

DELEGATED

**AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE
10 SEPTEMBER 2014
REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR,
DEVELOPMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD
SERVICES**

14/1997/REV

4 Farm Lane, Ingleby Barwick, Stockton-On-Tees

Revised application for increase in ridge height, installation of 3no.dormers to front and dormer window to rear and single storey rear extension

Expiry Date 16 September 2014

SUMMARY

This revised application seeks planning permission for a proposed increase in ridge height, the installation of 3 dormers to the front, a dormer window to rear, and the erection of a single storey rear extension to No 4 Farm Lane.

The application site is a detached bungalow located along Farm Lane, Ingleby Barwick. To the north is No 6, a detached two storey dwellinghouse. Residential properties are present to the front (west), south and to the rear (east).

Planning application 14/1001/FUL which related to a 'proposed increase in ridge height (with Dutch hip design), installation of 3no.dormers to front and dormer window to rear and single storey rear extension' was refused by the Local Planning Authority on 29th May.2014 as it was considered to result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity and living conditions of existing and future occupiers of No 6 Farm Lane (in respect of the resultant impacts on a first floor bedroom window in the side elevation of No 6).

The main revision to the previously refused scheme relates to the omission of the previously proposed 'Dutch hip end' roof design. The revised proposal will increase the existing ridge height by approximately 550mm (from approx. 5.25m to 5.8m in height) for the full length of roof (approx. 11.7m). The eaves would remain at the same height as existing (approx. 2.8m). The roof would maintain a dual pitched roof design, with the main ridge line set off-centre (further towards the front of the bungalow).

The 3 proposed pitched roof dormer windows to be installed in the front elevation are of a pitched roof design. The proposed dormer window to the rear would feature a flat roof design. The single storey extension to the rear would measure approximately 1.5m in projection x 6.185m in length x 3.3m in height with a lean to roof.

The Head of Technical Services has raised no objections to the scheme.

An objection has been received from Councillor Kevin Faulks. 7 objections have also been received to date from 5, 6, 8 and 12 Farm Lane, 2 and 5 Farrier Close and 8 Tanner Close. These objections are set out in full below but include comments that the previous scheme (that was refused) was preferable and resulted in less impact on neighbouring properties, the current proposal would result in an impact on the amenity and privacy of surrounding properties, over development of site, impact on the street scene and the proposal resulting in an increase on street car parking.

The revised scheme as proposed is not considered to have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the existing property or street scene, or lead to an unacceptable loss of amenity for neighbouring properties or have an adverse impact on highway safety.

The application is recommended for approval accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning application 14/1997/REV be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives below;

01 The development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the following approved plan(s);

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
TPS001-2014 REV B	22 July 2014

Reason: To define the consent.

Conditions to be Implemented

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

Informative 1: National Planning Policy Framework

The Local Planning Authority has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

BACKGROUND

- 1. 14/0206/FUL** An application for the erection of 2no. two-storey detached dwellings (demolition of existing detached bungalow) was withdrawn on 5th March 2014. Concerns were raised with respect to the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the adjacent property (No 6). Concerns were also raised regarding the proposed scheme resulting in an incongruous development and failing to enhance the character of the area.
- 2. Planning application 14/1001/FUL** relating to a 'Proposed increase in ridge height (with Dutch hip design), installation of 3no.dormers to front and dormer window to rear and single storey rear extension' was refused by the Local Planning Authority on 29th May 2014 for the following reason

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed development, by virtue of the scale and siting of the increased ridge height and proposed dormer window to the rear, and the close proximity to the bedroom window (habitable room) in the first floor side elevation of No 6 Farm Lane (north), would lead to an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity and living conditions of existing and future occupiers of this property in terms of a loss of outlook and an overbearing impact, contrary to saved Policy HO12(i) and National Planning Policy Framework (para 17) which states that in designing new development, proposals should provide a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

3. The application site is a detached bungalow located along Farm Lane, Ingleby Barwick. To the north is No 6, a detached two storey dwellinghouse. Residential properties are present to the front (west), south and to the rear (east). The host bungalow is served by a detached garage to the rear (east).

