

Date of Meeting	6 th April 2016
Application Number	16/00563/FUL
Site Address	118 Silver Street Lane, Trowbridge, Wiltshire BA14 0JR
Proposal	Second storey extension, single storey porch, extension to garage and new boundary fence
Applicant	Mr & Mrs O Rhouati
Town/Parish Council	TROWBRIDGE
Electoral Division	TROWBRIDGE GROVE – Councillor Jeff Osborn.
Grid Ref	384748 156321
Type of application	Full Planning
Case Officer	Steven Vellance

Reason for the application being considered by Committee :

Councillor Jeff Osborn has requested that this application be considered by the Planning Committee for the following reasons:

- Scale of development;
- Visual impact on the surrounding area:
- Relationship to adjoining properties;
- Design – bulk, general appearance.
- Neighbourhood concern.

1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of the report is to assess the merits of the proposal against the policies of the development plan and other material considerations and to consider the recommendation that planning permission be refused.

2. Report Summary

The main issues to consider are:

- Design – Impact of the proposal on the character of the surrounding area;
- Impact of the proposal on amenity.

Trowbridge Town Council – Objects to this planning application for the following reasons:

- Large scale and massing;
- Over-dominant, resulting in a large two-storey house in an area of single-storey properties.

-Design is incongruous and includes unacceptable fenestration.

Neighbourhood Responses – Eleven emails and letters of response received.

3. Site Description

The application site is 118 Silver Street Lane, Trowbridge and is a part of an established residential estate. The property is a detached bungalow, located within its own grounds and characterised by being set within a distinct line of bungalows facing onto Silver Street Lane. The immediate vicinity is further characterised with there being two storey developments to the rear of the host dwelling and also to its immediate front along the main highway. There is a public right of way to the immediate west of the site and the dwelling is visible from the public realm.

4. Relevant Planning History

None.

5. The Proposal

The proposal is for the construction of a two storey extension for the entire building, which would convert the single storey bungalow into a two storey dwelling. The scheme would retain its existing footprint and would increase the overall pitched roof height from a current 5 metres to a proposed 7.5 metres, the eaves height would also increase from 2.4 metres to 5 metres. The scheme also proposes an enlarged garage, new fence boundary and a double gate at the entrance to the site.

6. Planning Policy

Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015)

CP57: Ensuring high quality design and place shaping.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

7. Consultations

Trowbridge Town Council: Objects to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Large scale and massing;
- Over-dominant, resulting in a large two-storey house in an area of single-storey properties.
- Design is incongruous and includes unacceptable fenestration

Wiltshire Council Highways:

Comments that the Council's parking standards for a four bedroom property require a minimum of three off road car parking spaces, which it is considered can be achieved within the site.

- Concerns expressed with regards to visibility for vehicles exiting the driveway, as any walls or boundary treatment must not be any higher than 600mm. Visibility must be maintained above the height of 600mm across the whole site frontage for a minimum of 2.4metres from the carriageway edge.

-Requests that if in the event that permission is to be granted, a new plan is supplied showing the boundary treatment to be set below 600mm across the frontage of the site and for a minimum of 2.4m back from the carriageway edge.

8. Publicity

The application was advertised by way of site notice and letters to neighbours.

Eleven emails/letters of objection were received, with some neighbours writing in more than once raising the following points:

- Loss of hedgerow to rear of property would harm wildlife.
- Proposed high level windows would look onto garden directly opposite.
- Loss of light.
- Proposal not in keeping with other bungalows.
- Proposal would be an “eyesore”.
- Would harmfully impact on the visual amenity of the street scene.
- Scale of proposal is disproportionate and not in keeping with immediate area.
- Proposal out of character and dominant.
- Loss of open feel of the area.
- Proposal would look disproportionate in context of other bungalows.
- Single storey proposal would be more in keeping.
- Bungalow owners have worked to maintain properties so that they are of a group value.
- Proposal is excessive, overbearing with no consideration for the area.
- Poor design, visually unbalanced.
- Proposed boundary treatment not in keeping.
- Houses to immediate rear at Alder Close would suffer loss of sunlight and privacy.
- Loss of privacy.
- Transition to house equates to higher occupancy level and noise and disturbance.
- Support proposal for new front porch.
- Scheme contrary to policy.
- NPPF and Core Strategy requirement of providing varied mix of houses
- Need for bungalows for elderly/disabled people.
- Scheme would remove dwelling from bungalow housing stock.
- Inaccuracies in submitted information.
- Garage extension would create harm.
- Object to new boundary wall and contrary to covenants.
- Footings of proposed brick wall would harm nearby trees.

