

Item No. 19**SCHEDULE B**

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/10/00330/FULL
LOCATION	4 Owlswood, Sandy, SG19 2SL
PROPOSAL	Full: Two storey side extension
PARISH	Sandy
WARD	Northhill and Blunham
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs Caroline Maudlin & Tricia Turner
CASE OFFICER	Annabel Gammell
DATE REGISTERED	02 February 2010
EXPIRY DATE	30 March 2010
APPLICANT	Mr Patterson
AGENT	
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Cllr Aldis called the application into Committee for the following reasons: Local concerns and impact on the street scene, over development and loss of amenity to neighbours
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Full Application - Granted

Site Location:

The application site is 4 Owlswood in Sandy which is a large three storey modern residential dwelling. The house is constructed from pale buff bricks with orange brick detail and a grey tile gable roof. The dwelling has a double garage set back from the road up a side driveway, which has spaces for approximately 2 cars to park, giving a total off road parking allocation of 4 spaces. Owlswood is part of a large new residential development called Fallowfield to the north of Sandy town centre, the area is predominately residential and as the dwellings were constructed at the same time, they are built in complimenting styles. Number 4 Owlswood is adjacent to the cross roads of Owlswood, Crow Hill, Plovers Field and Woodpecker Way, due to the size and location of the dwelling it is prominent within the street scene.

The Application:

This application seeks permission for a two storey side extension. The extension would form an unobstructed ground floor car port with an additional bedroom over.

The extension would adjoin the northern elevation of the dwelling. The extension would be 4 metres in width, 6.5 metres in depth and have a maximum height of 9 metres in height.

RELEVANT POLICIES:**National Policies (PPG + PPS)**

- PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)
- PPS 3 Housing (2006)

Regional Spatial Strategy

East of England Plan (May 2008)

Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy (March 2005)

Bedfordshire Structure Plan 2011

Not applicable

Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, November 2009

Policy DM3 - High Quality Development

South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review Policies

Not applicable

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Design in Central Bedfordshire, A Guide for Development

Planning History

- CB/09/06564/FULL Two storey side extension (including ground floor garage, first floor bedroom) - Refused:
- Highway grounds, development would have only one off road car parking space retained, which would have been within the proposed garage.

Representations: (Parish & Neighbours)

Sandy Town Council:

Objects:

- Adverse impact upon the streetscene
- Loss of amenity for near neighbours
- Loss of parking
- Overdevelopment of the site

Neighbours:

Two letters of objections received:

41 Woodpecker Way & 2 Owlswood:

- Development less than a metre from side boundary with 2 Owlswood.
- Loss of light to ground floor WC of 2 Owlswood.
- Loss of privacy in rear garden of 2 Owlswood.
- Loss of parking
- Design is contrary to original planning
- Loss of decorative gate would be detrimental to the streetscene
- Frontage would be in excess of the 45 degree sight line.
- Possible loss of day light and sun light to

number 41 Woodpecker Way.

Consultations/Publicity responses

Site Notice Posted on 12.02.10: No comments received
Highways Department: No objection as access is not from the public highway.

Determining Issues

The main considerations of the application are;

1. The effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area
2. The impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties
3. Any other implications of the proposal

Considerations

1. Effect on the character and appearance of the area

The two-storey side extension would be visible within the streetscene of Owlswood, Woodpecker Way and Plovers Field.

In design terms it is considered that the extension would be in accordance with the technical guidance *Design in Central Bedfordshire, a Guide for Development* as it states that it is essential to set back a side extension on a detached house and that the ridge of the roof of the extension must be lower than the existing building. The proposed side extension would be approximately 0.6 metres back from the front elevation of the dwelling. When viewed from the front of the dwelling the maximum height of the extension would measure some 9 metres in height, which is 3 metres lower than the ridge height of the dwelling. The two storey extension would have a gable ended roof which would match the existing gable. The extension would be a minimum of 0.8 metres from the side boundary of the site, the large proportion would be 1 metre from the boundary, this is considered to be sufficient to ensure it would not form a cramped development.