PROPOSAL

4. This revised application seeks planning permission for a proposed increase in ridge height, the installation of 3 dormers to the front and a dormer window to rear, and the erection of a single storey rear extension to No 4 Farm Lane.
5. The main revision to the previously refused scheme relates to the omission of the previously proposed 'Dutch hip end' roof design. As a result of this change, the dormer windows in the front and rear elevations have been amended. These changes are as follows;
6. The revised proposal will increase the existing ridge height by approximately 550mm (from approx. 5.25m to 5.8m in height) for the full length of roof (approx. 11.7m). The eaves would remain at the same height as existing (approx. 2.8m). The roof would maintain a dual pitched roof design, with the main ridge line set off-centre (further towards the front of the bungalow).
7. The 3 proposed pitched roof dormer windows to be installed in the front elevation are of a pitched roof design and would measure approximately 2.1m in projection (the length from the main ridge height) x 1.5m in width x 1.9m in height (overall 5.5m in height). The dormers would feature windows in the front elevations.
8. The proposed dormer window to the rear would feature a flat roof design and would measure approximately 8m in length x 3.1m in projection (the length taken from the main ridge height) x 2m in height (5.2m overall height). The proposal would feature 4 windows in the rear/east elevation. The proposals would facilitate 3 bedrooms (creating a 5-bed property) and a bathroom.
9. The single storey extension to the rear would measure approximately 1.5m in projection x 6.185m in length x 3.3m in height with a lean to roof. The proposal would feature 2 sets of French doors in the rear elevation and would facilitate a living room extension.

CONSULTATIONS

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

Head of Technical Services

Highways Comments

In accordance with SPD3: Parking Provision for Developments 2011, 4 in curtilage car parking spaces are provided for a 5-bedroom house and there are no highway objections.

Landscape & Visual Comments

This proposal has no landscape or visual implications.

Councillor Kevin Faulks

Having studied both revised applications I object to the ridge height and I would rather see the original proposed increase (with Dutch hip design). It is very frustrating for residents and Councillors alike to see revised applications coming in time after time.

The second application did seem to be more sensible and had no objections.

I do feel continuous revised applications wear our residents down. Will it be a case of a further revised application if this one is passed.

Councillor Gillian Corr

Councillor Jean Kirby

No comments received

Parish Council

No comments received to date.

PUBLICITY

11. Neighbours were notified and comments received are set out below :-

Mrs Wendy Robinson

5 Farrier Close Ingleby Barwick

The original planning application which had a Dutch hip design roof seemed to be a complete improvement and accepted by the immediate neighbours affected by this development. Why yet again move the goal posts and come up with another unacceptable plan. I think the builders think if they push and push in the end they will get what THEY want. Stick with the original plan and get on with it. I object to this new plan and would have appreciated a heads up from Stockton Council that new plans were afoot.

Mr Alfred Keane

5 Farm Lane Ingleby Barwick

The original plan was to build 2 properties on this site which was out of place for this residential area, and would have set a precedent for the demolishing of perfectly good bungalow to make as much money from redevelopment with no regard for the residents. The new proposal has inherited the same flaws, over development of the site to maximise the resale value of the plot with no regard for the neighbours or residents. The revised plan which had a Dutch hip design to offset the impact of the increase in height was a preferable alternative but this seems to have been submitted with the sole purpose of disguising the developers "real" plans.

Mr David Cook

8 Farm Lane Ingleby Barwick

The new proposal in my opinion is still showing over development of the site with very little regard for the neighbours. The revised plan which had a Dutch hip design was a preferable alternative. Also, the question needs to be asked why we hadn't received a letter informing us of the further changes to the planning application of 4 Farm Lane?

Mrs Dee Cranny

2 Farrier Close Ingleby Barwick

Why didn't the Buyer of the bungalow buy a house??? He doesn't want a bungalow!!!!!!what happened to Dutch Hip Design????

Why the increase roof height???? Not mentioned on page 2 of your document Application details 'Proposal'.

Proposal is really to convert a bungalow into a house. Bungalows are scare how many houses are on market??? Do we really need anymore???

Too many 'Bolt On's' to the bungalow, may not be aesthetically pleasing to the eye and unbecoming to the surrounding properties.

I have had no formal contact, even though it overlooks my property.

