

## **Item No. 13**

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>	<b>CB/18/00083/FULL</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>53 Northwood End Road, Haynes, Bedford, MK45 3QB</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>Proposed single storey front and rear extension with a double storey side extension with integral garage. Demolish existing garage and shed</b>
<b>PARISH</b>	<b>Haynes</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Houghton Conquest &amp; Haynes</b>
<b>WARD COUNCILLORS</b>	<b>Cllr Mrs Barker</b>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	<b>Michael Allen</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED</b>	<b>30 January 2018</b>
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	<b>27 March 2018</b>
<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>Mr Bennett</b>
<b>AGENT</b>	
<b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE</b>	<b>Called in by Cllr Barker due to the development; causing an overbearing impact and loss of privacy to No. 53A, resulting in over development of site, being of poor design that would cause a harmful impact on the character of the area and therefore being contrary to policy.</b>
<b>RECOMMENDED DECISION</b>	<b>Full Application - Recommended for Approval</b>

### **Reason for Recommendation:**

The principle of enlargements and alterations of an existing residential dwelling is acceptable. The development would not result in an unacceptable impact on the character of the area, an adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties or highway safety. Therefore subject to conditions, the proposed development is in conformity with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and The National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Site Location:**

The application site consists of a semi detached two storey dwelling house and its curtilage. This site is located at No. 53 Northwood End Road, Haynes, MK45 3QB. To the north west of the site is dwelling No. 51 and to the south east of the site is No. 53A Northwood End Road.

### **The Application:**

This application seeks planning permission for a two storey side extension. The proposed side enlargement projects 2m beyond the principle side elevation wall, has a total depth of 7.3m, a total height of 8.0m and an eaves height of 4.9m.

This application seeks planning permission for a single storey rear/side extension.

The proposed rear/side extension enlargement projects 3.4m beyond the wall, has a width of 6.6m, a total height of 3.8m and an eaves height of 3.3m.

This application seeks planning permission for a single storey front/side extension. The proposed front/side extension enlargement projects 1.5m beyond the wall, has a width of 8m, a total height of 3.7m and an eaves height of 2.7m.

In addition this application seeks planning permission for the demolition of an existing garage and shed.

## **RELEVANT POLICIES:**

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012)**

#### **Core Strategy and Development Management Policies - North 2009**

DM3 High Quality Development  
CS14 High Quality Development

#### **Central Bedfordshire Local Plan - Emerging**

The Central Bedfordshire Local Plan has reached submission stage and was submitted to the Secretary of State on 30 April 2018.

The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 216) stipulates that from the day of publication, decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The apportionment of this weight is subject to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan;
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies;
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework.

Reference should be made to the Central Bedfordshire Submission Local Plan which should be given limited weight having regard to the above. The following policies are relevant to the consideration of this application:

#### **Supplementary Planning Guidance/Other Documents**

##### **Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (March 2014)**

7 Householder Alterations and Extensions

**Relevant Planning History:** None.

#### **Consultees:**

Haynes Parish Council

The Parish Council have made an objection on the following grounds:

- The development represents over development of the

plot.

- The development would have an undesirable impact on the street scene.
- The development would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of no 53a, which has a glass door & window on this side of their property, which will lose light from the development.
- The gap between the extension & the boundary appears very small. We ask that Planners ensure this gap meets current legislation, & there is room to bring out bins, bikes etc.
- There doesn't appear to be a scale bar on the floor plans. The garage appears to be very small, & potentially not big enough to comfortably park a car, creating the potential for an unwelcome increase in on road parking.
- Drawing No PL 100 has the site plan labelled as 'proposed whilst in fact it is the existing site plan.

## **Archaeology**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application. It has been noted that this is a re-consultation following submission of revised documents. Having reviewed new information the advice provided by the Archaeology Team remains the same and is as follows:

The proposed development site lies within the historic core of the medieval settlement of Northwood End, Haynes (HER 17043) and under the terms of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) this is a heritage asset with archaeological interest. However, the nature and scale of the proposals are such that there is unlikely to be a major impact upon any surviving archaeological remains. Consequently, there would be no archaeological objection to this application.

## **Highways**

The existing is a 3 bedroom dwelling with a small garage (difficult to park a vehicle within as measure 4.8m x 2.5m external dimensions) and at least 3 parking spaces in front and clear of the public highway. The garage is located at the rear of the site with a single width access adjacent to (south-west) the dwelling.

The proposal is to demolish the garage and shed, construct a single front extension, double side extension and integral garage. The amount of bedrooms remains unaltered. The access will be widened.

