Winchester City Council Planning Department Development Control

# **Committee Decision**

TEAM MANAGER SIGN OFF SHEET

Case No:	07/00637/FUL	Valid Date	15 March 2007
W No:	06158/06	Recommendation 23 April 2007	
Case Officer:	Ms Elizabeth Stewart	8 Week Date 10 May 2007	
		Committee date	24 <sup>th</sup> May 2007
Recommendation:	Application Permitted	Decision:	Delegated Decision

Proposal: Single storey side extension

Site: 6 Godfrey Pink Way Bishops Waltham Southampton Hampshire SO32 1PB

Open Space Y/N	Legal Agreement	S.O.S	Objections	EIA Development	Monitoring Code	Previous Developed Land
	Ν	Ν	Y	Ν	Ν	Υ

DELEGATED ITEM SIGN OFF					
<b>APPROVE</b> Subject to the condition(s) listed					
	Signature		Date		
CASE OFFICER					
TEAM MANAGER					

AMENDED PLANS DATE:-

Item No: Case No: Proposal Description: Address:	10 07/00637/FUL / W06158/06 Single storey side extension 6 Godfrey Pink Way Bishops Waltham Southampton Hampshire SO32 1PB
Parish/Ward:	Bishops Waltham
Applicants Name:	Miss D Taylor
Case Officer:	Ms Elizabeth Stewart
Date Valid:	15 March 2007
Site Factors:	Tree Preservation Order
Recommendation:	Application Permitted

#### **General Comments**

This application is reported to Committee at the request of Councillor Busher, whose request is appended in full to this report

#### Site Description

The application site lies to the south of Godfrey Pink Way, within the defined settlement boundary of Bishops Waltham. The site contains an existing two storied detached dwelling with an integral single bay garage. The site lies within a residential estate comprised of dwellings similar in scale and character to the application site.

The application site occupies an area of 600m<sup>2</sup> with frontage of approximately 16m. The gradient of the site gradually descends away from the site in an easterly direction. A 1.8m Close Boarded Fence extends along the southern, western and eastern site boundaries.

A significant horse Chestnut tree (subject of a TPO) lies approximately 8m to the south of the dwelling.

#### Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a single storey side extension, which would provide additional ground floor accommodation in the form of a study and multi purpose play area. The proposed extension would be located to the east of the parent building and would measure 3.1m x 9.2m with a maximum and minimum height to the eaves of 5m and 2.7m respectively. The roof of the proposed extension slopes to the east and follows the same plane as the parent dwelling. The development would be completed from facing bricks with a brown tile roof.

#### **Relevant Planning History**

**W06158/05** Residential development comprising of 22 No four-bed detached dwellings with associated garages, roads and new access - Street BLPU 0 Godfrey Pink Way Bishops Waltham Hampshire - Application Permitted - 15/10/1993

#### Consultations

None

## **Representations:**

Bishops Waltham Parish Council = No comments Neighbour Representation = 1 letter of objection received. Contrary to policies DP.1 and DP.3 of the WDLPR

• Overbearing and dominant feature which is out of character within the neighbourhood.

- Extension will create an unbalanced appearance to the existing dwelling when viewed from the neighbouring property and from the street scene in general.
- Large extension constructed 0.7m from the side boundary fence of No: 5. The current distance is 4m. Sketch drawings do not accurately reflect the closeness or the bulky extent of the extension, so close to No; 5.
- Drawings do not clearly demonstrate ground levels between No; 6 & 5. As a result the submitted plans do not clearly demonstrate impact development will have on adjacent occupiers.
- Canopy and spread of TPO tree to north needs to be fully assessed.
- Design of roof is out of character and will create a dominant and uncharacteristic roofscape in an area where there are traditional full two storey dwellings.
- Development will be highly visible from the HCC public open space area.
- Floor plans for extension are annotated as office/study and play area. Concerns that the
  extension could be used for and office based business or crèche, involving regular visits to the
  property.

# **Relevant Planning Policy:**

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3 Winchester District Local Plan Review DP.3; DP.4 National Planning Policy Guidance/Statements: PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development

# Planning Considerations

- Principle of development
- Impact on dwelling and character of area in general
- Impact on amenities of adjacent occupiers
- Landscape/Trees

#### Principle of development

The application site lies within the defined settlement boundary for Bishops Waltham. Under the relevant planning policy therefore there is a general presumption in favour of development subject to the scheme according with the relevant provisions of the WDLPR, and in particular DP.3.

#### Impact on dwelling and character of area in general

The proposed development would measure 3.1m x 9.2m with a maximum and a minimum height to the eaves of 5m and 2.7m respectively. It is not considered that the proposed development would materially harm the character of the area for the reasons set out below:

The proposed addition would be single story and sited to the east of the parent dwelling. The southern most part of the extension would be stepped back approximately 0.2m from the face of the parent dwelling, thereby maintaining the visual integrity of the existing house, and simplifying the construction. Similarly the pitch/roofline of the extension follows the angle of the existing dwelling and therefore appears visually subservient and seeks to reduce the overall mass of the development.