It will have effect on sunlight and no privacy, this property is overlooking into my garden.

Mrs Katherine Rennoldson
6 Farm Lane Ingleby Barwick

Having received a further amendment to the proposed plans for 4 Farm Lane I respond as follows.

The letter received from Stockton Borough Council states that the revised plan is due to an increase in roof height.

This is not entirely true. The actual design of the roof is completely different. Where the previous plan had a Dutch hip design to the roof this new plan now has that removed.

The Dutch hip design proposed previously would have taken away the building from my bedroom window to the side of my house. As it is now we are back to the original issues of light and view being blocked.

I find it incredible that the new proposal is dressed up as an increase in height with no mention whatsoever of the redesign of the roof.

I feel like we are being hood winked into accepting a proposal that was not fully explained in the letter received.

Is there going to be more redesigns until this developer ends up with his original proposal of 2 houses on the one plot?

There has been no honesty or consideration for neighbouring properties. I would have thought someone should have had the courtesy to be open and honest about proposals rather than try to hide behind a cleverly worded letter.

On these grounds and those listed and because now I am faced with the same issues as previous proposals I object to this "redesign" and increase in height.

Mrs Angela Taylor
12 Farm Lane Ingleby Barwick

Once again I am appalled by the lack of communication from Stockton Council on this development. I live only three doors away from this property and yet again I have received no notification of any of the planning applications.

It is outrageous that an application can be granted and then revised plans put in time after time to suit a property developers lust for maximising resale value of a property.

The original plans for this property were completely unacceptable and were an over development of the site. The property as it stands is in keeping with the rest of the street and the plans now being considered go completely against the whole look of the neighbourhood and again is an over development of a plot.

This bungalow is a lovely sized property which fits in well with its neighbouring homes. If these plans are approved then it will be the proverbial sore thumb on what is currently a well-kept, attractive area. The visual impact of the new plans will be detrimental to the rest of the area and could lead to a down valuation in surrounding properties. As it is at the moment we are struggling in the street with non-residents parking along the end of Farm Lane to get to the shops, school etc. If the bungalow is extended then this will undoubtedly lead to it being eventually sold on to a larger family than was originally intended and thus will result in more problems with vehicles parked on the road. Being a corner plot this presents a danger to pedestrians - I needn't remind you that this is one of the main routes for children attending Whinstones Primary School - and also for current residents and users of the road.

Although it does not affect me directly I can only imagine the impact that this amendment will have on the properties directly adjacent to it. The original submission wasn't ideal as I already stated but at least it did give some consideration to the loss of light and privacy to the neighbouring property.

If this property developer wished to extend a home into a much larger property then perhaps it would have been prudent for them to invest in a property which was suitable and able to accommodate an extension of this nature. This bungalow cannot take such an extension. By submitting this amendment it looks very much as though the developer planned this all along and by getting the original plans passed then looked to sneak in these amendments, I strongly urge the council to consider all objections before making a decision on this proposal.

Mr Thomas Bowman

8 Tanner Close Ingleby Barwick

This application tries to hide that they are applying to convert a small bungalow into a medium sized House. They are only building Houses and Flats now so Bungalows are in short supply in Ingleby Barwick. Once one is converted it establishes a precedent for more to follow. Thus I object.

PLANNING POLICY

12. 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 Plan is the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and saved policies of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan
13. Section 143 of the Localism Act came into force on the 15 Jan 2012 and requires the Local Planning Authority to take local finance considerations into account, this section s70(2) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended requires in dealing with such an application [planning application] the authority shall have regard to a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application and c) any other material considerations
14. The following planning policies are considered to be relevant to the consideration of this application:-

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 14. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking;

For decision-taking this means:

approving development proposals that accord with the development without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

-any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
-specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

Core Strategy Policy 3 (CS3) - Sustainable Living and Climate Change

Additionally, in designing new development, proposals will:

- _ Make a positive contribution to the local area, by protecting and enhancing important environmental assets, biodiversity and geodiversity, responding positively to existing features of natural, historic, archaeological or local character, including hedges and trees, and including the provision of high quality public open space;
- _ Be designed with safety in mind, incorporating Secure by Design and Park Mark standards, as appropriate;
- _ Incorporate 'long life and loose fit' buildings, allowing buildings to be adaptable to changing needs. By 2013, all new homes will be built to Lifetime Homes Standards;
- _ Seek to safeguard the diverse cultural heritage of the Borough, including buildings, features, sites and areas of national importance and local significance. Opportunities will be taken to constructively and imaginatively incorporate heritage assets in redevelopment schemes, employing where appropriate contemporary design solutions.

