



## **The Application:**

This application seeks retrospective planning permission for the erection of single storey rear extension.

Following the demolition of an existing single storey mono-pitched extension to the eastern half of the rear of the dwelling, planning permission was granted for a single storey rear extension under planning application reference CB/12/03398/FULL.

This extant permission approved an extension measuring approximately 4.6 metres in width and 4.4 metres in depth. With a dual pitched roof it rose to a maximum ridge height of approximately 3.5 metres, falling to an eaves height of 2.2 metres.

The single storey extension built to the rear of the dwelling has not been built in accordance with the above permission. Accordingly, planning permission is retrospectively sought for this alternative addition. As built the extension measures approximately 3.5 metres, to the east falling to an eaves height of 2.2 metres, and to the west a parapet wall defines the shared boundary with adjoining neighbour No.40 approximately 2.6 metres in height. The extension projects northwards from the rear wall of the existing dwelling by 4.2 metres in to the rear garden, a total width of 4.5 metres.

## **RELEVANT POLICIES:**

### **National Guidance**

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)  
Circular 11/95 - The use of Conditions in Planning Permissions

### **Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (November 2009)**

|      |  |
|------|--|
| CS14 | High Quality Development                           |
| CS15 | Heritage   |
| DM3  | High Quality Development                           |
| DM4  | Development Within and Beyond Settlement Envelopes |
| DM13 | Heritage in Development                            |

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

Central Bedfordshire Council's Technical Guidance - Design Supplement 4:  
Residential  
Alterations and Extensions (January 2010)

### **Planning History**

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| CB/12/03398/FULL | Erection of a single storey rear extension. Approved 08.11.12                         |
| CB/13/01482/FULL | Land adj to No. 38: Erection of a three bedroom detached dwelling. Withdrawn 11.07.13 |

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

Sandy Town Council No consultation response received.

Consultation response (dated ) in response to previous planning application reference CB/12/03398/FULL:

Support the proposal but noted that the plans show changes to the existing cross over/access to the road. The Council's comment is only with respect to the extension.

Neighbours

No objections to the development have been made in writing directly to the case officer. However, the owner/occupier of the adjoining property, No.40 Bedford Road, has approached the Conservation Officer for his opinion on the development that has taken place at the application site, as proposed by this application. The concerns which they raise can be summarised as follows:

- The roof pitch seems at odds with the proportion and style of the existing house;
- The lintels, these are not gauged to match the existing, they appear straight vertical bricks, fanned by adding a couple of pieces to the end, this appears at odds with the windows they sit above;
- The brick colour does not match the existing, the stock yellows are in no way sympathetic to the existing and the new brick courses do not align with the old.

A full copy of the above correspondence can be viewed on the application file.

## Publicity

Local Press  
advertisement  
Site Notice

02.08.13

29.07.13

Posted to the pole of a road sign to front of property.

## Consultations/Publicity responses

Conservation

This is a relatively sensitive part of the conservation area, though this sensitivity relates in particular to the road frontages and the public realm.

The modified design of the single storey rear extension, currently under construction and much completed, now subject of this application is disappointing after the previous discussions with the applicant and agent for the earlier application granted permission (CB/12/03398/FULL) with close attention to detail and careful selection of materials that would have been in accord with our usual conservation area expectations/ requirements.

The extension as it now is (your photos are most helpful as a record)

is rather odd with the asymmetry of the rear elevation slate roof, parapet wall to the side boundary and somewhat sub-standard brick to the rear.

However, as you mentioned, the view from the Bedford Road footway, i.e. where the extension is mostly viewed from in terms of public realm, is probably acceptable. The impact on the neighbours is unfortunate, though, and I can quite understand their disquiet at this outcome. I will visit again to view and assess the neighbour impact- although you will have already carefully assessed the daylight/ sunlight implications and any oppressiveness/ loss of amenity involved.

