lean-to roof. Whilst the adjoining neighbour's conservatory is likely to lose some light from the side elevation, the nature of conservatory allows for light to be sought from other elevations. Given the rear extension is only single storey it is considered that the proposal will not have a significantly detrimental impact on the adjacent neighbours at No.7.

It is considered that as there is an existing garage at single storey, it unlikely that the rear extension to No.8 will have any increased impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbours at No.9. It is therefore considered that the proposed development is acceptable and in accordance with the local plan policy BE.1 (Amenity).

Highway Safety

The proposed extension will include the loss of some driveway to accommodate the extension, and the loss of the existing garage. The proposed extension will include an attached garage on the front elevation of the extension; however it is acknowledged that it is unlikely to be suitable to fit a car within it. However as the floorplan shows it to be a garage/store it is likely that this will allow space to store wheelie bins etc, rather than leaving on the front driveway.

The proposal does include the surfacing of the existing landscaped garden to create a parking/driveway area to the front of the dwelling, which will accommodate two car parking spaces. The Highways Authority have raised no objections to the proposed extension and therefore it is considered that the proposed development can safety accommodate parking for the dwellinghouse without having a detrimental impact on highway safety, in accordance with Policy BE.3 (Access and Parking).

Other Matters

Within the objections made by the adjacent neighbours issues have been raised relating to construction methods and the possible need to use the adjacent neighbours land to build on to the boundary. Despite the discrepancies in the proposed plans the amended proposal shows the proposed extension is to be constructed wholly within the boundary of the red edge and the applicant has signed certificate A, stating that all the land which the planning application relates to is on land owned by the applicant. Therefore any further issues of land ownership or the need to construct on adjacent land becomes a civil matter and is not a material consideration on a planning application.

Furthermore, within the objections the impact on the value and saleability of the adjacent dwellings has been raised as an objections, however the value and/or impact on saleability of properties is not a material consideration to be dealt with in the planning application.

Two issues have been raised with relation to surface water drainage, to ensure that the proposed car parking to the front of the site does not increase surface water run off in the area; a condition will be attached to the permission to ensure that the proposed hard surfacing of the front garden is constructed in permeable materials. Furthermore, it is unlikely that the proposed surface water drainage to the rear of the property will be exacerbated to a point that would have a significantly detrimental impact on the neighbours, however the issues of the existing drainage pipes is a civil matter and not a material planning consideration to be dealt with in this applications.

Within the objection, the issue that the adjacent neighbour will not be able to use there drive way functionally has been raised. Due to the staggered nature of the housing development No.9 are able to park a car further down the drive than No8, allowing them to open the car doors onto the 'shared driveway However, if two cars were parked side by side on the driveway in the current situation, a similar issue would occur. Notwithstanding this, the adjacent neighbours could place a fence/wall/hedge between the two properties without planning permission and this would have the same effect blocking their ability to open the car door onto the shared drive. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension may have an impact on the current use of the adjacent neighbour driveway however; this does not mean the proposal should be refused. The proposal would not have a significantly detrimental impact on the neighbour's amenity, and any issues relating to the ownership of the 'shared' drive is a legal matter and not a material planning consideration.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASON(S) FOR THE DECISION

It is considered that the proposed development is of size and position which is in-keeping with the host dwelling, and the surrounding area. The proposed development will not have a

significantly negative impact on the adjacent neighbours, or highway safety and is therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the relevant policies of the Local Plan.

Conditions

- 1. Standard Time
- 2. Materials to match existing dwelling
- 3. Side elevation window to be obscure glazed and PD removed for any other windows or doors on side elevation
- 4. Surfacing materials to front parking area to be constructed in permeable materials
- 5. Approved plans

Reason for approval

The proposed development respects the size and character of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area and will not have a significant impact upon neighbouring amenity. The proposed development is of a suitable design appropriate to the purpose it will serve in keeping with Policy BE.2 (Design Standards). The proposal therefore complies with Policy BE.1 (Amenity), Policy BE.2 (Design Standards), Policy BE.3 (Access and Parking) and Policy RES.11 (Improvements and Alterations to Existing Dwellings) of the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011.