Saved Policy HO12 of the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan

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.

Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2 (SPG2, 2004)

2 GUIDING PRINCIPLES.

2.5 Extensions must be designed so that they complement the main house for example through being smaller or set back. Often such designs are more successful in visual terms than large extensions built flush with the front of the house. This will obviously vary depending on the size and shape of the original house. However, in all cases it is necessary to leave a useable amount of private amenity space – approximately two thirds of the plot - and this may limit the size of the extension you can build. The garden space must be a useable shape too. If you really do need a large house it may be more advisable to buy a bigger house to start with rather than try to cram a huge house onto a small plot.

2.6 The shape of the extension will have a significant impact on the appearance, and it may be possible to have a very large extension that complements the house or a relatively small extension that is very obtrusive. Therefore the design is critical to ensure that it fits in with the street scene, but is not judged solely on the size of the footprint.

2.7 Any extension should be sited and designed to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties in terms of light, overlooking and overbearing. However it is the purpose of this guidance note to limit such impacts through good practice advice. It may be necessary to adjust the dimensions of proposed extensions to compromise between additional space and good neighbourliness. Although every application is assessed on its own merits, the Local Planning Authority would normally seek a minimum separation distance of 21 metres between the windows of the main habitable rooms (for example bedrooms and living rooms) of the proposed extension that face windows of the main habitable rooms of the neighbouring property. Where a side extension would face the rear of the neighbouring property (or a rear extension would face the side of the neighbouring property) a gap of 11 metres is normally required between the windows of the main habitable rooms to prevent overlooking. These standards may be reduced if obscured glazing is used or where the windows are those of secondary rooms (for example bathrooms, hallways and landings).

6 REAR EXTENSION.

6.1 Building around the back does not mean that you can ignore the need for good design! Although fewer people will see it on a daily basis, a poorly designed extension to the rear

will still lower the value of your house. The same broad principles for shape, materials and neighbour impact that apply for extending to the side of your house, also apply to extending to the rear of your house.

6.2 From experience it is found that a reasonable compromise between impact on neighbours and the need for space allows about a 3-metre extension at the back, although it will vary from plot to plot. Any extensions that project further than 3 metres will be subject to the 45 and 60 degree rules as explained below.

6.3 In order to assess the impact of a single storey extension on a neighbouring property, the Council will apply the '60 degree rule'. This is simply a line drawn at 60 degrees from the centre of your neighbour's nearest window of a habitable room. Your extension should not cross that line otherwise there could be an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property.

6.4 For a two-storey extension or upper floor extension the same principle applies, but this time the angle is reduced to 45 degrees as there would be significantly more bulk to block out light and increase overlooking.

9 LOFT CONVERSIONS.

9.1 Loft conversions are a cheaper alternative to building extensions, but are limited in the amount of useable space by the pitched roof. It is advisable to get a survey carried out to assess the suitability of your loft for conversion at an early stage, as more modern construction techniques may not lend themselves easily to conversion. It is possible to raise the roof height to allow more of the space to be used, but uncommon because of the cost involved. This is a somewhat drastic measure and will significantly upset the aesthetic balance of the house. There are only a few houses where it could be done without significant visual harm and is therefore not normally supported by the Council.

9.2 Windows will be necessary in the loft if it is to be used as a room, and these must be installed sympathetically too. Normally roof windows of any design are not permitted in the front elevation unless they are already a feature of the house or street. Windows would be acceptable on the rear elevation and in some cases the side elevations subject to the individual plot.

