

DELEGATED

**AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

DATE 30th JANUARY 2008

**REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR,
DEVELOPMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD
SERVICES**

07/2975/FUL

19A Ridley Drive, Norton

Demolition of existing attached garage. Erection of a two storey side extension, single storey side & rear extension and a bay window to the front of the dwelling.

Expiry Date 21 January 2008

SUMMARY

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey side extension, single storey extension to side and rear and a bay window to front of this detached dwelling, which is located within a residential cul-de-sac.

Initial concerns were raised with regards to design of the proposed two storey extension to the side. The applicant and agent subsequently submitted revised drawings addressing the concern, which is to be now considered for determination.

The initial drawings received five letters of objection from surrounding neighbours; whilst the revised drawings dated 26th November 2007 received one letter of objection. On this basis the application is required to be determined by the Planning Committee.

It is considered that the proposed developments are of a scale, design and proportion that complement the existing dwelling. It is not considered that the proposals would have an adverse impact on the street scene. The design and layout would maintain the privacy of the occupants of existing dwellings and would not dominate or overshadow those properties. It is considered that the proposed development would retain sufficient amenity space at the existing dwelling and that the requisite car parking spaces can be provided.

The application is considered to accord with policies GP1, HO12 and does not significantly conflict with Supplementary Planning Guidance Number 2: Householder Extension Design Guide of the Stockton on Tees Adopted Local Plan and it is recommended that the proposals be approved.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning application 07/2975/FUL be Approved subject to the following conditions:-

01 The development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the following approved plan(s); unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
1 OF 6	18 October 2007
2 OF 6	18 October 2007
3 OF 6	18 October 2007
SBC0001	18 October 2007
4 OF 6	26 November 2007
5 OF 6	26 November 2007
6 OF 6	26 November 2007

Reason: To define the consent.

02. The external finishing materials shall match with those of the existing building

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory form of development

03. The proposed windows of the proposed two storey extension to side in the rear first floor elevation; shall be glazed with obscure glass, details of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences and shall be installed before the building hereby permitted is brought into use and the type of glazing agreed shall be employed in those windows during the life of the building.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent property.

The Proposal has been considered against the policies below and it is considered that the scheme accords with these policies and the proposal is in keeping with the property and the street scene in terms of style, proportion and materials and does not involve any significant loss of privacy and amenity for the residents of the neighbouring properties. and there are no other material considerations which indicate a decision should be otherwise.

**Adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan (June 1997)
GP1 General Principles
HO12 Householder Extensions**

Supplementary Planning Guidance Number 2: Householder Extension Design Guide

PROPOSAL

The applicant seeks planning permission for the demolition of existing attached garage, with the erection of a two storey side extension, single storey side & rear extension and a bay window to the front of the dwelling.

CONSULTATIONS

The following Consultations were notified and any comments received are set out below:-

Urban Design Engineers
Urban Design\Urban Design - SP

Proposal: Demolition of existing attached garage. Erection of a two storey side extension, single storey side & rear extension and a bay window to the front of the dwelling Date: 17/12/07
Location: 19A Ridley Drive, Norton, Stockton-on-Tees Ref: 07/2975/FUL Rev

LTP Shared Priority Check	Consultation
Congestion	Traffic Management
Road Safety	Public Transport
Accessibility	Network Management
Air Quality	Consultancy
Quality of Life	Road Safety
Parks & Countryside	
Environment	

I refer to your memo dated: 28 November 2007

Reference drawing no:

General Summary

See below.

Highways Comments

A 5-bedroom property requires 4 in-curtilage car parking spaces. I have no adverse comment to make regarding this application subject to the 4 spaces being provided to the Design Guide standard.

The applicant will need to speak to Direct Services regarding widening the dropped kerb crossing.

The use of unbound material for surfacing of private driveways is not acceptable as this causes damage to the adopted footway and carriageway leading to a requirement for premature maintenance.

Landscape & Visual Comments

No Comments

Built Environment Comments

No Comments

PUBLICITY

Neighbours were notified and comments received are summarised below:-

Mrs Maureen Lund
19 Ridley Drive' Norton
Summarised:

Objects to proposal on grounds of being overbearing, loss of light and view, rear windows will overlook their rear garden, loss of privacy, too close to boundary and concerned with safety, out of character with surrounding properties.

Mr and Mrs M Tomlinson
20 Clements Rise' Norton

Summarised:

Objects on grounds of loss of privacy to rear garden and property, out of character with street, will create social problems and would prefer downsizing of extension.

