

Application No: 12/0477C

Location: 25, THORNBROOK WAY, SANDBACH, CHESHIRE, CW11 3ZB

Proposal: Single Storey Side and Rear Facing Extension

Applicant: Mrs J Adamson

Expiry Date: 30-Mar-2012

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to conditions

MAIN ISSUES

Principle

Design

Amenity

REASON FOR REFERRAL

The application was called in to Southern Planning Committee by Cllr Gail Wait for the following reasons:

(i) Proposed extension is over-intensive for the site area. Light would be detracted from the kitchen and bathroom due to the size.

(ii) The extension would block the light entering the adjoining property as going up to the boundary.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT

The application site is 25 Thornbrook Way which is a modern detached dwelling with the immediate surrounding land use being predominantly residential. The site is situated with the Sandbach Settlement Zone Line, as defined by the Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review 2005.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for a single storey side and rear extension. The development would extend across the width of the rear elevation and wrap around the dwellinghouse to the side. To the rear this would project 3.6 metres in length with a maximum width of 9.5 metres. When viewed from the front the proposal would be 1 metre wide which would gradually increase to a side projection of 2.5 metres towards the rear.

RELEVANT HISTORY

33338/3 Conservatory (Approved 2001)

POLICIES

Regional Spatial Strategy (NW)

DP7 Promote Environmental Quality

Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review 2005

GR1 (New Development)

GR2 (Design)

GR6 (Amenity and Health)

GR9 (Accessibility, Servicing and Parking Provision)

Other Material Considerations

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development

VIEWS OF SANDBACH TOWN COUNCIL

The Town Council object to the application as the side extension up to the boundary line is un-neighbourly and will have an adverse impact on the adjacent property (27). As such its unduly detrimental effect on neighbouring amenity contravenes Local Plan policy GR6 (Amenity and Health).

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

An objection has been received from neighbouring property number 27 Thornbrook Way. In summary the objection relates to the following design and amenity issues:

- Proposal is over-intensive for the site area
- All detached dwellings on Thornbrook Way have amenity and access space of 3ft, or more, to each side of the house; approving the side extension will set precedence, resulting in a dense over-built and unattractive area. As such the proposal is not in-keeping with the area or the neighbouring homes
- The side extension proposed, being in excess of 32ft in length and 13ft in apex height, will be built directly up to the boundary line/fencing. This will create an oppressive corridor affecting amenity greatly and will significantly limit the amount of light entering all facing windows/doors on that particular elevation.
- Owing to the position and scale of this side extension, natural light in to both the south-facing kitchen windows and family sitting room windows will be reduced, with the family room also facing directly on to this 32ft extension wall. This positioning goes against the 45 degree rule.
- The siting, length and height of the extension would create an over-bearing and excessively dominant outlook when viewed from 27.
- Building so closely up to the side boundary with an extension which requires raft foundations will be incredibly difficult in the current narrow pathway space available. Access for building and maintaining the site from 27 is not a viable option given the outbuildings positioned along the fence line (within the boundary of 27). Building a side

extension in such a confined space, with very limited access options, is an inappropriate proposal.

- The proposal contravenes Local Plan policies GR2 and GR6 owing to the significant negative impact on neighbouring amenity, loss of light through design, position and scale.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

The application site is situated within the settlement boundary where the principle of householder development is accepted, provided that it accords with Local Plan policies GR1 (New Development), GR2 (Design) and GR6 (Amenity and Health). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that proposals are appropriate in design terms and have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design

The application proposes a single storey 'wrap around' extension to the existing dwelling. To the rear this would project 3.6 metres in length with a maximum width of 9.5 metres. When viewed from the front the proposal would be 1 metre wide which would gradually increase to a side projection of 2.5 metres towards the rear. The proposal would have a pitched roof with a projecting gable and chimney feature at the rear. Given the single storey nature of the extension with a maximum height of 4 metres to the ridge (excluding the chimney) the development would appear subordinate to the original dwelling. Subject to materials to match the proposal would have an acceptable appearance. There would be limited impact on the streetscene given the height, width and setback of the extension when viewed from the frontage along Thornbrook Way.

Having regard to the above the proposal is considered to be acceptable in design terms and would comply with the provisions of Local Plan policy GR2 (Design).

Amenity

A key consideration in the determination of this application is the impact of the proposed development on the residential amenity of adjacent properties number 23 and 27 Thornbrook Way.

In terms of number 23 the extension would project 3.6 metres from the rear elevation with a height of 2.2 metres to eaves level and a maximum height of 4 metres to the ridge which slopes away from the property. The properties are also separated by a 2 metre gap, with number 23 also benefitting from an existing single storey rear extension with similar dimensions. In this regard there would be no impacts on the residential amenity of number 23 Thornbrook Way.

Turning to the adjacent property number 27, this is also set apart from the application dwelling by around 3 metres. The side element of the proposed single storey extension would extend up to the common boundary which is defined by a timber fence of around 2 metres in height. Here the extension would have a height of 2.2 metres to eaves level rising to 4 metres to the

ridge. The gap between number 25 and 27 would be reduced to around 1.5 metres which would remain as the side access to number 27. Whilst there is a glazed kitchen door and first floor bathroom, there are no principal windows along this elevation which would be affected by the proposal. Although loss of light and oppressive impact of the proposal on these windows has been cited in the neighbour objection, as stated above these windows do not serve habitable rooms, and furthermore the first floor bathroom window would not be affected by the single storey extension. To the rear the proposal would project 3.6 metres beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling. The 2No windows on the rear elevation of number 27 serve the kitchen and the dwelling also benefits from a single storey extension which is around 6.4 metres from the common boundary. Contrary to the neighbour objection, the proposal does not breach the 45 degree guideline from the nearest window which is non-principal and furthermore the extension would be single storey. Accordingly it is not considered that there would be any significant adverse impacts associated with loss of light. Whilst the proposal would extend beyond the length of the host dwelling and to the rear along the common boundary, regard is given to the single storey nature of the development. Views of the proposal from habitable windows of number 27 would be seen in the context of the rear projection and not a 32ft wall as referred to in the neighbour objection. Having regard to the above it is not considered that the proposed development would result in an unduly detriment impact on the residential amenity of number 27 by reason of visual intrusion, over-bearing effect, or loss of light issues.

It is considered that the proposal would comply with the provisions of Local Plan policy GR6 (Amenity and Health).

Other matters

Maintenance

Whilst access to neighbouring land for maintenance purposes has been raised in objection, this is not a material planning consideration.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASON(S) FOR THE DECISION

The application proposes an acceptable for of development in design terms and would not be unduly detrimental to neighbouring residential amenity. The proposal is in accordance with the relevant policies of the Development Plan and is therefore recommended for approval accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard Time
2. In accordance with approved plans
3. Materials to match existing dwelling