9.3 It is possible to extend the amount of useable loft space with dormer windows, and these will be assessed by size, design and siting with regard to the neighbouring properties. More traditionally shaped dormer windows will be preferable to large flat roofed dormers, and multiple smaller dormers will be better than a single large window.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

15. The main planning considerations with respect to this application are the impact on the character and appearance of the existing bungalow and surrounding area, the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and highway safety matters. These and any residual matters are considered below.
16. Eight objections have been received to date, including an objection from Councillor Faulks. These objections are set out in full above but are summarised as follows;
 - The previous scheme (that was refused) was preferable and resulted in less impact on neighbouring properties
 - Impact on amenity and privacy of surrounding properties
 - Insufficient neighbour consultation has been undertaken

- Over development of site
- Impact on street scene
- Description inaccurate
- Will there be further revisions and re-designs
- Increase on street car parking
- The proposal would set an undesirable precedent

Character and appearance of bungalow and street scene

17. It is considered that there is a defined character to this part of the estate in terms of the rhythm and siting of bungalows and other property styles as per the original approval(s) for the development in 1980 and 1982; the bungalows at the entrances of the adjacent cul de sacs (Ostler Close and Lorimer Close) and to the south of the site have retained the original bungalow design and the majority of properties feature gable ends.
18. Nonetheless, it is noted that planning permission was granted in April 2011 at 9 Lorimer Close (11/0538/FUL) for the erection of 2 dormer windows to front and 1 dormer window to rear (attic conversion). Although the permission has now expired, this remains a material consideration.
19. It is considered that the proposed 3 dormer windows in the front elevation are of a modest size and scale that accord with the provisions of SPG2. The proposed flat roof dormer would be sited to the rear, of which it is considered that only limited views would be achievable from the wider street scene (primarily from the south). It is also considered that the increase in roof height and the retained dual pitched roof design, albeit set at an off-centre design, would not introduce an incongruous design feature by virtue of the overall character and scale of the bungalow being retained.
20. The single storey extension to the rear is considered to accord with the general provisions of SPG2 in terms of design and scale and is considered to be acceptable.
21. In view of the above considerations, it is considered that the proposed scheme would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the existing property or introduce incongruous features into the street scene as to warrant a refusal of the application. The scheme is also considered to respect the proportions of the application site and does not result in overdevelopment of the plot.

Amenity

22. The proposal would primarily project along the side elevation of No 6 Farm Lane. There are a number of windows in the side elevation (south) of the adjacent property of No 6 Farm Lane. This includes a first floor bedroom window (habitable room) and a bathroom window (non-habitable room) and ground floor toilet and staircase/hall windows (both non-habitable rooms) as verbally confirmed on site by the occupier of No 6 (during the course of a previous application). Of these windows, the bedroom window is sited immediately adjacent to the host bungalow. This window serves as the only bedroom window (a habitable room) to this room, as confirmed on site by the case officer during the previously withdrawn application, and as set out on the approved floor plans for the original development in 1982.
23. With respect to the proposed raising of the roof height (by approx. 550mm) with a dual pitched roof design and the provision of the dormer window in the rear elevation, the nearest element of the roof would be sited approximately 1.9m from the first floor bedroom window in the side elevation (south) of No 6 Farm Lane. The side/north elevation of the

proposed rear dormer window would be sited approximately 3.8m from the first floor window in the side elevation (south) of No 6 Farm Lane.

