DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO/ADDRESS: 11/1091 – 12 George V Avenue

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 22/3

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): None.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

Detached house on the east side of George V Avenue of a design which is a variation on a theme in this part of the Avenue. They have projecting two storey front gable features and parapeted flat roof side garages. The application site has a brick finish.

PROPOSAL

The application has been revised since first submitted and a first floor side extension and roof extensions have been removed from the application. The application is now for single storey side and rear extensions.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

No. 14

75/863 - Extension to garage. Granted 10.10.75

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

RES7, BE1, H16 and H18 of the saved Local Plan.
BE1, CC1 and CC6 of the South East Plan
PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development
Policy 16 Submission Core Strategy

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

No letters from neighbours received.

Environment Agency – did not wish to comment.

HUMAN RIGHTS:

First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 is relevant to this application. It is accepted that the proposal, if approved, would have some impact on the neighbouring properties. However, it is considered that the level of development proposed would not cause undue

harm in terms of additional noise, disturbance and loss of privacy and that, on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The revised application is now simply for single storey side and rear extensions. The existing side garage is to be replaced by a side extension which is set 650mm back from the front gable feature. This lines through with the position of the existing garage. The extension is proposed on the boundary and will extend 2.6 metres beyond the rear wall. It will have a parapeted flat roof 3.1 metres in height at the front and 3.6 metres high at the rear to allow for a difference in ground level. The front is about 0.5 metre higher than the existing garage but retains the appearance of garages in the area.

No. 10 to the south is set off the boundary by approximately 1 metre and has five ground floor side windows, a side kitchen door and two first floor side windows. The ground floor windows give light to the hall, which is also lit from the front, two obscurely glazed windows which are thought to be WC/bath, two secondary kitchen windows and a kitchen door which has its main window in the rear elevation. No. 10 also has a projecting boiler house on the boundary which projects approximately 1 metre into the garden and has a mono pitched roof which is nearly as high as first floor cill level.

These side windows at No. 10 will lose some light due to the depth and proximity of the extension but as these windows are not to habitable rooms or are secondary in nature it is not considered that this impact is so great that it warrants a refusal. An approved extension to the garage at no. 14 has had a similar impact on No. 12, the application site.

The rear extensions proposed include a central conservatory to a depth of 3 metres. Closer to the boundary with No. 14 a reconfiguration and extension to the projecting boiler house is proposed. The total depth of extension in this area is just over 5 metres. No. 14 has extended to the rear by approximately 2 metres and so the proposed addition would only be 3 metres beyond No. 14's extension. Given the 1 metre boundary clearance this is considered to be an acceptable relationship that would not result in significant loss of light or outlook.

The design of the extensions in the revised scheme respect the integrity of the original house.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant subject to conditions.

1. 5 years
2. Approved Plans
3. Materials to Match

4. No new windows

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposal complies with the relevant policies of the Development Plan.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION? No.

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign..... Date..... 31/3/11

Authorising Officer sign..... Date..... 4/4/11