The current guidance for a single garage measure 3.3m x

7.0m internal dimensions. The proposed garage measures 2.6m x 5.0m internal dimensions. It is a like for like replacement to that which exists but at 5.0m length it will be difficult to park a vehicle within and access the garage door; a more suitable length is 5.5m which allows a vehicle to park and a resident to access the garage door between this and the vehicle.

A 6.0m length is required between the highway boundary and the front of the garage (5.5m if the garage has a roller shutter door). This allows a vehicle to park clear of the public highway and the driver to open the garage door. The proposal only has 3.5m in front of the garage door and clear of the public highway.

The proposal is also showing an additional vehicle parked on the hardstanding frontage and within the public highway which is not acceptable. Any permitted parking within the public highway is for ALL users of the highway and not private spaces only.

Therefore as submitted the proposal can not be supported as it removes existing parking provision and leave a 3 bedroom dwelling with possibly only 1 'tight' garage parking space.

It may be possible for the public highway to be stopped up, which removes the highway rights over the land. This process is open for consultation to all consultees within the council, parish council. Highway authority and all members of the public. If the applicant wishes to consider this they should contact the highways searches officer for further details. NOTE: if the land is successfully stopped up it will return to the land owner.

Please suggest the applicant withdraw the proposal and address the issues raised. If however you require a formal reason for refusal please advise and I will provide one.

## **Other Representations:**

### **Neighbours**

Two responses were received and made objections on the following grounds:

- Development causes a terracing effect
- No rear access to the host dwellinghouse.
- Causes an overbearing impact
- Causes a loss of light
- Has harmful implications on the character and appearance of the area
- Overdevelopment of site

- How will the building works be constructed without accessing the property of No. 53A?

### **Determining Issues:**

The main considerations of the application are;

### **Considerations**

#### **1. Character and Appearance of the Area**

- 1.1 The proposal includes a two storey side extension that project 2.0m beyond the principle side elevation wall. The extension is a large addition to the original dwelling, whilst the extension will appear prominent within the streetscene, it is considered that the scale, bulk and massing of the extended dwellinghouse as shown on the plans and elevations will not have such a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, given it will be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling and set down from the roof.
- 1.2 The proposed rear/side extension development would be located to the rear of the host dwellinghouse, whereby the enlargement would not be highly visible from public viewpoints. Furthermore; the proposed development would be single storey, set down from the ridge and eaves of the host building, appearing as a subservient addition, in accordance with the design principles outlined within the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (2014).
- 1.3 Due to the location of the single storey front/side enlargement, it is considered that the proposed development would be highly visible from the public realm and from the highway but due to the modest scale of the proposal, it is not overly prominent and would be acceptable. Furthermore; the proposed development would be single storey, set down from the ridge and eaves of the host building, appearing as a subservient addition, in accordance with the design principles outlined within the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (2014).
- 1.4 Therefore for the reasons outlined above subject to the imposition of conditions that would ensure the external materials used are acceptable in the context of the site, it is considered that the proposed development as a whole would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### **2. Amenity and Living Conditions of Occupiers of Neighbouring Dwellings**

- 2.1 Objections have been raised in relation to the proposed two storey side extension causing an overbearing impact. When the original plans were submitted there was a concern regarding the impact of the development on the neighbouring property No. 53A. Revised plans have now been submitted to address this issue, whereby the two storey extension has been set in by 0.7m from the boundary at first floor level and the ridge height has been lowered to ensure that this aspect of the development is subservient to the host dwellinghouse. In addition there is an adequate separation distance of 1.1m (approx) between the side wall of No. 53 and the side wall of No. 53A at ground floor level and 1.7m (approx) at first floor level. Given the above the revised plans have significantly reduced the impact on No. 53A and it is now considered from these amended plans that this aspect of the development is not

overbearing.

