

**Item No. 09****SCHEDULE B**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>                | <b>CB/10/02958/FULL</b>   |
| <b>LOCATION</b>                          | <b>4 Coopers Close, Sandy, SG19 1NQ</b>   |
| <b>PROPOSAL</b>                          | <b>Proposed two storey side &amp; rear extension and single storey rear extension</b>   |
| <b>PARISH</b>                            | <b>Sandy</b>  |
| <b>WARD</b>                              | <b>Sandy</b>  |
| <b>WARD COUNCILLORS</b>                  | <b>Cllr Nigel Aldis &amp; Cllr Peter Blaine</b>   |
| <b>CASE OFFICER</b>                      | <b>Vicki Davies</b>   |
| <b>DATE REGISTERED</b>                   | <b>26 August 2010</b>   |
| <b>EXPIRY DATE</b>                       | <b>21 October 2010</b>  |
| <b>APPLICANT</b>                         | <b>Mr Jobling</b>   |
| <b>AGENT</b>                             | <b>Blueprint Architectural Design</b>   |
| <b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE</b> | <b>Cllr Aldis as there are concerns from neighbours about the impact of the single storey extension aspect of the application and how it will affect them in terms of loss of light to breakfast room and over-bearing nature</b> |
| <b>RECOMMENDED DECISION</b>              | <b>Full Application - Granted</b>   |

**Site Location:**

The application site is located on the western side of Coopers Close, a cul de sac, located to the south west of Sandy town centre on the edge of the settlement. Coopers Close consists of seven detached properties of similar design. The application site is approximately 1100 metres square. The dwelling is located to the front of the site and has a rear garden in excess of 90 metres in length.

**The Application:**

The application seeks consent for a two storey rear extension, a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.

The two storey rear extension would be located on the southern side of the rear of the property and would extend 3.75 metres from the rear elevation of the dwelling. An existing conservatory would be removed from the rear of the property in order for the proposed extension to be built. The side elevation of two storey rear extension would be in line with the existing side wall of the dwelling. The two storey rear extension would be approximately 6.4 metres in height to the ridgeline. The ridgeline of the extension would be around 0.5 metres lower than that of the existing dwelling. The rear extension would have a gable end arrangement to the rear of the dwelling.

The two storey side extension would result in the existing dining room being converted back to a garage with a bedroom and ensuite constructed at first floor level over the garage. The side extension would be approximately 7 metres in depth and 2.4 metres wide, the same width as the existing ground floor dining room. The side extension would be 7 metres in height to the ridgeline. The ridgeline of the side extension would match the ridgeline of the existing dwelling. The first floor of the side extension is proposed to have a narrow gable end feature to the front.

The single storey rear extension would be located on the northern side of the rear of the property and would extend 3.75 metres from the rear elevation of the dwelling in line with the two storey rear extension. The side elevation of the single storey rear extension would be in line with the existing side wall of the dwelling. The single storey rear extension have a lean-to roof which would measure 3.5 metres to the top of the roof and 2.5 metres to the eaves. The single storey rear extension due to its dimensions is permitted development under Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008 and does not require planning permission. The single storey rear extension does however form part of the planning application.

All the proposed extensions would be constructed using materials to match those of the existing dwelling.

#### **RELEVANT POLICIES:**

##### **National Policies (PPM & PPS)**

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development  
PPS3: Housing

##### **Bedfordshire Structure Plan 2011**

No relevant policies

##### **Central Bedfordshire Council North Team Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (November 2009)**

CS1 - Development Strategy  
CS14 - High Quality Development  
DM3 - High Quality Development

##### **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

Design in Central Bedfordshire: A Guide for Development  
Design Supplement 4: Residential Alterations and Extensions

##### **Planning History**

MB/93/00675/FA                      Erection of part 2 storey and part first floor extension -  
Approved 3/8/93

## **Representations: (Parish & Neighbours)**

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Sandy Town Council | Object - the extension would be an overdevelopment of the site and have an overbearing impact on near neighbours. There would also be a loss of amenity to neighbours in the form of loss of light  |
| Neighbours         | One letter of objection has been received from an adjacent resident, at 3 Coopers Close, who states that the single storey extension would be on the boundary of the property and would block light into their breakfast room, utility room and kitchen. The extension would extend at least 3 feet (approx 90cm) further than the neighbours current building and because the extension is south of the property it will restrict light to a window in the western end of their breakfast room. The objector continues stating that the rear single storey extension would have a high pitched roof which would cause the loss of more light to the rooms of his property. |

## **Consultations/Publicity responses**

Internal Drainage Board    No response received

## **Determining Issues**

The main considerations of the application are;

1. Principle of Development
2. Impact on Streetscene and Appearance of the Area
3. Impact on Amenities of Nearby Residents

## **Considerations**

### **1. Principle of Development**

Core Strategy policy CS1 designates Sandy as a Major Service Centre. The application site is within the settlement envelope for Sandy and is not covered by any other constraints. As such the principle of extending a residential property is acceptable.

### **2. Impact on Streetscene and Appearance of the Area**

Core Strategy policy DM3 requires that extensions be appropriate in scale and design to their setting and that they contribute to creating a sense of place through design and use of materials. The existing dwelling is relatively small in comparison to the size of the site it is located on. It is considered that the extensions are appropriate in scale to the dwelling and the neighbouring properties. The design of the extensions would be similar to that of the existing dwelling and the materials proposed would match as closely as possible those used in the existing property.

