Item No. 17

APPLICATION NUMBER CB/13/00089/FULL

LOCATION 11 Medley Close, Eaton Bray, Dunstable, LU6 2DX PROPOSAL Erection of side dormer bedroom extension and

front porch.

PARISH Eaton Bray
WARD Eaton Bray
WARD COUNCILLORS CIIr Mrs Mustoe
CASE OFFICER Nicola Darcy
DATE REGISTERED 09 January 2013
EXPIRY DATE 06 March 2013
APPLICANT Mr Michael Simkins

AGENT

REASON FOR Called-in by Cllr Mrs Marion Mustoe for the

COMMITTEE TO following reasons:

DETERMINE 1. Appropriate development

2. Modest extension

3. Other properties extended in surrounding area

4. Not overlooked

5. Enhances look of house

6. No opposition from neighbours or Parish Council

RECOMMENDED DECISION

Full Application - Refused

Site Location:

The application site comprises a semi-detached, bungalow on a large corner plot of the cul-de-sac Medley Close in the village of Eaton Bray. The site is flanked by numbers 10 and 12 Medley Close, open countryside and Green Belt lie to the north of the site.

The character of Medley Close is made up of identical bungalows, situated around a pleasant green.

The existing building has a large rear dormer which dominates the rear roof slope.

The Application:

Permission is sought for a hip to gable conversion and the extension of the rear dormer to create a third bedroom within the proposed roof cavity.

Also subject of this application is a replacement side porch which would measure 1.2m in depth by 2.8m in width.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Section 7 : Requiring good design

South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review Policies

BE8 Design Considerations H8 Extensions to Dwellings T10 Parking

(Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, the age of the plan and the general consistency with the NPPF, policies BE8 & H8 are still given significant weight. T10 is afforded less weight)

Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire

Policy 27: Car Parking

Policy 43: High Quality Development

(Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, significant weight is given to the policies contained within the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire, which is consistent with the NPPF. The draft Development Strategy is due to be submitted to the Secretary of State in May 2013.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Central Bedfordshire Design Guide: A Guide for Development 2010 - Design supplement 4 - Residential Alteration and Extensions

Local Transport Plan Appendix F: Parking Strategy

Planning History

Application:PlanningNumber:CB/12/01168/FULLValidated:28/03/2012Type:Full ApplicationStatus:WithdrawnDate:24/05/2012

Summary: Decision: Application Withdrawn

Description: Erection of side dormer study extension and front porch.

Application:PlanningNumber:SB/07/00730Validated:02/07/2007Type:Outline ApplicationOutline Application04/09/0007

Status: Decided Date: 24/08/2007

Summary: Decision: Refuse Planning Permission

Description: ERECTION OF ONE DWELLING AND GARAGE (OUTLINE)

Application:PlanningNumber:SB/87/01269Validated:Type:Full ApplicationStatus:ReceivedDate:11/01/1988

Summary: Unknown Decision: Grant Planning Permission

Description: PROPOSED ROOM IN ROOF-SPACE

Representations:

(Parish & Neighbours)

Parish Council No objections

Neighbours None received

Consultations/Publicity responses

None required

Determining Issues

The main considerations of the application are;

- 1. Design
- 2. Highways
- 3. Other Issues

Considerations

1. Design

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Policy 43 of the emerging Development Strategy requires development to be appropriate in scale and design to their setting, contribute positively to creating a sense of place and respect local distinctiveness through design, layout and use of materials.

Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review requires development to take full account of the need for opportunities to enhance or reinforce the character and local distinctiveness of the area and the scale, massing and overall appearance should complement and harmonise with the local surroundings, particularly in terms of adjoining buildings and spaces and longer views. Policy H8 requires extensions to take full account of the character of the site and its surroundings and the setting of the existing building.

'Aims' (part 4) within the Central Bedfordshire Design guide state that:

"Proposals to alter or extend your home must have regard and respond positively to the host building, neighbouring properties and the wider context" and that 'Alterations and extensions should work with host buildings form, scale, massing and detailed design to produce a harmonious and respectful addition.'

'Design Principles' (part 6) states that maintaining the same roof pitch as the original house is more likely to result in an extension which is in proportion with the host building.

The proposed roof extension is considered to be out of keeping with the existing

dwelling, in terms of it's overall massing and scale.

This application essentially proposes a first floor, rather than accommodation in the loft space. The proposed flat crown is considered to be poor design and indicates that the development should either be reduced in size or the roofs reconfigured in order to achieve a more satisfactory roof design.

Many of the bungalows have rear dormers and there is an example of a hip to gable conversion within close proximity of the application site. That particular example details a half hip which is considered to be more in-keeping with the proportions of the original bungalow.

The size and bulk of the roof extension is considered to be out of keeping with the existing bungalow, wider street scene and surrounding dwellings, harmful to the character of the locale and therefore contrary to both local and national planning policy.

The proposed replacement porch is not considered to have any detrimental impact in terms of the character of the street scene or residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

2. Highways

The proposal would result in a three bedroom dwelling, although the driveway is organised to park two vehicles, it is considered that three vehicles could fit on the site and as such, the proposal would not be in conflict with the Council's parking strategy.

3. Other Issues

Human Rights issues

The proposal would raise no Human Rights issues.

Equality Act 2010

The proposal would raise no issues under the Equality Act 2010

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

The proposed roof extension would, because of its size, bulk, siting and unsympathetic design, be out of character with the existing dwelling and other similar properties in the locality harmful to the visual amenities of the street scene and of nearby residents. The proposal is therefore contrary to the principles of good design as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, to Policies BE8 and H8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review, Policy 43 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire and technical guidance Design in Central Bedfordshire, A Guide for Development (Supplement 4).

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management

Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2012 - Article 31

Planning permission has been refused for this proposal for the clear reasons set out in this decision notice. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant in an attempt to narrow down the reasons for refusal but fundamental objections could not be overcome. The applicant was invited to withdraw the application to seek pre-application advice prior to any re-submission but did not agree to this. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2012.

DECISION		