The proposed extension to the dwelling seeks to increase the gross floor area from 151m<sup>2</sup> to 177m<sup>2</sup>. This equates to a percentage increase of approximately 17%, which is proportional to and in keeping with the parent dwelling.

The proposed development would be constructed from materials in keeping with the original dwelling, thereby maintaining the visual integrity of the building and the street scene in general (condition 2).

The extension is considered to be subservient to and proportional in scale to the parent dwelling. Furthermore, as the extension would not protrude beyond the building line of the parent dwelling, the 20m long green verge to the south of the plot will be preserved. This green verge to the south of the site is considered to enhance the wider character of the area by way of creating a focal point and sense of space and openness. As the proposed development would maintain this element, it is considered that the proposed development would to preserve the wider visual character of the area.

In addition, it is not considered that the proposal would create a precedent for similar development, given each case is assessed on its merits and constraints/opportunities afforded to that particular site.

## Impact on amenities of adjacent occupiers

At its closest point the proposed addition would be set back approximately 0.7m from the eastern site boundary. It is not considered that the proposed development would materially harm the amenities of adjacent occupiers to the east because the western facing wall of the adjacent property (No; 5 Godfrey Pink Way) is comprised of a solid flank wall and set back approximately 4m from the site boundary. This in combination with the single storey nature of the development would ensure the development would not intrude unacceptably upon the adjacent occupier's privacy.

The roof of the proposed extension slopes to the east and follows the same plane as the main roof. At its lowest point (approximately 0.7m from the eastern site boundary), the development would have a maximum height of 2.9m. As the proposed extension would not protrude beyond the northern or southern facing elevations of the adjacent property, it is considered that the proposed development would avoid materially harming the adjacent occupier's daylight amenity in terms of light.

The eastern site boundary runs at an angle. Accordingly, the eastern wall of the extension graduates away from the said boundary. This, in combination with the single storied nature of the development would mean that the development would not appear visually dominating or materially harmful to the amenities of the adjacent occupiers.

#### Landscape/Trees

A large and significant tree protected by a TPO lies to the south of the proposed development. The adjacent occupier to the east of the site, has raised concerns that the proposed development would harm the health and vitality of this tree.

It was noted at the case officers site visits that the tree is set back approximately 8m from the front of the existing dwelling. As the proposed extension would be stepped in an additional 0.2m from the face of the dwelling, it would be set back a total distance of approximately 8.2m. The Council's Arboricultural Officer reports that the nearest the development could be to the tree is 8m.

In light of the above distance between the extension and the tree, it is considered that impacts on the health and vitality of the Chestnut tree can be adequately mitigated subject to the imposition of condition's (No's 3 to 5) requesting an arboriculture method statement for the protection of the tree during construction.

#### Other matters

Comments made in relation to the use of the extension for business purposes are noted. However, as these comments appear to be speculative, they can be afforded little weight.

The adjacent occupier to the east raises concerns that the proposed development fails to accurately represent the differences in site levels, and as the application site is set at a higher elevation than the adjacent occupier this would further exacerbate the height and impact of the extension so close to the site boundary.

Whilst it is acknowledged that these details have not been shown on the detailed drawings submitted, it is not considered that this is sufficient to sustain a reason for refusal in light of the above-mentioned matters and the difference in levels between the 2 sites has been taken into account. Furthermore as the addition would be a single storied extension and the overall difference in ground level is relatively modest (0.5m) it is considered that the development would not represent a visually dominating or intrusive element and would not have a overbearing impact on the neighbouring dwelling.

The adjacent occupier also states that the development would be highly visible from the Hampshire County Council's owned public space area. Whilst it is acknowledged that the development would be visible from the public open space area, it is not considered to be a visually dominating feature out of character with the surrounding area.

#### Recommendation

# APPROVE

#### **Conditions/Reasons**

1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship between the new development and the existing.

3 A Method Statement (in accordance with BS5837:2005 standards), which relates specifically to the Horse Chestnut tree (which has a TPO) to the south of the dwelling, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, prior to any demolition, construction or groundwork commencing on the site. The development shall then proceed in accordance with the approved Method Statement. Any deviation from works prescribed or methods agreed in accordance with the Method Statement shall be agreed in writing to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees and hedgerows to be retained and in particular to avoid unnecessary damage to their root system.

4 The Arboricultural Officer shall be informed as soon as the construction exclusion zone has been fenced so that it can be inspected and deemed appropriate and in accordance with the approved Method Statement. Contact Arboricultural officer on 01962 848317.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees and hedgerows to be retained and in particular to avoid unnecessary damage to their root system.

5 No arboricultural works shall be carried out to the trees other than those specified and in accordance with the Method Statement.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees and hedgerows to be retained and in particular to avoid unnecessary damage to their root system.

#### Informatives

1. The Horse Chestnut to the south of the dwelling is protected by a tree preservation order. Damage to the tree is an offence under the Town and Country Planning Act. Failure to comply with the above conditions could result in enforcement action and a fine of up to £10,000.

2. This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

3. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3 Winchester District Local Plan Review: DP.3; DP.4