J P Lee
24 Clements Rise' Norton

Summarised:

Objects to application on grounds that the house is at a higher level to surrounding properties, extension will appear to join fully with the neighbouring property, overlook my rear garden, out of character with street.

Mr G Lund
19 Ridley Drive' Norton

1. We are of the opinion that the house is a large detached on an estate of average semi-detached, and is somewhat out of character. Concern is expressed that the appearance of the extended house will be even more out of character.
2. Building tight to the boundary could be dangerous - we regularly look after our grand children (Several days per week) and their safety is paramount. We fear that access to and from the rear of our property will be severely impeded and as a consequence we will not give permission for scaffolding construction or provide access to our property.
3. There is concern for builder's traffic on narrow estate roads.
4. We understand that the property will be vacated while the work is being carried out - this could mean that noise, dust and safety are not controlled properly.
5. We are very concerned that the new gable side elevation will be overpowering and deprive our property of light and view.
6. Drainage from 19a connects to manholes in our property; we are concerned that alterations may cause problems.
7. We are very concerned that the two top storeys windows at the rear of the property will be overlooking our rear garden and invade of our privacy.

James Foulger
22 Clements Rise' Norton

Summarised:

Objects to proposal on grounds that it will be overbearing, loss of light and view to his property, ground floor extension will be too close to his property, causing noise and loss of privacy. Concerned with security while the house is rebuilt and will be out of character with street scene.

Mr G Lund
19 Ridley Drive' Norton

I have been advised by one of my close neighbours that an update to the proposed planning application has been distributed to those addresses that adjoin or are close by the property in question (9 addressees in total) however; no details have been forwarded to my address.

Due to the lateness of my receiving information I would imagine that it is too late to send these details to me in time for me to respond before the close date for objections to be received.

I have however, seen a copy of the letter and revised plan passed to my neighbour and would like to state that there would be no change to my originally submitted objections forwarded to you earlier as a consequence.

PLANNING POLICY

The relevant development plan in this case is the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

Where an adopted or approved development plan contains relevant policies, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that an application for planning permissions shall be determined in accordance with the Development Plan(s) for the area, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the relevant Development Plans are: - *the Tees Valley Structure Plan (TVSP) and the Stockton on Tees Local Plan (STLP)*.

The following planning policies are considered to be relevant to the consideration of this application:-

Policy GP1

Proposals for development will be assessed in relation to the policies of the Cleveland Structure Plan and the following criteria as appropriate:

- (i) The external appearance of the development and its relationship with the surrounding area;
- (ii) The effect on the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties;
- (iii) The provision of satisfactory access and parking arrangements;
- (iv) The contribution of existing trees and landscape features;
- (v) The need for a high standard of landscaping;
- (vi) The desire to reduce opportunities for crime;
- (vii) The intention to make development as accessible as possible to everyone;
- (viii) The quality, character and sensitivity of existing landscapes and buildings;
- (ix) The effect upon wildlife habitats;
- (x) The effect upon the public rights of way network.

Policy HO12

Where planning permission is required, all extensions to dwellings should be in keeping with the property and the street scene in terms of style, proportion and materials and should avoid significant loss of privacy and amenity for the residents of neighbouring properties.

Permission for two-storey rear extensions close to a common boundary will not normally be granted if the extension would shadow or dominate neighbouring property to a substantial degree.

Permission for two-storey side extensions close to a common boundary will not normally be granted unless they are set back from the boundary or set back from the front wall of the dwelling

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

This application site is a detached dwelling located within the corner bend of a residential cul-de-sac, which predominately comprises of semi-detached dwellings. The property in question is set back and orientated away from the highway of Ridley Drive by approx. 17.0 metres. There is a long driveway to the front of the property, which faces onto an electricity sub station and the gable wall of No. 21 Ridley Drive (East).

To the North and West (rear), of the site, there is a large garden area, which increases in ground level towards the boundary perimeter by 900mm (approx.). The boundary treatments surrounding the property to the rear, comprises of 1.6m high wooden fencing.

There are residential properties to the rear of the property, which are located at Clements Rise and the adjacent dwelling to the South, is No.19 Ridley Drive, which is a semi-detached dwelling with an attached garage to the boundary of No.19A and which is at a slightly lower ground level to the application site.

The residential properties along Ridley Drive, predominately comprise of two storey side extensions, which comprise of various sizes and designs.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning consideration in respect of this proposal is the impact on the street scene and visual amenity and any impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and highway safety issues.

