DELEGATED REPORT SHEET

APPLICATION NUMBER: 20172063

PROPOSAL: Erection of side and rear extensions and conversion of attached garage.

CONSULTATIONS:

Contaminated Land Officer: No comment

Parish Council:
Initial consultation response was an objection as it was felt the application is:
- Not in keeping with the surrounding area
- An overdevelopment of the site
- Overshadowing neighbouring properties
- Loss of light and privacy to neighbouring properties.

Comments following revised plans and further re-consultation:
- Blofield Parish Council has now had an opportunity to consider the above planning application and wishes to make no comment to the proposals contained therein.

Neighbour Comments:
No. 28 Chamberlin Court objects for the following reasons:
- Scale and size of the proposal – the extension will be oppressive and overshadow their property
- Out of character with the existing dwelling and the wider street scene.
- Windows overlooking conservatory and garden.
- Increased external lighting
- Parking and access issues, particularly during construction.

No. 24 Chamberlin Court objects for the following reasons:
- Overall size of extensions, causing overshadowing/ loss of light to garden
- Not in keeping with the row of houses it sits in.
- Devalue my property
- Concerned of effects to garage which is attached to No. 26’s.

Site Notice: Expired 25/12/2017

POLICY FRAMEWORK:

National Planning Policy Framework

Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2011
(amendments adopted 2014)
- Policy 2 – Promoting Good Design
Development Management DPD 2015
- Policy GC4 – Design

Blofield Neighbourhood Plan

PRE-APP ADVICE:

(1) Was pre-application advice sought? Yes
(2) Was the planning decision consistent with the pre-application advice?
There was some ambiguity regarding the pre-application advice however following amendments to the plans first submitted the scheme was considered acceptable.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Approve subject to conditions

- 3 year commencement condition; A1 (R2)
- Plans received 23 November 2017 and 15 January 2018 E3 (R15)

REASONS FOR DECISION

This application has been considered against the Development Plan for the area, this being the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2011 as amended 2014, the Development Management DPD (2015) and Blofield Neighbourhood Plan. The policies of particular relevance to the determination of this application are Policy 2 of the JCS and Policy GC4 of the Development Management DPD (2015). The National Planning Policy Framework is also a material consideration.

The existing dwelling is a two storey end terrace house with an attached garage located on a quiet cul-de-sac.

The street is populated with a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced two storey houses and bungalows.

The original submission sought planning permission for a first floor extension over the existing garage with a large flat roof extension running almost the full width of the house to provide a third floor and additional rooms in the roof with a further two flat roof extensions at first floor and ground floor level.

Following a site visit concerns were raised regarding the overall scale, form and design of the extensions which were considered to be excessive and at odds with the character of the host dwelling and others within the surrounding residential development.

The parish council also objected to the original proposal on the grounds that it was out of character and considered over development of the site. It would also lead to overshadowing and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

Negotiations between the Agent and Planning Officer resulted in amended plans being submitted on 14th December 2017 and again on 15th January 2018.
Following submission of amended plans on 14th December 2017 the occupants of No. 28 Chamberlin Court objected to the scheme based on the summary of comments outlined above.

Further amendments to the scheme were submitted on 15th January 2018 to address some of the concerns highlighted in the comments received from No. 28 but also the on-going concerns noted by the Planning Officer. These related to the two storey rear projection which was considered excessive and would lead to an unneighbourly development close to the boundary with the adjoining property.

The second amendment to the scheme significantly reduced the two and single storey rear extension in terms of the height, width and projection into the rear garden of the application site. The overall design of the two storey extension was also improved by reducing the projection of the two storey element and incorporating a hipped roof design. The revisions also incorporate a 1.2m gap between the proposed rear projection and the boundary fence with the adjoining property (No. 24 Chamberlin Court) to reduce the impact on this property in terms of the proximity of the development and overall massing close to the boundary fence.

The side extension above the existing garage was enlarged to provide the additional head room required for the stairwell to the first floor and bedroom within the roof space.

Following submission of the second amendment to the scheme and further consultation with neighbouring properties and the Parish Council additional objections were received from the owners of No. 24 Chamberlin Court as outlined above.

Prior to the Parish Council meeting held on 29 January 2018, to discuss the second amendment to the scheme, the Agent submitted an additional plan regarding a shadow fall analysis of the proposed development in relation to neighbouring properties. The analysis shows the potential shadow fall from December to September at various times of the day based on the existing and proposed built form. Whilst the information provides a visual indication of the potential impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties, the drawing does not form part of the formal determination of the application.

Following the parish council meeting on 29th January Blofield Parish Council did not wish to make any further comment to the proposals contained therein.

Having considered all the comments and objections received in conjunction with the amendments made to the original scheme, on balance the resulting proposal is considered acceptable.

The final amendments significantly reduce the overall height and massing of the proposed two storey development close to the boundary with the adjoining neighbour (No. 24 Chamberlin Court) by re-designing the roof structure and introducing a hipped roof design. In addition, the width of the rear extension has also been reduced and stepped away from the boundary with No. 24 leaving a 1.2m gap between the two properties. Furthermore the projection of the two storey element has been reduced to approximately 2.8m which is
considered acceptable. In addition, the number of first floor windows located within the north facing elevations has also been reduced to minimise overlooking in relation to No. 28 Chamberlin Court.

Due to the space afforded between the application property and No. 28 and orientation of the properties it is unlikely the accepted scheme will lead to excessive overshadowing or loss of light as the rear garden of both properties face east and therefore are naturally in shadow as the sun moves from east to west. Furthermore the two storey rear extension is located to the north of No. 24 therefore based on the movement of the sun from east to west it is unlikely the development will lead to excessive overshadowing or loss of light in respect of No. 24.

Whilst some off road parking space will be utilised for the development it is considered there remains a minimum of two spaces which is considered sufficient for a three bedroom dwelling and in keeping with Norfolk County Council’s off road parking guidance.

As there are several sets of terraced house within the vicinity the addition of the side extension above the existing garage will not look out of place, more a continuation of the row of terraces and is therefore considered to be in keeping with the street scene. The rear aspect of the extension will not be significantly visible from within the street therefore will have limited impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

The construction process and any resulting noise, dust or traffic are not matters that can be materially considered during the planning process.

Planning Practice Guidance specifies that the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of a development on the value of a neighbouring property or loss of private rights to light cannot be material considerations.

Based on the reasons stated above the application is considered to be acceptable and is therefore approved as it complies with National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Policy Guidance, Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy, Policy GC4 of the Development Management DPD 2015 and the Blofield Neighbourhood Plan.

The Local Planning Authority has taken a proactive and positive approach to decision taking in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
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