

TWC/2015/0414

63 Derwent Drive, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9QR

Erection of a single storey rear and side extension and first floor rear extension (Part retrospective)

APPLICANT

, Stuart Williams

RECEIVED

20/05/2015

PARISH

St. Georges and Priorslee

WARD

Priorslee

OFFICER Tom Carruthers

OBJECTIONS: Yes

1. THE PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The proposal seeks consent for the erection of a single storey side extension which is 1.15m in width and 10.75m in length. It is 2.25m in height to the eaves and 3.15 to the highest point with a sloping roof continuing along the line of the existing canopy. This element on its own would be classed as permitted development.
- 1.2 The single storey element of the rear extension, which is partly retrospective, is 4.75m in width and comes out 3.65m. It will have a flat roof and will be 3m in height. As indicated on an earlier provisional enquiry, this element on its own is also permitted development. It however is attached to a two storey rear extension that requires planning consent. This will be 3.3m in width and 4.5m in depth; including a cat slide roof to match the existing roof on the rear elevation. The maximum height of the extension will be 6.75m and matched the height of the existing house. On the rear elevation there is a dormer window which is 1.75m in width and comes out a maximum of 3m.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The dwelling is located within a residential suburb of Telford in close proximity to the local centre of Priorslee which is within the urban area in the East of Telford.
- 2.2 It is set within a predominately residential area where the majority of the properties are detached. Close by is Priorslee Flash and there is a Public House, a Doctors Surgery, a Dentist's surgery and a Primary school close by.
- 2.3 The application property is a brick and tile built, two storey detached house that is surrounded by generous gardens to the rear. The property has had a previous extension above the original garage. The property sits slightly lower than the neighbouring property at no.61 which is a bungalow.

3. PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 W2007/0569 Change Of Use Of Private Open Space To Private Garden Land, Erection Of A First Floor Extension Over Existing Garage, Ground Floor Extension To Rear And Bay Window Additions To Side And Front Of Existing Dwelling 26/06/2007
- 3.2 W2007/1233 Change Of Use Of Private Open Space To Private Garden Land, Erection Of A First Floor Extension Over Existing Garage And Bay Window Extensions To Side And Front. Full Granted 01/11/2007
- 3.3 TWC/2014/0730 Erection of a two storey rear extension and single storey side extension. Withdrawn 17/12/2014

4. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

- 4.1 National Planning Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework
- 4.2 Wrekin Local Plan Saved Policies
UD2 Design Criteria
- 4.3 Core Strategy
CS15 Urban Design

5. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 5.1 St Georges & Priorslee Parish Council: Object

It would destroy the amenity of adjoining properties.

- 5.2 Drainage: No Comment
- 5.3 Ecology: Comment – Recommend Trenches and Pipework, Storage of Materials and Bats informatives.
- 5.4 Arboricultural: Comment

The Ash tree referred to in the application is a Tree of Heaven and has been reduced before. It has a root protection of 4.8m which is 5m outside of the closest distance of the proposal.

- 5.5 Shropshire Fire: No comment
- 5.6 Neighbourhood Consultation

Two letters of objection were received following neighbour consultation:

- Loss of privacy and will harm the peaceful environment and will be
- unacceptable and visually intrusive
- The dormer window is less than 10m away from the boundary and will look

directly into the garden of no.67.

- Previous application was refused and the ground floor extension was previously refused in application W2007/0569.
- The proposal is disproportionately large in relation to the size of the original dwelling and would represent an adverse form of development
- The plans do not accurately show the extension in relation to the boundary fence and contradict the supporting statement.
- The side extension is not a mirror of the bay window.
- The majority of original ground floor habitable rooms are positioned farthest away from no.61 the new games room wing will bring these closer to habitable rooms of no.61
- The extra doors windows and decking will bring noise and disturbances closer to neighbours.
- The decking could encourage vermin.
- The development may impede natural drainage.
- The applicant has already built part of the rear wall and the foundations.

6. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 Having regard to the development plan policy and other material considerations, including comments received during the consultation process, the planning application raises the following main issues.

- **Scale and design**
- **Overlooking and the loss of privacy**
- **Other matters**

6.2 Scale and design

Officers consider that the extension is of an acceptable design reflecting features that are already on the existing dwelling. Officers acknowledge that the property has been previously extended; however; it is not considered that the proposed extensions are too large or disproportionate to the host dwelling, as the majority of the work would be permitted development if undertaken separately. The proposed materials would match with the existing dwelling. Officers consider that after the development, the applicants would be left with sufficient garden land to proportionate to the proposed living accommodation.

6.3 Overlooking and the loss of privacy.

The dormer window in the rear elevation is the only window at first floor level. The plans submitted clearly show that the dormer window will only be 9.925m from the rear boundary, which officers consider is an acceptable distance for a first floor window and will not have any adverse impact on the amenity of no.67 and will not cause any adverse overlooking issues.

6.4 It has been stated that the proposal contravenes the 45 degree code in relation to no.61. The 45 degree code is a guidance used by the authority that only relates to the nearest habitable room window for the first five metres, in order to protect the outlook and loss of light from adjacent living room accommodation; this proposal falls outside of this radius and therefore officers

considered that this proposal will not have an adverse impact on the adjacent dwelling in terms of outlook or loss of light. Furthermore there are no windows within the side elevation and therefore, the proposed extension would not overlook the adjacent property. As the majority of the ground floor extensions could be erected under permitted development rights officers consider that the proposed first floor element will not adversely impact on the amenities of no.61.

6.5 Other Matters

The comments received make reference to a previously refused application. The reasons for refusal on W2007/0569 related to a 2 storey extension and the loss of open space in relation to the proposed change of use of land that was part of that application. The refusal reasons did not make any reference to any ground floor rear extension. However since that application, the permitted development regulations have changed considerably, and the majority of the ground floor extension could be constructed under permitted development.

6.6 The accuracy of the plans, with relation to the distance of the extension from the boundary fence with no.61 has been brought up however officers are content that the plans and the supporting statement are accurate and do not conflict with each other. The supporting statement states that the extension will be 0.6m from the boundary with no.61 and when scaled off the plans, this is correct. The boundary between the two properties is the fence line and not the retaining wall which is completely within the boundary of the application site.

6.7 Concerns about possible future problems with drainage have been raised. The Council's drainage team were consulted on the application and had no objection; officers concur with the view that the proposal will not have any further impact on the drainage system.

6.8 Comments raised with regard to the decking are noted, however this does not form part of the application. Furthermore the works currently undertaken on site are being done so under permitted development rights. All other objections raised in the consultation process have been considered but they do not raise any issues that would warrant a review of the analysis of this proposal.

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Officers consider that the proposals will not adversely increase overlooking issues to neighbouring properties. The proposed extensions are considered to be of an acceptable design and are in keeping with the existing dwelling and will not detract from the appearance of the surrounding area, in accordance with local and national planning policies.

8. RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 Based on the conclusions above, it is recommended that the committee **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the following conditions:
- 1 A04 Time Limit
 2. C001 Materials to match
 3. C38 Development in accordance with plans