Additional comments received after re-consultation for amended boundary treatment:

- Water mains, fibre optical cables, sewer pipes would be disrupted by proposed fence.
- Site plan inaccurate with regards to existing boundary treatment.
- Previous comments with regard to domineering bulk, mass and loss of privacy still stand.
- Proposal would be out of keeping within context of other bungalows.

9. Planning Considerations

The proposal is for the construction of a two storey extension for the entire building, which would convert the existing single storey bungalow into a four bedroom two storey dwelling. The scheme would retain its existing footprint and would approximately increase the overall current pitched roof height from 5 metres to approximately 7.5 metres, the eaves height would increase from an approximate 2.4 metres to 5 metres. The scheme also proposes an enlarged garage, new boundary fence and a double gate at the existing entrance to the site.

The site is located within the established residential area of Silver Street Lane, Trowbridge. Within the immediate site area, there are a line of ten bungalows, all of similar design, of which number 118 is a part. This line of bungalows is significant in that they serve to visually disrupt the views of two storey development within the area and whereby their presence serves to offer a different character of development to the overall street scene.

9.1 Planning Policy.

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Core Policy 57 of the adopted Core Strategy is of relevance and relates to design and place shaping and in part states the following:

“A high standard of design is required in all new developments, including extensions, alterations, and changes of use of existing buildings. Development is expected to create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complimentary to the locality”.

Core Policy 57 continues by stating that new development should be:

“Responding positively to the existing townscape and landscape features in terms of building layouts, built form, height, mass, scale, building line, plot size, elevational design, materials streetscape and rooflines to effectively integrate the building into its setting”.

The line of bungalows are strong in their distinct identity and serve to add a positive contribution to the spatial form of the area, the bungalows are sited in close proximity to Silver Street Lane itself, which is the main spinal route running through this residential development from Frome Road to Bradley Road. Whilst it is appreciated that the site has a mature hedgerow by its entrance and the building is set back from the highway, the bungalow is visible from the public realm at various vantage points, which in turn serves to make an important visual contribution to the area.

It is considered that the proposed scheme by virtue of its proportions, increased height and

mass has not drawn on the local context of the existing bungalows, whereby its design is overly dominant and contrary to the above policy. It is further considered that due to the scheme's increase in height and elevational proportions, it does not enhance the setting of the remaining bungalows, but instead serves to create visual harm to the immediate area.

This is further confirmed by NPPF paragraph 64 which states that planning permission should be refused for development which is of poor design and which fails to improve the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

9.2 Highways.

The Council's Highways Officer has been consulted, who states that for a four bedroom dwelling, three off road car parking spaces are required. The officer has requested in the event that the scheme is recommended for approval, that a further detailed plan is submitted to show the required visibility splays, which potentially involve the removal of some of the existing hedgerow. This consequently would make the site more visually exposed and increase its visual impact on the surrounding area, although it has to be recognised that the removal of part of the hedgerow would not by itself require planning permission and the concerns of the highways officer would not by itself amount to a sustainable reason for refusal of the application as the matter could be dealt with by a condition.

9.3 Amenity

A number of the neighbours have raised objections with regard to the impact of the proposal on their amenity. Households within Alder Close, whose rear gardens back onto the rear garden of the site have raised concerns about the loss of the Lleylandi hedgerow within the application site and the consequential loss of their privacy. This hedgerow could be removed at any time by the applicant without a need for consent. It is noted that other properties within Alder Close, which are of two storey height back onto other bungalows within the same development, where there are no such high level hedgerows. Therefore, the principle of a two storey building backing onto single storey bungalows with the potential to overlook has at this location been established.

The neighbouring property at number 116 has expressed concern about the proposed high level windows overlooking his rear garden. It is considered that such high level fenestration would offer a minimal oblique view of the adjacent rear garden area.

In terms of the visual impact of the proposal on the immediate area, the bungalow within the site is visible at various vantage points along Silver Street Lane and the public right of way to the immediate West of the site. It is considered that if the two storey extension were to be permitted, the resultant build, due to its increase in height, scale and proportions would be more visible and consequently would have a harmful visual effect on the immediate area.

10. Conclusion.

Whilst the scheme has sought to address the concerns relating to the initially proposed brick wall boundary treatment, by substituting this material for wooden fencing; the very principle of a two storey dwelling set within the context of a development containing ten single storey bungalows is not considered to be acceptable for the reasons discussed above. The

application is therefore recommended for refusal for the reasons set out below.

RECOMMENDATION:

Refused for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed development by reason of the increase in height, together with its form, mass and scale in this prominent location would appear incongruous and overly dominant within the street scene and as such would have a detrimental impact on the spatial form and character of the vicinity, contrary to Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.