

**Parish:**Easingwold

Ward: Easingwold

**6**

Committee Date: 12 October 2017

Officer dealing: Justine Forrest

Target date: 19 October 2017

**17/01466/FUL**

**First floor and two storey side extension to dwelling**

**12 Apple Garth, Easingwold**

**Mr & Mrs Kay**

**This application is referred to Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Rooke**

## **1.0 SITE, CONTEXT AND PROPOSAL**

- 1.1 This application seeks to construct a first floor extension, and a small part of which is two storey extension, to the rear of the garage. The extension all lies to the east side of the red brick detached dwelling.
- 1.2 The extensions would be finished in red brick (London Brick Co Tudor red) and concrete roof tiles (Sandtoft double roman terracotta red smooth faced) to match those of the existing dwelling.
- 1.3 The private rear garden is enclosed by a boundary fence approximately 1.8m high with trees and mature shrubs. There are neighbouring properties on all sides.
- 1.4 The original plans did not comply with the detailed design expectations of the domestic extension SPD as the extension was at the same height and alignment as the existing property. The amended plans have provided a break in the position of the front wall and reduced the ridge height by introducing a hipped roof. The eaves height of the extension remains the same as the eaves height of the existing dwelling.

## **2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY**

- 2.1 No relevant planning history.

## **3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES**

- 3.1 The relevant policies are:
  - Core Strategy Policy CP1 - Sustainable development
  - Development Policies DP1 - Protecting amenity
  - Core Strategy Policy CP17 - Promoting high quality design
  - Development Policies DP32 – General Design
  - NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework – Adopted March 2012
  - Supplementary Planning Document - Domestic Extensions - Adopted 22 December 2009

## **4.0 CONSULTATIONS**

- 4.1 Parish Council – Parish Council - Have no objection to the proposal, expired 9 October.

4.2 Public comments - Site notice and neighbour notifications - Three neighbour responses have been received which are summarised as follows raising concern about:

- loss of daylight/sunlight.
- the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy.
- the dominant impact of the extension and the expanse of brickwork.

## **5.0 OBSERVATIONS**

5.1 The main issues to be considered in this case relate to the impact of the proposal on i) the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse, ii) any impact on the streetscene and iii) the amenities of the nearby neighbours.

5.2 The proposed extensions are subservient to the main dwelling, the front elevation is of acceptable design and are proposed to be constructed of appropriately matching materials. It is felt that the proposed extensions will not have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the dwelling or the streetscene.

5.3 The main matters is the relationship of the size and position of the extension to the neighbouring dwellings. The Policy CP1 and the Domestic Extension Supplementary Planning Document requires extensions to protect the amenity of neighbours and gives advice how to achieve this protection and prepare acceptable schemes.

5.4 The proposed extension is close to the neighbouring properties to the east side. There are three immediate neighbours, the nearest being approximately 9m from the proposed extension. It is considered that the mass of the proposal would have a negative impact on the amenity of neighbours due to the height, width of a large expanse of brickwork that would have an overbearing impact on the nearest dwelling.

5.5 A daylight impact assessment has been submitted. This shows the extent of sunlight lost due to the dwelling as it exists with further simulations for the initial proposal and the revised proposal. The extent of the loss of light has been significantly reduced by the amended plans received on 29 September 2017, such that the shading in the example times does not shade the walling of the house so severely. The extension would however cast shadow over the garden room of 22 Thornlands that is not currently shown to be in shade. No shading is shown to other dwellings in the assessment. The assessment confirms the increased impact and supports the finding that the effect of the extension on the neighbours would be too dominant and create an impression of being 'hemmed in'.

5.6 The side first floor window to the proposed ensuite is shown to face onto the neighbour at 22 Thornlands and although there may be a perception of overlooking any actual loss of privacy would be minimal as the window is not to a habitable room and could be conditioned to be obscurely glazed.

5.7 Taking all of the above into account it is considered that although the proposal will not cause harm to the appearance of the dwelling it is likely to cause significant harm to the amenities of the neighbours due to the overbearing impact and loss of daylight. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

## **6.0 RECOMMENDATION**

6.1 That subject to any outstanding consultations permission is **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would have a significant detrimental impact upon the amenities of the immediate neighbouring residential properties due to the scale and position of the two storey extension, resulting in a loss of daylight and an unacceptable overbearing impact, contrary to Hambleton Local Development Framework policies CP1 and DP1 and the Domestic Extensions Supplementary Planning Document.