## **Determining Issues**

The development has been assessed in the context of human rights issues and The Equalities Act (2010) and it is considered it would have no relevant implications. As such, from the consultation responses received and from an inspection of the application site and surrounding area the main considerations of the application are;

1. Principle of development
2. Character, design, context and impact upon the surrounding conservation area
3. Residential Amenity
4. Car parking and highway safety

## **Considerations**

### **1. Principle of development**

The site falls within the Sandy Settlement Envelope where Policy DM4 (Development within Settlement Envelopes) of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) states that the broad principle of residential development will normally be acceptable. Further to this the principle of development has been accepted by approval of CB/12/03398/FULL

As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in principle. Notwithstanding this, the implications for other policies of the Local Plan shall be considered within the main body of the report below.

### **2. Character, design, context and impact upon the surrounding conservation area.**

The site falls within the Sandy Conservation Area. As such, careful consideration should also be given to Policy DM13 (Heritage in Development) as well as DM3 of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009). Pre-application discussions with the Conservation Officer resulted in detailing to improve the design of the extension (as considered under application reference CB/12/3398/FULL) and now incorporates gauged brick arches over openings, more sympathetic to the character of the building it extended, also serving to enhance the character of

this part of the Conservation Area as has been implemented on site and under consideration of this current application.

Located to the rear of the dwelling and single storey in height the proposal is not considered to have a significant presence in the street scene that is significantly different from that of the original single storey addition that previously existed to the rear (as illustrated on drawing number 12/BR/02). While upvc windows and presumably plastic rain water goods are discouraged in conservation areas, the dwelling is not listed and located to the rear it is considered unreasonable to insist on higher quality detailing.

The roof has been finished in slate and reclaimed buff bricks in keeping with those of the original dwelling have been used on the east elevation which is visible from the public realm. It is acknowledged that a less sympathetic brick has been used to the rear north elevation and side elevation which sits on the shared boundary with adjoining No.40, but these materials, and the amended roof profile (asymmetrical comparable to the symmetrical roof profile of the extension approved by reference CB/12/03398/FULL) are not visible in the street scene of Bedford Road and as such the impact of the proposal upon the wider surrounding conservation area is considered acceptable. Accordingly the proposal is considered to comply with policies DM3 and DM13 of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009).

### **3. Residential amenity**

Hard to the common boundary with adjoining neighbour No.40 Bedford Road to the west, it is acknowledged the extension will have a greater impact upon the residential amenity of these neighbours than the former single storey extension which has been demolished and was set off the boundary by approximately 2.2metres.

When compared to the extension approved under planning application reference CB/12/03398/FULL the retrospective proposal considered by this application presents a parapet wall 0.2 metres higher than that previously approved. Further to visiting the site it is considered unlikely that this 0.2 metre difference in height will result in any materially greater loss of light as a result of overshadowing by the development. Located north east of these neighbours the extension does take some early morning light. The kitchen, a utility space and a toilet are located toward the rear of No.40 but, benefiting from northeast and northwest facing openings to the rear of the dwelling and mindful that this proposed addition extends no further into the garden than the original single storey rear extension (prior to the approval of CB/12/03398/FULL) that it has replaced, the difference is considered to be negligible. With respect to outlook this has been reduced but not to the extent that would warrant refusal. The proposal is only single storey in height and its dual pitched roof beyond the parapet slopes away from this adjoining neighbour.

In order to safeguard the privacy of the residential occupiers at No.37 a condition should be imposed which precludes any openings on the west facing elevation (condition 1). No other neighbouring dwellings are materially affected given their siting.

Subject to the suggested condition the proposal is considered acceptable with respect to residential amenity and in accordance policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009).

**4. Highway safety and car parking**

On site car parking remains unaffected by the proposal. Accordingly there is not considered to be any adverse implications for car parking or highway safety as a result of the proposal.

**Recommendation**

That Planning Permission be approved subject to the following:

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS / REASONS**

- 1 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 windows shall be inserted into the west elevation of the extension hereby approved.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009).

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers [12/BR/04/G; 12/BR/01; 12/BR/02].

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

**Notes to Applicant**

**Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2012 - Article 31**

The Council acted pro-actively through early engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development 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**

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