- 2.2 No 53A has a first floor side window that is obscurely glazed which would face directly towards the two storey side extension. Given this, the adequate separation distance between the proposed side extension and No.53's side window and the orientation of the sun, it is considered that this aspect of the development does not cause an unacceptable loss of outlook or light to No. 53A's first floor side window. In addition due to siting of the proposed two storey side extension and the positioning of No. 53A's rear windows. It is considered this aspect of the development will not cause any loss of light to any of No. 53A's rear windows.
- 2.3 The proposed two storey side extension will have a new window located to the rear which will serve as a bedroom. This window does not overlook No. 53A's rear garden private amenity space, given this it is considered that there is no unacceptable loss of privacy to No. 53A and therefore is acceptable.
- 2.4 When considering neighbouring dwelling No. 51 in relation to the two storey side aspect of this development. No. 51 will not have a viewpoint of the two storey side extension, for this reason it is considered that this aspect of the development will no cause any loss of light, privacy and outlook, nor is it overbearing upon No.51.
- 2.5 Due to the location, nature and scale of the proposed single storey rear extension it is considered that there is no unacceptable loss of privacy to dwelling No. 51. Given the Council's 45 degree guidance and the orientation of the sun there is no unacceptable lost of light to the nearest ground floor window at No. 51. In addition due to the single storey nature, depth of the extension, the proposed development has no overbearing impact or loss of outlook to No. 51.
- 2.6 Due to the single storey nature and the adequate separation distance between the proposed rear extension and neighbouring dwelling known as No. 53A, it is considered that there is no loss of light, privacy, outlook or overbearing impact. Therefore the development is considered acceptable.
- 2.7 Due to the location, nature and scale of the proposed front extension it is considered that there is no material loss of light, outlook, privacy or overbearing impact on immediate neighbouring dwellings known as No. 51 and 53A Northwood End Road.
- 2.8 So therefore the development as a whole would not cause harm to the amenity and living conditions of occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings in accordance with policy DM3 of the core strategy development management policies (2009).

### **3. Car Parking and Highway Safety**

- 3.1 The proposal would result in the host dwellinghouse becoming a three bedroomed house. The current parking standards contained within the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (2014) state that a 3 bedroomed house should have a minimum of 2 no. spaces (3 spaces suggested). Given Highways comments in relation to the proposed garage accommodation not meeting the minimum requirements of a garage parking space, the garage accommodation will not be counted within the minimum spaces required for a dwelling of this size.

- 3.2 From the plans submitted the site will offer two on site parking spaces which will be located on the front driveway. These two spaces are acceptable as they meet the width and depth requirements for two parking spaces in accordance with the Central Bedfordshire design guidelines. The proposed development will still be able to provide two parking spaces which is the same amount of parking spaces as the existing site frontage offers. In the absence in any highway safety concerns identified by the Highways team the proposed parking provision is considered acceptable notwithstanding that a small area of it may be sited on highway land.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable in the context of car parking and highway safety, in accordance with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009).

#### **4. Comments Received**

- 4.1 Objections have been received in relation to loss of outlook, overbearing impact, loss of light and harm to the character and appearance of the area. These objections have all been addressed within the report.
- 4.2 An objection has been raised about the proposed development causing a terracing effect. Given that the revised elevations of the proposed two storey side extension are now set 300mm back from the front elevation, set 0.7m from the boundary at first floor level and the ridge height has been dropped. It is considered that this aspect of the development does not cause a terracing effect.
- 4.3 A concern has been raised about the lack of accessibility to the rear of the garden if the proposed development was constructed. In addition to this, a concern has been raised on where is the room to bring out bins. It is clear from the plan that the rear garden can be accessed via the proposed garage and this route could be used for the bins. Therefore this is considered acceptable.
- 4.4 Another concern has been raised about how the building work will be constructed without going onto No. 53A's property. This is not a planning matter and instead it is a civil matter.
- 4.5 An objection has been raised about the proposed development would actually be overdevelopment of the site. Given the size of the existing dwellinghouse and the proposed works, the site will not be overdevelopment as the demolition of the existing shed and garage will actually create more amenity space. In addition the footprint of the proposed development is in proportion with the application site and therefore is considered acceptable.

#### **5. Equality and Human Rights**

- 5.1 Based on information submitted there are no known issues raised in the context of Human Rights/The Equalities Act 2010 and as such there would be no relevant implications.

#### **Recommendation:**

That Planning Permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following:

## RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 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 in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

(Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and Section 7, NPPF).

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers PL 100 Rev B, PL 101 Rev A, PL 102, PL 200 Rev D, PL 201 Rev D PL 202 Rev F and PL 203.

Reason: To identify the approved plan/s and to avoid doubt.

## INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT

1. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

2. **Will a new extension affect your Council Tax Charge?**

The rate of Council Tax you pay depends on which valuation band your home is placed in. This is determined by the market value of your home as at 1 April 1991.

Your property's Council Tax band may change if the property is extended. The Council Tax band will only change when a relevant transaction takes place. For example, if you sell your property after extending it, the new owner may have to pay a higher band of Council Tax.

If however you add an annexe to your property, the Valuation Office Agency may decide that the annexe should be banded separately for Council Tax. If this happens, you will have to start paying Council Tax for the annexe as soon as it is completed. If the annexe is occupied by a relative of the residents of the main dwelling, it may qualify for a Council Tax discount or exemption. Contact the Council for advice on **0300 300 8306**.

The website link is:

<http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/council-tax/bands/find.aspx>

**Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35**

The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process 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) Order 2015.

**DECISION**

.....  
  
.....