Street Scene

Given the orientation, siting and the property being a detached dwelling within a street scene of semi-detached properties, it is considered that the proposed two storey extension to side produces a subservient design and the proposed front bay window, visually enhances the existing dwelling, from its present state. Also, by incorporating similar materials and not significantly projecting forward of the existing dwelling. It is not considered that the proposals will be obtrusive in the street scene or have any significant impact upon the character of this residential street.

With respect to the remaining elements of the proposal, these are not considered to impact upon the street scene, due to the fact; there will not be visible from this point of view.

Privacy and Amenity

As there are various proposals to this application and for clarity, each one has been assessed separately:

Two storey extension to side:

The proposed extension will involve the demolition of the existing attached garage to the side if approved permission. The two storey extension will measure 5.4m wide x 7.9m wide x 6.4m high with a hipped roof. The proposed roof height will be 300mm lower than the original roof height. This development will be sited on the footprint of the previous garage, however, be sited 200mm away from the boundary of No.19 Ridley Drive and be sited flush with the front and rear building line. There will be a blank gable wall facing onto No.19 Ridley Drive, Norton.

The development needs to be examined in relation to the 45 degree rule policy found within the Supplementary Planning Guidance Number 2: Householder Extension Design Guide. In light of this examination, the proposal does not conflict with the 45 degree rule. It is also considered that due to the extension comprising of a hipped roof; the gable wall facing onto a landing and obscure glazed bathroom window of No.19, the proposal will only have a slight shading impact upon No.19. The proposed extension will not significantly reduce the amount of daylight entering into the rear of the neighbouring properties or have an overbearing impact, to be sufficient to warrant a refusal of the application.

To the rear of the application site, the proposal will be a distance of 16.0 metres approximately from No.22 and 24 Clements Rise, Norton. Given, that the existing property is sited at the same distance from the neighbouring properties to the rear at present and the proposed windows of the extension will be part of the bathroom and en-suite, it is considered that the development therefore, does not have any significant impact upon these properties, with respects to loss of privacy or amenity of neighbouring residents.

This will be further secured by the placing of a planning condition on the approval notice for the installation of obscure glazing into these proposed windows.

Single storey extension to rear and side:

This part of the development will comprise of a wrap around extension which is to be sited to the rear of the proposed garage and continue around to the north elevation of the property. It will measure 2.4m long x 14.1m wide x 3.3m high, with a lean to roof design. The remaining part of the extension, which continues around to the north elevation, will measure 7.7m long x 1.8m wide x 3.3m high.

Given the extension will be partially screened by the raised ground level of the rear garden and the existing boundary treatments, the proposed development is not considered to have a significant impact on loss of privacy or amenity of these neighbouring residents to rear along Clements Rise, Norton.

Bay window to front:

The proposed bay window will project approx. 500mm from the existing front building line and extend 4.7m wide along the width of the original part of the front elevation. The development is considered to aesthetically enhance the bland design of the existing dwelling and given the proposed window will face onto the gable wall of No.21, will not impede on the privacy of these residents or worsen the existing situation as the present windows.

Highway Safety

As the application site has sufficient spaces to accommodate 5 no.incurtilage car parking spaces, the proposal meets the Head of Technical Services design standards for a 5no. Bedroom property.

It is therefore considered that the proposed developments will have no significant impact upon, on street parking and highway safety along Ridley Drive, Norton.

Residual matters

The remaining issues raised by the objectors with respects to drainage and construction concerns can be dealt with separately by the building control department and is not a planning matter. The remaining issues with regards to builder's traffic, noise and disturbance from building works are also not material considerations in determining this application and can be dealt with by other statutory bodies of the authority such as Environmental Health. While comment has been made by one of the objectors about not receiving notification of the amended plans, the Computer processing system clearly indicates that all relevant neighbours were reconsulted by letter.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the development is in keeping with the property and the street scene in terms of style, proportion and materials, and does not involve any significant loss of privacy for the residents of neighbouring properties. There will remain sufficient amenity space for residents.

The proposal is not contrary to Policy GP1 and HO12 or advice within Supplementary Planning Guidance Number 2 of the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services
Contact Officer Mr Fahim Farooqui Telephone No 01642 528558

Financial Implications – As report

Environmental Implications – As report

Legal Implications – As report

Community Safety Implications – As report

Background Papers –

Stockton on Tees Local Plan (June 1997), Adopted Tees Valley Structure Plan (February 2004),

Human Rights Implications - The provisions of the European Convention of Human Rights 1950 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report

WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS

Ward	Norton North
Ward Councillor	Councillor M. Frankland

Ward	Norton North
Ward Councillor	Councillor Mrs K. F. Nelson