Policy DM3: High Quality Development of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, 2009 states that to be found acceptable the design of the development needs to be "appropriate in scale and design to their setting". It is considered that this development complies with this, the extension would be subservient by one storey, and recessed from the front elevation by what is considered a significant amount. It is appropriate for it to be constructed in matching materials.

Although the extension would be visible from the street scene, it is only 4 metres in width, it is judged that this is in keeping with the scale of the original dwelling. All the materials would match the existing, and as the dwelling is relatively new it is considered that new materials would not detrimentally impact upon the visual appearance of the property. A car port would be visually interesting within the streetscene, it would allow access to the back of the property, which is considered appropriate as there is the structure of a double garage and parking is towards the rear of the site.

As the materials would match that of the existing house and the extension would

be subservient the proposal is not considered to detrimentally affect the character and appearance of the surrounding area and they are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, November 2009.

2. Impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties

It is considered that the proposed extension would not cause a detrimental impact on any adjoining neighbours. The house is adjacent to numbers 2 and 6 Owlswood. The extension would be adjoining the northern elevation, which would be on space currently used for parking between the dwelling and number 2 Owlswood. It is judged that as the extension would be on the opposite side of the dwelling to number 6 Owlswood and as the extension would not project either side of this elevation that the development would not impact upon this residential dwelling. It would move the footprint of the dwelling towards number 2 Owlswood, but it is considered that it would not significantly effect the residential amenity of this dwelling. No other dwellings would be significantly effected by this development given its scale and location.

Loss of light:

The extension would be attached to the side of the dwelling it is considered that as the extension is subservient to the main dwelling, and 0.8 metres from the shared boundary that it would not cause an impact on the light into this dwelling. There is one small ground floor WC window in the side elevation of number 2 Owlswood, but it is judged that there would still be sufficient light into this window, due to the slight staggered building line, moreover this is not a habitable room. The two buildings would be approximately 1.85 metres apart, which is judged to be sufficient to ensure adequate separation of the properties. The extension would not impact the light into any other neighbouring property.

Overbearing impact:

It is judged that the development would not contribute to the overdevelopment of the site or have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties or streetscene. This is due to the size and position of the side extension, there are buildings in the same development which are of a similar scale and appearance as the proposed dwelling would be after the extension was built. The plot on which the dwelling sits is of sufficient size to ensure that this extension would not contribute to the overdevelopment of the site.

Loss of privacy:

The design of the extension would ensure that there would not be any significant loss of privacy, there are no side facing windows proposed. Due to the staggered building line the rear elevation of number 2 Owlswood is behind the rear elevation of number 4 Owlswood, this would further reduce the chance of any overlooking or loss of privacy.

Outlook:

The extension would not detrimentally affect neighbouring properties in terms of outlook, the extension would be visible, but it has been designed to be subservient to the original dwelling and the matching materials would harmonise

the development. It is considered that the design is in accordance with the Central Bedfordshire technical design guidance. A high quality car port would be attractive visually and help maintain parking of vehicles off the road, as currently there is a set of double gates, which are parked in front of, the car port would encourage drivers to travel through and park off the street.

Two letters of objection were received, from number 2 Owlswood and number 41 Woodpecker Way:

– **Development less than a metre from side boundary with 2 Owlswood.**

It is considered that as no side facing windows are proposed, and there are no 1st floor windows in the southern elevation of number 2 Owlswood, it is judged that a distance between 0.8 metres and 1 metre from the boundary is an acceptable distance for an extension of this size, to ensure residential amenity is maintained.

– **Loss of light to ground floor WC of 2 Owlswood.**

Due to the position of number 2 Owlswood, it is considered that there would still be sufficient light into the downstairs WC. The window is located at ground floor level, there is currently a wall between these properties, it is considered that the extension would not significantly change the light into this window. A WC is not a habitable room and therefore a slight loss in light is not considered to be detrimental to the amenity of this room.

– **Loss of privacy in rear garden of 2 Owlswood.**

No side facing windows are proposed, the first floor rear window would not have a significantly different aspect to that of the existing rear windows. It is judged that the privacy of the rear garden of number 2 Owlswood would be safeguarded.

