

DELEGATED

**AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

24 February 2010

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

10/0040/REV

25 St Davids Grove, Ingleby Barwick, Stockton-on-Tees

Revised application for erection of single storey rear extension, part conversion of integral garage into utility room, raising of roof height and installation of velux windows to the front and rear for provision of 2 no. bedrooms in roof space and single storey hall/porch extension to front

Expiry Date 8 March 2010

SUMMARY

This revised application seeks planning permission to raise the roof height of the dwelling by approximately 0.9m with the installation of velux windows in the front and rear roof slope, the erection of a single storey extension to the rear, a single storey hall/porch extension to the front and the part conversion of the existing integral garage at No 25 St Davids Grove.

The main planning considerations with regard to this application are the impact on the existing dwelling and street scene, the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, the impact on access and highway safety and any other residual matters.

No objections have been received from The Acting Head of Technical Services. 2 letters of objection have been received from neighbouring properties.

In accordance with the approved scheme of delegation, the application is being reported to the Planning Committee for determination, as the applicant is an employee of the Local Authority (Connexions).

It is considered that the proposed scheme will not have a significant adverse impact on the existing dwelling and street scene; the proposal will not lead to an unacceptable loss of amenity for neighbouring residents and will not lead to an adverse loss of highway safety. The application is therefore recommended for approval

RECOMMENDATION

Planning application 10/0040/REV be Approved subject to 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.***

<i>Plan Reference Number</i>	<i>Date on Plan</i>
<i>PAGE 2 REV A</i>	<i>9 February 2010</i>
<i>SBC0001</i>	<i>11 January 2010</i>
<i>SBC0002</i>	<i>11 January 2010</i>
<i>PAGE 3</i>	<i>11 January 2010</i>

Reason: To define the consent.

02. Prior to the development, hereby approved, being brought into use, two additional car parking spaces (to provide a total of four spaces), shall be provided within the curtilage of the property in accordance with Plan SBC0002 (dated 11th January 2010), the surface of which shall be in accordance with the details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall provide for the use of permeable materials or make provision to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse. The approved car parking spaces shall be retained for the life of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason; To provide sufficient car parking to serve this five bedroom dwelling and to prevent increase risk of flooding from surface water run off.

03. Construction of the external walls and roof shall not commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the structures hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control details of the proposed development.

INFORMATIVES

General Policy Conformity

The proposed scheme has been considered against the policies and documents identified below. It is considered that the scheme accords with these documents as the proposal does not lead to an unacceptable loss of amenity for neighbouring residents in terms of outlook, overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing. It is also considered that the proposal does not have an adverse impact on the existing dwelling and does not create a significant incongruous feature within the street scene. It is further considered that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on access and highway safety. There are no material planning considerations, which indicate that a decision should be otherwise.

The following saved policies of the Adopted Stockton on Tees Plan and associated documents are considered to be relevant to the determination of this application

Policy GP1 -General Principles

Policy HO12 -Domestic Development

Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2; Householder extension guide (SPG2, 2004)

Supplementary Planning Document 3; Parking provision for new development (SPD3, 2006)

The applicant should contact Direct Services regarding the widening of the vehicle crossing.

Unbound materials, such as gravel, may only be used if a 1.5m hard-surfaced buffer strip is provided adjacent to the highway for the full width of the access in order to prevent materials being carried onto the highway.

BACKGROUND

1. Planning application 09/2531/FUL for the erection of a single storey extension to the rear, the conversion of the garage into a utility room, and to raise height of roof by 1 meter with a dormer window extension in the rear elevation of the dwelling was withdrawn on 7th December 2009. The application was withdrawn as the applicant could not provide adequate parking.