24. At present, the existing ridge height of the bungalow allows for an element of outlook from the first floor bedroom window in the side of No 6 Farm Lane, when looking to the south east across the rear garden of No 4 (the case officer has previously viewed the application site from this window) however a large element of the outlook is the existing gable side wall of No 4 and is therefore considered to be a poor outlook.
25. The proposed scheme would in effect increase the massing of the host dwelling when viewed from the bedroom window of No 6, primarily by that of the proposed dormer window to the rear.
26. The previously refused application (14/1001/FUL) was accompanied by a 'diagrammatic argument' plan which illustrated the 'fall back' position of erecting a dormer window to the rear under permitted development. The applicant argued that the resultant impact of this 'permitted' development was comparable to/not significantly worse than the proposed. The applicant also considered that the provision of hipped ends assisted in reducing the impact on this window.
27. Although the proposal featured hipped ends, as a result of the existing close proximity of the roof to this bedroom window, and in view of the proposed increase in ridge height and provision of a dormer window to the rear, it was considered that the proposed scheme would worsen the existing situation and result in an unacceptable loss of amenity for existing and future occupiers of No 6 in terms of overbearing, overshadowing and loss of outlook as to warrant a refusal of the application.
28. 'Fall back' is a material planning consideration but must be rationalised. Planning Case Law notes that "*the weight to be given to it includes the real likelihood of any fall back actually being exercised in the event of a refusal*".
29. The current revised scheme features an increase in roof height, however this continues at a similar roof pitch to that of the existing roof pitch, resulting in the off-centre ridge line and thereby reducing the massing of the actual roof. As a result of this revision, the impact of the proposed dormer window to the rear would, in effect, result in a similar impact on the bedroom window in the side elevation of No 6 that a dormer window in the same position would have, and which it is accepted could be erected under permitted development.
30. As a result, whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal would still result in a degree of overshadowing and overbearing, and a loss of outlook for the bedroom window serving No 6, it is considered that on balance, there is a genuine likelihood of the fall-back position being exercised, and therefore this forms a material planning consideration in this instance as indicated in the previous two paragraphs.
31. Furthermore, the current scheme also reduces the massing of the overall roof height increase through the off-set ridge line, which continues a similar roof pitch to that of the existing roof, as illustrated within the appendices 10 and 11 to this report. This differs to the previous refused scheme whereby the increased ridge height in addition to the proposed dormer window would have had a greater overshadowing and overbearing impact than the current scheme.
32. Taking the above considerations into account, it is considered that the proposal will not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity for existing and future occupiers of No 6 Farm Lane as to warrant a reason for the refusal of the current application. As such, the reason for the refusal of the previously application is considered to have been addressed.

33. The nearest first floor window in the front elevation (west) of No 6 is sited away from boundary to No 4 by virtue of the internal layout of No 6. The nearest windows in the rear elevation (east) of No 6 are a kitchen (ground floor) and bathroom (first floor). It is further considered that no direct views would be achievable between windows in the front and rear dormer windows and habitable room windows in the front, rear and side elevations of No 6 Farm Lane. Notwithstanding the above considerations in terms of the impact on the first floor bedroom window in the side of No 6, the proposed scheme, including the single storey rear element, is not considered to result in an adverse loss of amenity or privacy for No 6 in this respect.
34. With respect to the impact of the proposed increase in ridge height, provision of dormer windows to the front and rear and single storey extension to the rear, in view of the remaining separation distances to the nearest properties to the front (west), south and rear (east), it is considered that the proposals accord with the provisions of SPG2 in terms of siting and separation distances and do not involve any significant loss of privacy and amenity for the residents of the neighbouring properties to the front (west), side (south) and rear (east).

Highway safety

35. The Head of Technical Services has raised no objections to the scheme commenting that sufficient in curtilage car parking is provided. It is considered that the proposal will not result in an adverse loss of highway safety or increase in on street car parking.

Residual matters

36. In terms of any future applications at the application site and the proposal setting an undesirable precedent, these are not material planning considerations when assessing the current application as each application should be assessed on its own individual merits.
37. In terms of the application description, the current revised scheme has omitted reference to the Dutch hipped ends that formed part of the previously refused scheme. The description is considered to be satisfactory in this instance.
38. In terms of the level of neighbour consultation undertaken for the current application, as the application relates to domestic extensions to the existing bungalow only and is therefore a different application type altogether to the previously proposed (and withdrawn) scheme for two dwellings, only neighbouring properties within immediate vicinity of the site have been consulted, as would be the case for any domestic planning application. In view of the above, the consultation undertaken is considered to be satisfactory.

CONCLUSION

39. It is recommended that the application be Approved with Conditions for the reason(s) specified above.

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

WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS

Ward	Ingleby Barwick East
Ward Councillor	Councillor Jean Kirby
Ward	Ingleby Barwick East

Ward Councillor **Councillor K C Faulks**
Ward **Ingleby Barwick East**
Ward Councillor **Councillor Gillian Corr**

IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications: As report.

Legal 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. The detailed considerations within this report take into account the impacts on neighbouring properties, visitors to the area, pedestrians and other relevant parties responsible for; or with interests in the immediate surrounding area. Consideration has been given to the level of impact and mitigating circumstances with conditions being recommended to reduce the impacts of the scheme where considered to do so.

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