The neighbouring property at 3 Coopers Close already has similar two storey side and rear extensions. The extensions proposed by this application would reflect the neighbour's extensions in design terms. It may be considered that the two storey side extension would create a terracing effect as the gaps between the dwellings at first floor level would be removed. However the two storey side extension on the neighbouring property is not considered to have had an adverse impact on the streetscene and it is not judged that the proposed side extension would result in a significant adverse impact.

Design Supplement 4: Residential Alterations and Extensions recommends that extensions are subservient to the existing dwelling and that this can be achieved by setting in the walls and setting the roof line down. The ridgeline of the two storey rear extension is set down from the original ridgeline. The ridgeline for the two storey side extension would be in line with the existing roof however it is considered that this is acceptable as the proposed extension would be quite narrow and setting down the ridgeline of such a small part of the roof would look incongruous. The walls of the extensions would be in line with the existing dwelling however the joins between the existing and new brickwork on the sides and rear would not be visible in the public realm. The front elevation of the second floor of the side extension would extend beyond the front elevation of the existing dwelling by around 90cm and the join between the existing and new bricks would not be clearly visible. The difference between the existing and new roof tiles on the front roof slope would be clearly visible in the streetscene and therefore it is considered that a condition should be added to any planning permission granted requiring roof tiles from the rear roof slope to be used for the new part of the front roof slope in order that the tiles match in colour, shape and texture.

Overall it is considered that the extensions are appropriate in terms of scale, design and materials.

### **3. Impact on Amenities of Nearby Residents**

Core Strategy policy DM3 states that new development, including extensions, should respect the amenities of surrounding residents.

#### **Privacy**

The two storey side extension would be 1 metre from the neighbouring property to the south, 5 Coopers Close. The dwelling to the south does not have any windows at first floor level in the north facing gable end elevation. The proposed two storey side extension would have two windows, one for a hallway and an obscure glazed window for the ensuite. Ground floor windows are proposed in the side extension however the boundary treatment of a timber close boarded fence would mean that views into the neighbouring property would be prevented. It is not considered that there would be any adverse impact on the residents of 5 Coopers Close as a result of the two storey side extension.

The rear extensions would not have any windows in the side elevations and a condition could be added to any planning permission granted to ensure that no windows are added to the side elevations of the extensions.

Views from the first floor rear windows of the extensions would be possible into the gardens of the neighbouring properties. The views from the extensions would not be any greater than the views that are currently gained from the existing first floor windows on the rear elevation. It is therefore not considered that the privacy of neighbouring residents would be adversely affected.

### **Overdevelopment & Overbearing**

Sandy Town Council commented that they consider the proposed extensions would be overdevelopment of the site and would be overbearing on neighbours. Due to the large size of the site it is not considered that the relatively small extensions would result in overdevelopment of the site. It is not considered that the extensions would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring residents to the north, at 3 Coopers Close, as they have a similar sized two storey rear extension and the proposed extension would only extend around 90cm beyond their extension.

The neighbouring residents to the south at 5 Coopers Close would have clear views of the two storey rear extension which would be located 1 metre away from the boundary fence. It is however considered that extension would not be overbearing as it is not overly large. In addition the garden of the neighbouring property is wider than that of the application property which would help reduce the impact of the rear extension. Overall it is not considered that the extensions would be overdevelopment of the site nor are they considered to be overbearing.

### **Loss of Light**

The neighbouring residents to the south, at 5 Coopers Close, would not suffer any significant loss of light to habitable rooms as the extensions would be constructed to the north of their property.

The neighbouring resident to the north, at 3 Coopers Close, raises concerns regarding loss of light to his existing rear extension. The neighbour has ground floor windows in the southern elevation of the rear extension. The proposed single storey rear extension would be constructed approximately 1 metre from the windows in the side elevation of the neighbouring property. However it is considered that the loss of light would not be significant as there is currently a wooden close boarded fence outside of the south facing windows. In addition the applicant could choose to remove the single storey rear extension from the application and erect it under permitted development rights.

The neighbouring resident at 3 Coopers Close also raises concerns that there would be loss of light to the windows in the west facing, rear elevation of his extension. As the proposed extensions would be at most 1m beyond the rear elevation of the neighbour's rear extension it is not considered that there would be a significant loss of light to the west facing windows on the rear elevation of the neighbour's extension.

## **Outlook**

The location of the proposed extensions would mean that there would be some loss of outlook from the windows in the southern elevation of 3 Coopers Close. The affected windows currently look out at a wooden close boarded fence. Any outlook from the windows over the fence is over the garden of the application property. The limited loss of outlook which would result from the proposed rear extensions is not considered to justify refusing the application.

Overall it is not considered that the proposed extensions would have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity.

## **Reasons for Granting**

The two storey rear and side extensions and single storey rear extension would not detrimentally impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area and there would be no detrimental impact upon any neighbouring properties. The scheme therefore, by reason of its site, design, materials 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 Policies CS14 and 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" and Design Supplement 4: Residential Alterations and Extensions.

## **Recommendation**

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the following:

- 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 the existing building and the visual amenities of the locality.

- 3 The tiles used for the roof of the front extension shall be sourced and reused from the rear of the existing dwelling house unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the building and of the area generally.

- 4 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 additional windows shall be inserted into northern or southern elevation of the proposed extensions.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents.

**DECISION**

.....  
.....