PROPOSAL

2. This revised application seeks planning permission to raise the roof height of the dwelling by approximately 0.9m with the installation of velux windows within the front and rear roof slope. The proposal also seeks permission for the erection of a single storey extension to the rear, a single storey hall/porch extension to the front and the part conversion of the existing integral garage. (The previous scheme included a dormer window to the rear and the proposed roof height was 100mm higher at 1 metre).
3. The proposed increase in the existing roof height and internal alterations to the existing first floor will facilitate the conversion of the loft space to provide 2 bedrooms (resulting in 5 bedrooms in total) with an en suite facility. The proposed roof will measure approximately 3.7m in height (8.45m in total height) with a gable end pitched roof x 10.15m in length x 6.7m in width. The proposal will also feature 3 velux roof lights in the front and 2 velux roof lights in the rear, which measure approximately 0.9m x 0.7m.
4. The proposed single storey extension to the rear will project approximately 4m x 3.9m in width x 3.3m in height with a pitched roof. The proposal will feature 2 sets of opening doors in the rear (east) elevation, 1 velux roof light in the south elevation, and 1 velux roof light and a set of French doors in north elevation.
5. The proposed single storey hall/porch extension to the front of the dwelling will infill an area measuring approximately 0.9m in depth x 3.5m in width x 3m in height with a lean to roof. The proposal will feature 1 window and a set of doors in the front (west) elevation.
6. The proposed part conversion of the existing integral garage will facilitate the creation of a utility room at ground floor level, which will measure approximately 2.5m x 3m in area. The remainder of the garage will be used as a store. The existing garage door to the front will be retained and no external alterations will be made.

CONSULTATIONS

7. The following Consultees were notified and comments received are set out below:-

Head of Technical Services

8. Highways Comments
The revised plans show 4 car parking spaces to Design Guide Standard therefore no objections are raised to this application.

The applicant should contact Direct Services regarding the widening of the dropped vehicle crossing. It should be noted that unbound materials, such as gravel, may only be used if a 1.5m hard surfaced buffer strip is provided adjacent to the highway for the full width of the access in order to prevent materials being carried onto the highway.

Landscape & Visual Comments

No comments.

Ingleby Barwick Town Council

9 No Comments received

PUBLICITY

10. Neighbours were notified and comments received are summarised below:-

Mr Andrew Fullerton, 9 Gilwern Court Ingleby Barwick

11. I am writing to you to object to the above planning application, though I note the application has been amended, I would still maintain that as my garden faces west, by raising their roof this will have detrimental effect upon the amount of direct sunlight in my garden in an evening, as I work full time, this is virtually the only time I am able to enjoy it. I also feel that as no properties within vicinity have a 2nd storey, as in other areas of Ingleby Barwick, this property will in adversely stand out from its neighbours. If the family require more space, then why not sell up and move to a purpose built 3 storey house instead of causing an upset to the immediate neighbours. I would urge the planning department rejects this part of the plans. I am adamant that the applications will not succeed and will explore all avenues including taking the matter to court if need be.

Mr J A Corney, 3 Bloreng Court Ingleby Barwick

12. The proposed application is not in keeping with the surrounding properties. All are two storey dwellings and the raising of the roof line above the existing level would have a visually detrimental effect on the area. The increase in height would impact on the amount of light reaching our garden in the early evening. I am also concerned that once one application is approved the precedent will have been set and the potential for further applications will increase. This would further reduce the amount of sunlight reaching my property. Should the applicant require 3 storeys then there are other developments where suitable alternative properties are available.

The revision of replacing the large dormer window with velux windows would still have an excessive infringement on our privacy due to their elevated position; my property was purchased only after having inspected the then Shepherd homes development to ensure it would not be overlooked. I believe that my property would have reduced saleability with a negative impact on its valuation, if the proposed development in its revised form is approved, the proposed ground floor extension would bring the existing development considerably closer to the existing party boundary, with the associated increase in noise. The recent removal of the party boundary hawthorn hedgerow by the applicant and the installation of a hard standing area and trampoline adjacent to the party boundary have already had an impact on the enjoyment of our garden. I urge the planning committee to reject the revised application.