– **Loss of parking.**

See "any other implications" section.

– **Design is contrary to original planning.**

The scale of the building would be similar to some buildings that exist near the dwelling. It is considered that it would change the proportions of the house but it would be in accordance with the *Central Bedfordshire a Guide for Development*.

– **Loss of decorative gates would reduce the aesthetic appearance of the street scene.**

The gates which form part of the original dwelling would be lost, these gates are not considered to be of high enough design standard to warrant retaining them, the applicant could remove these gates to open up the parking area to the side and rear of their property without requiring planning consent. A brick car port would provide access to the rear which is judged to be of high importance, as the materials would match that of the original building it is considered that this would provide design of a high enough standard to be found acceptable.

– **Frontage would be in excess of the 45 degree sight line.**

The extension would be in accordance with the 45 degree principle, which is that an extension should not encroach upon the light that enters neighbouring windows, this is measured as a 45 degree angle from the corner of the proposed

extension to ensure that this light line does not cross the front windows of the adjacent property. This test has been applied to this application and it accords with the guidance found within the Central Bedfordshire design guide. The light into the front windows of number 2 Owlswood would not be significantly affected by the extension. It is not considered that the side window should be subject to this test as the dwelling currently shades this non habitable ground floor WC window.

– **Possible loss of day light and sun light to number 41 Woodpecker Way.** Due to the distance from the development it is considered that number 41 Woodpecker Way would be unaffected by the development. Currently there is a gap between numbers 4 and 2 Owlswood, which is the proposed location for the extension. It is considered that the loss of the gap between these houses would not significantly change the amount of light to this dwelling. The side of number 41 Woodpecker Way would be approximately 14 metres away from the extension, which is the same distance as the existing 3 storey dwelling, this extension would not significantly change the light into this property.

3. Any other implications

Highway implications:

Originally on the site there was parking for 4 cars, two within the double garage towards the rear of the site and two to the side of the dwelling. This application would increase the number of bedrooms at the property by 1, but it would maintain the off road parking provision, there would still be access to the rear garage, which could be potentially used for parking, and two cars could park along the side of the house, in front of the garage and under the car port.

Currently cars park in front of the gates to the side of the property, with the removal of the gates it would make parking off road easier, as cars would be able to pull directly onto the site.

Owlswood is currently not adopted highway, the comments from the Highway Department state no objection as the access is not from the highway and therefore the development would not impact upon the highway. The Highway Department did comment that should Owlswood have been public highway then they would object to it, this is based on a previous application where it stated that the double garage is used as a gym, therefore two of the parking spaces are removed, leaving only two off road spaces, insufficient for a dwelling of this size. Though the garage might be used as a gym, this does not affect the application, as access to the garage is maintained through the car port, the use could be reinstated to store cars under permitted development, therefore these spaces could be used by the residents of the dwelling if desired. It is judged that there still would be potential provision for at least four off road car parking spaces, which is considered acceptable.

There are no further implication regarding this application.

Reasons for Granting

The proposed two storey side extension on this residential dwelling would not detrimentally impact upon the character or appearance of the surrounding area and there would be no significant impact upon any neighbouring properties or upon

highway safety. Therefore the scheme therefore, by reason of its site, design and location, is in conformity with Planning Policy Statement 1 (2005), Planning Policy Statement 3 (2006), East of England Plan (May 2008), Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy (March 2005) and Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, November 2009. It is further in conformity with the Central Bedfordshire Supplementary Technical Guidance "Design in Central Bedfordshire, A Guide for Development."

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be granted for the following reason:

- 1 The development hereby approved shall be commenced within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 which is designed to ensure that a planning permission does not continue in existence indefinitely if the development to which it relates is not carried out.

- 2 All external works hereby permitted shall be carried out in materials to match as closely as possible in colour, type and texture, those of the existing building.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the completed development by ensuring that the development hereby permitted is finished externally with materials to match/complement the existing building(s) and the visual amenities of the locality.

- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no door shall be inserted in the ground floor side extension without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents, and ensure adequate off street parking.

DECISION

.....
.....