

Date of Meeting	28 th June 2018
Application Number	18/03512/FUL
Site Address	4 Hillside Close West Dean Salisbury Wiltshire SP5 1EX
Proposal	Two storey extension to rear of property and new front porch
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Harris
Town/Parish Council	WEST DEAN
Electoral Division	WINTERSLOW – Councillor Devine
Grid Ref	425721 126732
Type of application	Full Planning
Case Officer	Christos Chrysanthou

Reason for the application being considered by Committee

The application has been called in to committee by Councillor Devine for the following reasons –

- The scale of development
- The visual impact upon the surrounding area
- The relationship to adjoining properties; and
- Design – bulk, height, general appearance

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 the application be APPROVED.

2. Report Summary

The main issues which are considered to be material in the determination of this application are listed below:

- Principle of development
- Scale, siting and design
- Impact on amenity

3. Site Description

The application site is a semi-detached dwellinghouse located on Hillside Close situated within a residential area in the rural settlement of West Dean.

4. Planning History

None directly related to site, but other similar extensions in immediate area.

Relevant history – list of approvals of similar rear extensions to adjacent dwellings:

14/08256/FUL Two storey rear extension with hipped roof - 13 Hillside Close

13/00218/FUL Part single, part two storey rear extension – 14 Hillside Close

S/2007/1334 Rear extension to dwelling - 16 Hillside Close

5. The Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey rear extension and a front porch.

6. Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 1 Achieving Sustainable Development

Section 7 Requiring good design

Wiltshire Core Strategy

Core Policy 1 Settlement Strategy

Core Policy 2 Delivery Strategy

Core Policy 57 Ensuring high quality design and place shaping

Saved Policy C24 Extensions to buildings

Saved policy H31 Extensions to dwellings in the countryside

7. Summary of consultation responses

Parish Council - comments received:

'Whilst West Dean Parish Council (WDPC) does not have any specific concerns with regard to the proposed development in isolation, it is noted that the proposed building works represent a significant increase in the footprint of the property and that several other properties in the vicinity have already had similar works carried out. WDPC wishes to ensure that, over time and subsequent planning applications from nearby properties, the overall visual impact of these dwellings on the surrounding open agricultural landscape will not be made worse.

WDPC therefore requests that Wiltshire Council Planning Department give consideration to limitations on further development of this nature within the Hillside Close cluster of houses.

WDPC further notes the strong concerns raised by the owners of an adjacent property in relation to the scale of the proposed development requested by this planning application.

WDPC therefore requests that Wiltshire Council Planning Department experts give due

consideration as to the impact on the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and, in particular, whether the increased shadow arising from this two storey extension results in an unacceptable deterioration in light quality.'

8. Publicity

3 Neighbour/third party letters have been received citing the following material planning considerations:

2 Letters of support (local precedent):

'It is very similar to other approved planning applications in the close.'

'Other houses in Hillside Close have had extensions and set the precedence. 3 identical houses have had 2 storey extensions without any complaints before or after the build. '

1 Letter of objection (scale, bulk, loss of light)

'My partner and I have now had time to look carefully at the plans and consider their impact. It is with a heavy heart that we object to the application as we know that our objection will disappoint our neighbours, the applicants. However, we were shocked when we realised the bulk and scale of the proposed extension and its inevitable effect on this house.

The problem comes in part from the topography of the area. The clue is in the name: Hillside Close. Number 4 is uphill from number 3; it is directly south; and it is not parallel, it is offset. All of which combine to mean that this proposed extension, which would be 2 storey, full width, with pitched roof, would cast an enormous shadow over our house, number 3, as well as over number 2 Hillside Close which is the other half of this semi-detached property. In fact, from the end of September till the beginning of May no sunlight would fall on the rear of our houses at all. I have attached a photograph which gives an idea of the problem. The white building in the photo is the existing conservatory at number 4. It is approx. 5 metres deep and currently allows us some borrowed light. The proposed extension would be this depth but wider. To keep floor levels consistent through the house these proposed plans require raised foundations which, together with the pitched roof, considerably increase the final height of the extension.