PLANNING POLICY

13. 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 is the Adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan (STLP) and the Regional Spatial Strategy (RRS).

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

Policy GP1

15. Proposals for development will be assessed in relation to the policies of the Cleveland Structure Plan and the following criteria as appropriate:
 - The external appearance of the development and its relationship with the surrounding area;
 - The effect on the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties;
 - The provision of satisfactory access and parking arrangements;
 - The contribution of existing trees and landscape features;
 - The need for a high standard of landscaping;
 - The desire to reduce opportunities for crime;
 - The intention to make development as accessible as possible to everyone;
 - The quality, character and sensitivity of existing landscapes and buildings;
 - The effect upon wildlife habitats;
 - The effect upon the public rights of way network.

Policy HO12

16. 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.
17. Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2; Householder extension guide (SPG2, 2004)
18. Supplementary Planning Document 3; Parking provision for new development (SPD3, 2006)

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

19. The application site is a four bedroom, two storey, detached dwelling located within the cul de sac of St Davids Grove, Ingleby Barwick.
20. To the north of the application site is No 23 St Davids Grove, to the south is No 27 St Davids Grove, and to the west (front) is the highway and No 5 Davids Grove. To the rear of the site are No's 3 and 4 Bloreng Court (north east) and No 9 Gilwern Court (south east).
21. An existing integral garage and driveway to the front provide three incurtilage car parking spaces. An approximately 1.8m high closed boarded fence encloses the rear garden of the application site.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

22. The main planning considerations with regard to this application are the impact on the existing dwelling and street scene, the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of outlook, overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing, the impact on access highway safety and any other residual matters.

Impact on existing dwelling and street scene

23. With regard to raising the roof height of a dwelling to facilitate a loft conversion, the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Householder Extensions (SPG No.2) states that "there are only a few houses where it can be done without significant visual harm and is therefore not normally supported by the Council".
24. However, developments including the raising of roof heights have been supported by the Planning Inspectorate at sites within the Borough. The Inspector allowed the appeal to raise the roof height at No 6 Burdale Close, Eaglescliffe (SBC refusal reference 07/2906/FUL, appeal reference APP/H0738/A/08/2071530/WF), in which the Inspector commented that the proposal "would add variety...I do not consider that the proposal would significantly upset the aesthetic balance of the house, but could improve its proportions and ameliorate the rather squat and horizontal emphasis, typical of many suburban house designs". The Inspector concluded that the proposal would not "conflict with the aims of the Council's supplementary planning guidance...and would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider street scene".
25. A planning appeal was also allowed by the Planning Inspectorate to raise the roof height of No 15 Cribyn Close, Ingleby Barwick (SBC refusal reference 03/2206/FUL, appeal reference APP/H0738/A/04/1140789). The Inspectorate commented that "whilst the proposal would undoubtedly introduce some differences that would not be apparent on neighbouring properties...its separation from and its orientation in relation to its neighbours would ensure that such differences would not harmfully affect that character and appearance of the area".
26. There is a similar approval for the raising of the roof height at No 20 St Brides Court, which is located in the adjacent street to the south of St Davids Grove (approval reference 07/1077/FUL, dated 1st July 2007).
27. There are a variety of house styles with varying roof heights within St Davids Grove. It is considered that due to the orientation of the application site and the adjacent properties to the north and south. It is considered that the proposal will not create a significant incongruous feature into the surrounding area and will in effect add interest to the skyline with the varying heights and roof styles already in existence.
26. For the above reasons, it is considered that the proposed roof alterations will not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area.
27. Owing to the modest scale and design of the proposed velux roof lights in the front and rear elevations of the dwelling, the modest scale and design of the proposed hall/porch extension to the front, which will not project any further forward of the existing dwellinghouse, and that no external alterations will be required to facilitate the part conversion of the integral garage, it is considered that these proposals will not have an adverse impact on the character of the existing dwelling and will not lead to an adverse loss of visual amenity of the surrounding area.
28. Given that the proposed single storey extension to the rear will not be visible from the front of the site, it is further considered that the proposal will not lead to a loss of visual amenity within the surrounding area.
29. Overall it is considered that the proposed raising of the roof height, single storey extensions to the front and rear, and partial garage conversion will not have an adverse impact on the character and the appearance of the existing dwelling due to the complementary design,

mass and scale of the proposed scheme, which respects the proportions of the main dwelling and the application site.

