

Item No. 8

SCHEDULE A

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/11/00974/FULL
LOCATION	Holly Cottage, Lower Rads End, Eversholt, Milton Keynes, MK17 9EE
PROPOSAL	Removal of existing two storey rear extension and flat roofed garages. Replace with two storey extension.
PARISH	Eversholt
WARD	Aspley & Harlington
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllr Budge Wells
CASE OFFICER	Mary Collins
DATE REGISTERED	16 March 2011
EXPIRY DATE	11 May 2011
APPLICANT	Mr J Nield & Ms J Craig
AGENT	David Sim Architects
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE RECOMMENDED DECISION	Councillor F Chapman called in. Requests that Councillors visit the site. There are good planning reasons for this application to be approved.
	Full Application - Refused

Site Location:

Holly Cottage is located on the southern side of the highway at Lower Rads End.

The property is two storey with white painted brick walls and a plain tile roof. To the front elevation it has two gable projections and to the rear a two storey rear extension. To the side/rear is a flat roofed double garage with a third garage attached. The property is one of a small group which forms this "end" of Eversholt. This area of Eversholt has no settlement envelope and therefore is for planning purposes considered to be in the open countryside. The site is located in the Green Belt.

The Application:

The application seeks consent for the removal of an existing two storey rear extension and flat roofed garages and their replacement with a two storey extension.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

National Policies (PPM & PPS)

PPS1: Planning for Sustainable Development

PPG2: Green Belts

PPS3: Housing

Regional Spatial Strategy - East of England Plan

ENV7: Quality in the Built Environment

Central Bedfordshire Council (North Area) Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009

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

ARDC/2668 p5720	Garage extension and additional garage. Porch to rear Approved: 12/04/73
MB/76/01358/FULL	Full: Alterations to kitchen and erection of first floor extension above to form bedroom. Approved: 22/03/1977
CB/09/01013/FULL	Full: Change of use from highway to garden. Withdrawn: 02/09/2009
CB/09/05833/FULL	Full: Change of use from Highway to Garden. 27/01/2010
CB/10/04519/FULL	Full: Removal of existing two storey rear extension and flat roofed garages. Replace with two storey extension. Withdrawn: 31/01/2011

Representations: (Parish & Neighbours)

Eversholt Parish Council	No objection other than comments made on the previous application: The residents at numbers 7 and 8 and the detached property in between 6 and 7 will potentially lose their view. Will the new windows on the proposed works overlook the properties intrusively. Drainage Is there any conservation restrictions on any of the trees to be felled.
Neighbours	No responses received

Consultations/Publicity responses

Archaeology	The proposed development lies in within the medieval core of the settlement at Lower Rads End. It is an archaeologically sensitive site area and a locally identified heritage asset. However, the location, scale and nature of the proposed development mean that there is unlikely to be a serious impact on archaeological deposits or on the significance of the heritage asset. Therefore, the officer has no objection to the application on archaeological grounds.
-------------	---

Highways

The existing is a four bedroom dwelling with parking for five vehicles; three garages and three spaces in front (One garage is discounted as it is not long enough for a vehicle).

The proposal is to remove the garages leaving three on site parking spaces, and extend the dwelling to a five bedroom property. Although consider that three parking spaces for a five bedroom dwelling is not enough the parking provision complies with the current guidance and therefore have no reason to object to the proposal as submitted.

Determining Issues

The main considerations of the application are;

1. Principle of Development
2. Visual impact upon the landscape value and character and appearance of the area and the Green Belt
3. Impact on amenities of neighbouring residents
4. Other concerns

Considerations

1. Principle of Development

The property lies in the designated Greenbelt and open countryside wherein there is a presumption against inappropriate development. Paragraph 3.6 of PPG2 is relevant to this application:

*3.6 "Provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the **original** building, the extension or alteration of dwellings is not inappropriate in Green Belts.*

The dwelling is also in the open countryside where development is allowed only exceptionally. All development in rural areas should be well designed and inclusive, in keeping and in scale with its location, and sensitive to the character of the countryside and local distinctiveness.

The original house is considered to comprise the two storey section fronting the highway. There are no planning records for the initial ground floor extension to the rear or the single garage to the side. Planning records indicate that since 1948 the dwelling has been extended first to the side to form a flat roofed single garage which in 1973 was extended to the front and side to form an additional garage. At this time a porch was added to the rear to the side of the kitchen. In 1977 planning permission was granted for the extension of the kitchen and the construction of a first floor over to form a bedroom. There are no records of planning permission being granted for the third garage built alongside the double garage.

Original Footprint

The original dwelling has a footprint: 38.44 sq metres.

Original volume

Original volume excluding roof space: 172.98 cubic metres.

Total new footprint:

Footprint of extension: 82.94 sq metres.

Proposed volume:

Volume of extension (excluding roof and link section): 302.46 cubic metres

It is considered that the proposal represents a doubling of the footprint and volume of the existing dwelling and as such is considered to be disproportionate to the size of the original dwelling.

2. Visual impact upon the landscape value and character and appearance of the area and the Green Belt.

Core Strategy policy DM3 requires that new development be appropriate in scale and design to their setting and should contribute to creating a sense of place and respect local distinctiveness through design and use of materials.

In terms of supplementary planning guidance A Design Guide for Central Bedfordshire and Design Supplement 4: Residential Alterations and Extensions, in paragraph 4.01 (p.4) it states that 'proposals to alter or extend your home must have regard and respond positively to the host building..' It also states in paragraph 4.04 that 'alterations and extensions should work with the host buildings form, scale, massing and detailed design to produce a harmonious and respectful addition'. Later in this supplement it also states that extensions 'must work with the existing architectural style and form of the host building' (para 6.02.1).

