

TWC/2019/0087

33 Overdale, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 5AL

Erection of a two storey side extension, a porch to the front and a single storey rear extension \*\*\*Amended plans received\*\*\*

**APPLICANT**

, Mr Daniel Morris

**RECEIVED**

31/01/2019

**PARISH**

Lawley and Overdale

**WARD**

Ketley and Overdale

**CLLR. JOY FRANCIS HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS APPLICATION BE DETERMINED BY MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**1.0 SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION**

1.1 Grant Full Planning Permission subject to Condition(s) and Informative(s).

**2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

2.1 The application site is a residential property in Overdale, a predominantly residential area within Telford.

2.2 The application property is a semi-detached ex-Local Authority dwellinghouse. All of the houses in this street were built as semi-detached properties and are in similar sized and spacious plots. One dwelling opposite the site has been converted into a pair of flats.

**3.0 APPLICATION DETAILS**

3.1 This application seeks Full Planning Permission for the erection of a two-storey extension to the side elevation of the property, a porch to the front and a single-storey rear extension.

3.2 The two-storey side extension part of the application is similar to a previously approved application (ref.: TWC/2012/0719) which was never implemented and has now expired.

3.3 When initially submitted, the plans showed the extension protruding in front of the existing bay window to the front elevation. Following discussions with the Applicant, this has now been amended and the front of the extension is now proposed to be flush with the main house and the bay window feature has been replicated. The porch has been reduced in depth and is now level with the pair of bay windows.

3.4 During the course of the Application, the Applicant has removed one of the windows at ground floor level and has clarified that the remaining window will be obscurely glazed and non-opening. Also clarified, is for the window at first floor level to be obscured and top and inward opening.

## 4.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 4.1 TWC/2012/0719 - Erection of a two-storey side extension - Full Granted 23 October 2012

## 5.0 RELEVANT POLICY DOCUMENTS

### 5.1 National Guidance:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

### 5.2 Local Development Plan:

Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031

## 6.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

### 6.1 Local Member & Town/Parish Council Responses:

#### 6.1.1 Ketley Parish Council: Comment:

The Parish Council have discussed the concerns raised with Councillors by the local resident with the Planning Officer and have been informed that the revised planning application meets all technical planning requirements and therefore we have no further comments.

### 6.2 Standard Consultation Responses

#### 6.2.1 Highways: No Objection:

#### 6.2.2 Drainage: No Objection.

#### 6.2.3 Shropshire Fire Service: Comment: - consideration to be given to Fire Safety Guidance

## 7.0 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC RESPONSE

### 7.1 Four **Objections** have been received from one local resident, which make the following observations:

- Proposal would cast shadow and would block out light and air flow
- Overlooking;
- Extension is excessive and disproportionate in size and is too dominating;
- Extension would be in breach of the 2 metre rule and excessively higher than the 3 metre rule;
- Concerns regarding parking;
- Note that the house could be rented out to 6 people.

## 8.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 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:

- Principle of Development
- Scale, Design and Impact on the Character of the Area
- Impact upon Neighbouring Amenity

## 8.2 Principle of Development

8.2.1 The proposed two-storey extension is very similar to a previously approved proposal. The property is in a residential area and still has its Permitted Development Rights. It must be noted that a similar sized two-storey side extension could be built under the Local Development Order which could not be objected to.

8.2.2 The previous extension received no objections, however if Officers considered that there was a detrimental impact on any neighbouring property, including No.35, planning permission would have been refused.

## 8.3 Scale, Design and Impact on the Character of the Area

8.3.1 The single-storey extension is to the rear of the property, having the appearance of a conservatory however with a solid roof construction. The extension is proposed to project 3.6 metres from the rear of the existing house, namely 0.6 metres more than what could be erected under Permitted Development. As this is proposed to be located on the rear elevation, once the two-storey side extension is built, this would not be visible from the street scene. The extension is considered to be in keeping with the residential nature of the property.

8.3.2 The porch is proposed to be flush with both the existing and proposed bay windows. The roof of the porch will be continued over the pair of bay windows, creating a canopy. Whilst it must be noted that there are no canopies within the immediate area, it is considered that in this instance, the proposed canopy would not detract from the appearance of the property or the street scene as a whole.