Impact on amenity of neighbouring properties

30. The proposal involves a modest increase in the roof height (0.9m) of the dwelling. No direct views will be achievable between the proposed velux roof lights and the front and rear elevations of the adjacent properties, and it is considered therefore that the proposal will not lead to an unacceptable loss of amenity for the adjacent properties in terms of outlook, overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing
31. Having regard to the location of the nearby properties around the application site, there would be oblique separation distances of approximately 31m and 28m between the proposal and the rear elevations of 3 Bloreng Court (north east) and 9 Gilwern Court (south east) respectively. It is considered that the proposal will not lead to a significant adverse loss of amenity in terms of outlook, overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing.
32. In addition, there would remain a separation distance of approximately 17m between the existing front wall of the property and the blank wall side elevation of No 5 St Davids Grove (nearest neighbouring property to the front of the site), it is further considered that the proposal will not lead to an unacceptable loss of amenity for neighbouring properties in terms of outlook, overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing.
33. The proposed hall/porch extension will not project beyond the front elevation of existing dwelling, and there are no windows located in the side elevation of the proposal facing towards No 27 St Davids Court. It is therefore considered that the proposal will not lead to an adverse loss of amenity for surrounding properties.
34. There are no external alterations to facilitate the proposed part garage conversion and it is therefore considered that the proposal will not lead to an adverse loss of amenity for surrounding properties.
35. A letter of objection relating to the proposed single storey rear extension has been received from the neighbouring property to the rear of the site. The main objections are due to its proximity to the neighbouring boundary and the additional noise that the extension will create. Whilst the details of this extension have been included in the plans submitted with the planning application, the works are permitted development Class A (development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse), Part 1 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) Order 2008. .

Impact on access and highway safety

36. In accordance with Supplementary Planning Document 3, a five-bedroom property in this location requires four incurtilage car parking spaces. The applicant has submitted a proposed parking plan indicating the requisite car parking spaces, which will require additional hard standing to the front of the dwelling in place of an existing grassed area.
37. The Acting Head of Technical Services has confirmed that the submitted parking plan is acceptable and has no objection to this application. The details of the finishing surface materials for the proposed hard standing to the front can be secured by planning condition. It is therefore considered that the proposal will not lead to a significant adverse impact on access and highway safety.

Residual Matters

38. With regard to proposal setting a negative precedent for similar applications within the area and the proposal leading to a loss of property value within the surrounding area, each application is assessed on its own individual merits and property devaluation is not a material planning consideration when determining this application.
39. One objection relates to the creation of a small paved area to the rear of the site, the works constitute permitted development as the area is within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse for the purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse and any issues regarding noise and disturbance from the use of this area should be referred to the Environmental Health Unit for investigation

CONCLUSION

40. It is considered that the scheme accords with Saved Policies GP1 and HO12 and documents SPG2 and SPD3 as the proposal will not introduce a significant incongruous feature into the street scene or have an adverse impact on the existing dwelling. It is further considered that the proposal will not lead to an unacceptable loss of amenity for neighbouring residents and will not lead to an adverse loss of highway safety.

Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services
Contact Officer Mr Daniel James Telephone No 01642 528551

IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications:

As report

Environmental Implications:

As report

Human Rights Implications:

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

Community Safety Implications:

The provisions of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report.

WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS

Ward	Ingleby Barwick West
Ward Councillor	Councillor K Dixon
Ward Councillor	Councillor R Patterson
Ward Councillor	Councillor Jean Kirby