It is agreed that the existing two storey rear extension is bulky and unsympathetic to the character of the dwelling as are the three flat roofed garages which are inappropriate in character and that their removal is considered to be beneficial.

The proposed extension would be located to the rear of the building and would project to the side (west) where the garages are currently located by approximately 6 metres. The extension is linked to the rear of the main dwelling by a two storey section which is 1.8 metres deep by 7 metres wide with the extension itself being 14.8 metres wide by 5 metres at it deepest point.

The link is set in from the side wall of the existing dwelling and its roof is subservient to both the existing roof and the roof of the two storey extension.

The ridgeline of the proposed extension would be 30cm lower than that of the existing dwelling and the ridgeline of the link between the existing dwelling and proposed extension would be around one metre lower than that of the existing ridgeline.

The section of the two storey extension which would project to the side of the existing dwelling and replace the flat roofed garages would have the greatest visual impact from the lane. The extension would replace single storey structures and would therefore have an increased visual impact. However, the width of the side projection (6 metres) is considered to be in proportion with the existing house as it does not exceed half the width of the original dwelling and due to its set back of 1.8 metres from the rear of the house and 7 metres from the front of the site and its lower ridge line, it will be subservient and recessive in relation to the front of the dwelling. The design of the part of the extension seen from the highway would be simple with limited detailing to reflect the subservient role.

However the extension will project to the rear of the existing dwelling by 7 metres and the bulk and massing due to this depth will be visible from the lane. The extension is not considered to be in proportion with the depth of the existing dwelling and doubles the original depth of the dwelling. There will be views of the rear extension from the lane across the rear gardens of 1-6 Lower Rads End and the parking area to the side of the application site. Although the extension will be set in from the side wall of the dwelling by 3.5 metres and the extension will appear recessive being set back from the end gable, the full extent of the side wall of the extension will be visible.

When viewed from the other direction, the full depth of the extension will be visible and will be visually prominent with recessive views of the extension not reducing the appearance of its scale and bulk and the visual impact of the extension.

The extension would present two gables to the rear elevation. The extension dominates the rear elevation of the existing building obscuring much of the existing elevational details with only the ridgeline, chimneys, a small section of the original rear wall and ground floor window visible. The extension is also wider than the original house and is considered to be out of scale with the dwelling.

The application proposes that the materials used in the extensions would match those used in the existing dwelling. The existing dwelling is currently brick painted white in colour. The application includes a note setting out that it is proposed to remove the existing white paint from the walls of the dwelling as it is believed that the brickwork underneath maybe more attractive. If the brickwork is not of sufficient quality the walls would be repainted white in colour. It is considered that either removing the paint and retaining the original brickwork underneath or repainting the house and extension white in colour would be appropriate.

The extension is not considered to be in proportion with the existing dwelling. It is considered that the proposal will erode the character and appearance of the original dwelling and does not produce a harmonious and respectful addition.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would be contrary to the guidance given in Design Supplement 4: Residential Alterations and Extensions.

The proposal due to its size is not considered to be appropriate in scale to its setting and would therefore be contrary to Policy DM3 of the Central Bedfordshire Council (North Area) Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

3. Impact on amenities of neighbouring residents

The rear elevation of the extension will be closer to the boundary with neighbouring properties in cottages at 7-9 Lower Rads End than the existing rear elevation of the existing two storey rear extension. First floor bedroom windows will face these properties.

The window to Bedroom 2 will face towards the gable end of 7 Lower Rads End, however the window to Bedroom 1 will face the rear of this property. There is a distance of less than 21 metres between the two windows which is considered to be the minimum between windows to ensure a loss of privacy does not arise. However the windows do not directly face each other but instead are angled towards each other. Nonetheless it is considered that direct views could still be had and that a detrimental loss of privacy would result.

A minimum garden depth between the rear of the extension and the rear boundary of the site of 7 metres has been retained. It is considered that there may be potential for overlooking and a detrimental loss of privacy through overlooking into neighbouring gardens.

A first floor window is proposed in the side of the extension which will face the rear of the properties at 1-6 Lower Rads End. It is to serve a bathroom and a condition will be imposed to ensure it is fitted with obscured glazing to prevent a loss of privacy through overlooking.

The window to Bedroom 2 will face towards the rear of 6A Lower Rads End and bedroom windows at first floor level. Again there is a distance of less than 21 metres between the two windows and although the windows do not directly face each other, it is considered that direct views could still be had and that a detrimental loss of privacy would result. The extension will be within 6 metres of the boundary with this property and it is considered that a detrimental loss of privacy through overlooking into the private rear garden would arise.

4. Other issues

There are no protected trees on the site and there is no objection to the removal of the trees shown to accommodate the extension.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be Refused for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed extension, by nature of its size in comparison with the original dwelling, would result in a disproportionate extension in a Green Belt location where restrictive planning policies apply. The proposal therefore constitutes inappropriate development and no very special circumstances have been submitted to justify the development. The proposal is therefore contrary to Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belt January 1995 (Amended March 2001).
- 2 The proposal due to the depth of its projection would result in an incongruous form of development that would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling; as such the proposal is contrary to Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies for Central Bedfordshire (North) and Supplementary Planning Guidance: Design Supplement 4: Residential Alterations and Extensions (2010).
- 3 The proposal would have an adverse impact on the amenities, outlook and privacy of the occupiers of nearby residential properties; as such the proposal is contrary to Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies for Central Bedfordshire (North).

Notes to Applicant

DECISION

.....
.....
.....
.....