8.3.3 The proposed two-storey extension is tapered and is wider at the front than it is at the rear (4.2 metres at the front down to 3.2 metres at the rear). The extension is to be built up to the boundary but the plans indicate no overhanging of the boundary with No.35. The extension is the same depth as the existing house. The roof is to have a gable to replicate the existing gable offering an attempt at a form of symmetry, the roof being the same height as the existing. There were initially three windows proposed within the side elevation, however one window at ground floor level has been removed and it has been clarified that the remaining window is to be obscure glazed and non-opening (alongside the window at first floor level being a top-hung and inward opening obscured window) – to be conditioned as such in perpetuity.

8.3.4 Whilst reference is noted within the submitted Application Form to the potential for annexe type accommodation and/or a separate flat/planning unit, this has been clarified with the Applicant. Namely the Applicant has confirmed the current application to solely include the two-storey and single-storey extensions only and for no annexe or separate planning unit whatsoever. An Informative is proposed as part of any Approval clarifying the extent of the Approval.

8.3.5 Whilst the footprint of the development is reasonable in scale, the property benefits from a large garden and it is not therefore considered to constitute an overdevelopment of the plot.

8.3.6 As part of the consultation process, the Council's Highway Engineer has raised no objection noting that the proposal will create a 4-bed dwelling providing adequate parking.

#### **8.4 Impact upon Neighbouring Amenity**

8.4.1 In respect of the attached property, No.31, the proposed two-storey extension would not be visible and the porch would be obscured by the existing bay window. The single-storey rear extension would be adjacent to the shared boundary, however No.31 has an existing extension with no windows and it is considered that there would not be any detrimental impact caused.

8.4.2 The property, No.35 is currently vacant, however the new owner has raised a number of objections to the scheme. Many of the objections raised, including the cultivation of moss, clearing of gutters and the Party Wall Act are not Material Planning Considerations and are not therefore considered further as part of the current proposal.

8.4.3 The single-storey rear extension to the opposite side boundary is not considered to affect neighbouring amenity afforded to the property at No.35. The proposed porch would be obscured by the proposed bay window and again is not considered to adversely affect No.35.

8.4.4 The proposed two-storey side extension is the same width as the previously approved extension which received no objections. It is acknowledged that there was a different occupier at the time of the previous application. The objector states that they consider that last decision was wrong and that the damage has to be undone. However, Officers consider that the extension will be in keeping with the current property and will respect the current design. Whilst the extension is large, officers do not consider that it is of an inappropriate scale for the property or that it is overly prominent or dominant.

8.4.5 Whilst the windows in the side elevation will be on the boundary, the ground floor window is proposed to be obscurely glazed and fixed and the first floor window obscurely glazed, inward opening and top-hung. The window at first floor in the rear elevation has an outlook across the rear garden and it is considered that there would not be any significant impact caused. In terms on

loss of light, the neighbouring property has a pair of small ground floor windows and one window at first floor. None of these windows are within habitable rooms and therefore any loss of light is not considered significant to warrant refusal.

8.4.6 The neighbour has stated that the extension will be in breach of the '2 metre rule' and will be excessively higher than the '3 metre rule' – however no such 'rules' exist and it is considered that there is a misunderstanding regarding legislation in this instance.

8.4.7 Whilst it is noted that the neighbour states that the applicant could rent the property out to 6 people, this application is not a Change-of-Use and is being assessed as a Householder Extension only and any subsequent Change-of-Use proposal may require a subsequent Planning Application.

## 9.0 CONCLUSIONS

9.1 The Local Planning Authority considers that the scale and design of the proposals are acceptable, would be in keeping with and would not harm the character of the existing house design and would respect and respond positively to its context and the surrounding area. The proposed scheme would not cause any detrimental harm upon the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties by way of overbearing impact, loss of light or privacy. As such, the proposal is considered to be compliant with the Development Plan and national planning policy guidance.

## 10.0 RECOMMENDATION

10.1 Based on the conclusions above, the recommendation to the Planning Committee on this application is that **DELEGATED AUTHORITY** be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the following:

- a) The following Condition(s) and Informative(s) (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager):

### Condition(s)

Time Limit  
Materials to Match Existing  
Approved Plans  
Obscure Glazed Windows  
No Further Windows  
Restriction on Separate Use

### Informative(s)

Coal Authority High Risk Area  
Fire Authority

Clarification regarding extent of Planning Permission  
Conditions  
Reason for Grant of Full Planning