

Item No. 9**SCHEDULE A**

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/10/00695/FULL
LOCATION	14 Ridgway Road, Brogborough, Bedford, MK43 0YA
PROPOSAL	Full: Single storey rear extension with two velux rooflights
PARISH	Brogborough
WARD	Cranfield
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllr Bastable & Cllr Matthews
CASE OFFICER	Mary Collins
DATE REGISTERED	19 February 2010
EXPIRY DATE	16 April 2010
APPLICANT	Mrs Alison Moss
AGENT	
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Cllr Bastable call in. The application proposal is similar to a number of extensions already in the locality, no objection is made by the neighbour, the extension will considerably improve the facilities of the dwelling without the undue impact on surrounding properties.
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Full Application - Refused

Site Location:

14 Ridgway Road, Brogborough is a semi detached property with a red plain tile roof and is constructed in red brick. To the rear the property has a two storey rear extension with a single storey lean to section attached. Ridgway Road is characterised by semi-detached pairs of the same style and age.

The Application:

Planning Permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension.

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

PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS 3 Housing

Regional Spatial Strategy

East of England Plan (May 2008)
Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy (March 2005)

Bedfordshire Structure Plan 2011

None

Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, Central Bedfordshire (North), November 2009

DM3 - Criteria for extensions

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Design in Central Bedfordshire: A Guide for Development, Adopted January 2010
Design Supplement 4: Residential Alterations and Extensions

Planning History

CB/09/05860/FULL Full: Single storey rear extension. Refused: 29/10/09

Representations: (Parish & Neighbours)

Brogborough PC	Support as similar extensions already undertaken in Brogborough
Adj Occupiers	No response received

Consultations/Publicity responses

Site Notice Posted 16/03/10 No response received

Determining Issues

The main considerations of the application are;

1. Background
2. Visual impact upon the character and appearance of the area
3. Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

Considerations

1. Background.

Planning permission was refused on 29/10/09 for a single storey rear extension for the following reason:

The proposed extension by virtue of its depth would result in excessive building bulk close to the boundary resulting in an overbearing impact to the adjoining property at 16 Ridgway Road; as such the proposal is contrary to policy DPS6 of the Adopted Mid Bedfordshire Local Plan First Review 2005 and Technical Planning Guidance: Extensions and Alterations: A Design Guide for Householders 2004.

This application is for a resubmission for planning permission. The size of the extension has not been amended. Two rooflights have been inserted into the five metre roofslope to the side.

2. Visual impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

It is proposed to extend the property to the rear by 5 metres. The extension is single storey and 2.8 metres wide and will infill an area between the boundary wall and an existing two storey/single storey rear projection. The extension will project as far as the existing projection and be built in line with it.

The roof will be lean to sloping away from the boundary and does not overhang the boundary wall separating the two properties. The roof of the extension will connect into the existing lean to roof of the single storey rear section forming a roof wrapping around the two storey rear element of the dwelling. Two velux windows are proposed to the five metre span of roofslope.

The extension is to the rear of the property and as such will not have an impact on the street scene. Although there will be views of the extension from an access track to the rear of the property, the extension is single storey and is viewed against the backdrop of the existing property and as is not considered to affect the appearance of the area.

3. Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

The attached property at 16 Ridgway Road is the only property affected by the proposal.

This property is a mirror image of the host dwelling and also has a two storey rear projection. A window in the side of this section of this dwelling faces the boundary and the proposed extension. However this window is not considered to be detrimentally affected by loss of light using the 25 degree rule of thumb as it is sufficiently far away from the extension. The room is also served by a window in its other side elevation.

This property also has a window in the rear elevation of the main section of dwelling serving the lounge which may be affected by the extension. The extension projects by 5 metres from the rear of the property being set in by approximately 10 centimetres from the boundary, however as the roof of the extension slopes away from the boundary, the extension does not fail the 45 degree rule. This room is also served by a window to the front of the dwelling (as is the host dwelling) and as such the proposal should not result in a detrimental loss of light.

However the extension has a projection of 5 metres from the rear of the dwelling and being in close proximity to the boundary, the extension is considered to be overbearing on the neighbouring property.

The adjoining property has a section of garden area partially enclosed by its rear wall, the side wall of the two storey rear projection and the existing boundary wall. Double doors in the side wall open into this area. As this area is in close proximity to these doors and rear of the property, it forms a valuable amenity area.

The double doors face south with the rear of this property facing east. The orientation of the property at 16 Ridgway Road and the position of the

application site in relation to it means this section of the garden does not receive high levels of sunlight with only early morning sun. By building up to the boundary and creating a side elevation above the height of the existing wall a tunnelling effect will be created to the rear of this property and it is considered this will have an overbearing impact on this area of garden resulting in this area becoming shady and cold.

Design Supplement 4: Residential Alterations and Extensions 2010 states on page 11 that rear extensions can affect a neighbouring property's outlook and daylight. A single storey extension to the rear of a semi-detached property is permitted development and can be constructed without the requirement for planning permission as long as it does not project more than 3 metres beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling and meets other criteria including restriction on its height. This limit is to ensure that any potential impact through overbearing is minimised.

In this instance the projection of the extension exceeds the maximum projection allowed under permitted development by two metres and as such the proposal by virtue of its length and its position on the boundary is considered to have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjoining neighbour through overbearing.

The rooflights will face this property. However they are high level and should not result in a loss of privacy to this property.

Conclusion

In light of the above considerations it is recommended that planning permission is **refused**.

- 1 The proposed extension by virtue of its depth would result in excessive building bulk close to the boundary resulting in an overbearing impact to the adjoining property at 16 Ridgway Road; as such the proposal is contrary to policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, Central Bedfordshire (North), November 2009 and Design Supplement 4: Residential Alterations and Extensions.

DECISION

.....
.....