DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO/ADDRESS: 10/1101 – 10 Coombe Rise

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 4/3

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): None.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

Detached chalet bungalow on the south side of Coombe Rise, close to the junction with Lime Tree Avenue.

The property is not in a conservation area, nor is it listed and there are no protected trees on the site.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for a first floor hipped and flat roofed rear extension and a pitched roof single storey side extension. The existing house has a flat roofed rear dormer as part of the original construction and a partially constructed single storey rear extension.

The property to the west, No. 8, is now part of Limetree Surgery, the property to the east is an extended family dwelling.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

98/00912 – Extensions and alterations to provide pitched roof garage to side, kitchen/dining room, new bedroom and bathroom. Granted 21.12.98

98/0431 – Extension and alterations to provide pitched roof garage to side, ground floor kitchen/dining with new bedroom over and dormer to rear existing roof. Refused 13.7.98

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

RES7, BE1, H16 and H18 of the saved Local Plan.
BE1, CC1 and CC6 of the South East Plan
Policy 16 Submission Core Strategy
PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development
WBC SPG – Extending and Altering your Home

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

One objection received from the neighbour at No. 12 summarised as follows:

i) loss of view,
ii) loss of light
iii) loss of sunlight to bathroom, hall, stairs, landing and decking area.
iv) Loss of privacy – overlooked.

v) Devalue property.
vi) Inaccurate plans
vii) Current extension not in accordance with approval.

HUMAN RIGHTS:

Article 8 (Right to Respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application. It is accepted that the proposal, if refused, would have some impact on the applicant's Rights. However, it is considered that the harm caused by the development outweighs these and that in the public interest the application should be refused. Accordingly, it is considered that the decision complies with the Human Rights Act 1998.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The main issues for consideration in this case are the

i) the impact of the extensions on the appearance of the house and wider area;

ii) the impact of the extensions on neighbouring amenity.

Appearance

A rear ground floor extension has been partially built. It is now proposed to add a first floor to the extension. The first floor measures 5.7 metres in depth and 5.5 metres in width. It would have a hipped and flat roof with an eaves and ridge line below that of the original house.

The 1998 refusal was for a similar depth two storey rear extension. However, in that case the first floor extension was less bulky as it included a catslide roof on the east side with a dormer window in it. The extension was refused because it was considered to be out of scale and proportion with the existing house and therefore detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene. A reduced first floor extension, half the depth of the ground floor, with a hipped roof and dormers was eventually given permission.

The proposed extension is larger than the extension refused and bulkier and the proposed roof has less finesse. The extension would be visible from the street when viewed through the gap between Nos. 10 and 12 as it is proposed to extend out to the flank wall with only a small hipped roof. It would also be clearly visible from the extensive car park at the rear of the adjoining surgery and neighbouring properties at the rear. It is considered that the design and mass of the extension would be out of scale and proportion with the original house overwhelming its form and upsetting its composition and would dramatically alter its original appearance to its detriment. The roof design is in itself inelegant due to its clumsy and awkward flat roof element. It would also to be harmful to the appearance of the wider streetscene due to its high visibility.

Neighbouring properties have been extended but not as proposed here. Extensions have largely been confined to the existing roofslopes or ground floor level. This proposal is much larger than anything on the back of this run of houses.

The extension proposed on the west side is marginally set back from the main front wall at this point but is well behind the porch and front bay positions. It has a gabled side wall and pitched roof and is acceptable in design terms.

Impact on Neighbours

The proposed rear extension is no deeper than the rear wall of the house to the east, No. 12, and No. 10 has a garage on the boundary between the two properties. No. 12 has been extended into the roof and in its flank wall it now has bathroom and landing windows, a secondary ground floor bedroom window and two rooflights to a bedroom on its west side. This bedroom also has rooflights on the opposite side.

Consequently it is not considered that significant light will be lost to habitable rooms at No. 12 or that the proposed extension will be overbearing, despite being very large. Views across neighbouring properties to the west and beyond to the Downs will be lost from the landing window and bedroom windows. This in itself however, is not considered to be grounds for refusal.

The proposed side extension is single storey and proposed up to the boundary. No. 8 next door is set off the boundary and has a solid flank wall. The side extension will have no neighbour impact.

Conclusion

The mass and design of the extension are considered to be unacceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse for the following reason:

1. The first floor extension would, by reason of its design and massing, be out of scale and proportion with the existing house and appear obtrusive and inelegant and as such would be harmful to the appearance of the property and the wider streetscene. The application is therefore contrary to saved Local Plan policies BE1, H16 and H18, South East Plan policies BE1 and CC6 and Submission Core Strategy Policy 16.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

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

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

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign..... Date..16/3/11.....

Authorising Officer sign..... Date..17 3 11.....