Having studied the plans carefully, our conclusion is that proposed extension to number 4 is overbearing and out of scale. It creates a large bulk which will deprive neighbouring properties of daylight.

We fully understand why the applicants would like more space: we have a single storey extension as our kitchen and main living area. We hope that, by objecting to this particular application, a creative solution may be found by the applicants together with their architect which will give them additional space without having such a devastating impact on the neighbouring properties.'

9. Planning Considerations

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

9.1 Principle of development

Saved policy H31 permits extensions to dwellings in the countryside provided that the extension is subservient in size to the existing dwelling and does not substantially alter the character of the dwelling; the design of the extension is in keeping with that of the existing dwelling and uses complementary materials; and the extension would not create, or be capable of creating, a separate dwelling.

Saved policy C24 states that extensions and additions to buildings in the countryside will only be permitted if they are sympathetic in scale and character with the existing building and surroundings, and fall within the existing curtilage.

Core Policy 57 states 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 requires that development should ensure the impact on the amenities of existing occupants is acceptable, and ensuring that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable within the development itself, and the NPPF's Core Planning Principles (paragraph 17) includes that planning should 'always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.'

The proposed development is considered acceptable in principle, provided the development is appropriate in terms of its scale, siting and design to its context, and provided other interests including residential amenity are addressed.

9.2 Scale, siting and design

It is proposed to remove the existing conservatory and outbuilding and erect a two storey rear extension. The proposed rear extension would span the width of the dwelling and would project 5m from the rear elevation. The height to the eaves and to the ridge height would match the main dwelling. The extension would maintain a gap of 30cm to the boundary to no5 and the first floor element of the rear extension would be set away by 2m from the boundary to no5. The rear extension would maintain the existing gap to the boundary to no3.

Exterior materials are proposed to match the main dwelling. In addition a front porch with a hipped roof is proposed in front of the existing front door opening.

Whilst the scale, siting and design are considered to be acceptable, in view of the neighbour's objection, officers had tried to negotiate with the applicant a reduction in the depth and roof height of the rear extension however a slightly reduced scheme has not been forthcoming. Notwithstanding the above, officers note that similar rear extensions have been approved on Hillside Close, therefore a refusal on design grounds would be difficult to sustain.

9.3 Impact on amenity

The letter of objection from the neighbour which cites concerns regarding scale, bulk and loss of light has been noted and carefully considered.

All the properties have long rear gardens. The rear facades of the dwellings and rear gardens are north west facing, but given the generally open character of the plots, it appears

that the garden amenity areas and rear facades benefit from a significant amount of sunlight during most of the day.

Having visited the site the relationship between the two properties and the difference in ground levels are noted. It is also noted that the adjacent property 3 Hillside Close has an existing single storey rear extension, with patio area leading onto the garden area.

In officers view whilst there would be some reduction in daylight, due to the juxtaposition of the dwelling and the neighbour, any additional shading caused by the extension would mostly affect the roof of the neighbours single storey rear extension. The neighbour would maintain a west-southwest aspect meaning that they would enjoy afternoon/evening daylight. Therefore in officers view the reduction in daylight would not be significant to warrant refusal.

10 Conclusion (The Planning Balance)

The parish council's comments have been noted and the neighbour objection has been taken into full consideration. Having visited the site and after careful assessment, taking into account of the similar nearby extensions, officers consider the scale, siting and design of the proposed extension and porch to be acceptable and the development proposal would not unduly impact on neighbour amenity.

The development proposal conforms to the objectives of saved policy C24 and H31 and core policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the aims of the NPPF. Therefore, having regard to the material considerations and all matters raised, the Local Planning Authority considers that on balance, planning permission should be granted.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE, subject to the following conditions:

1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

Location Plan Date rec. 12/04/18

Drg. no. ADS2018/871/1/A Proposed Elevations and Floor Plans Date rec. 12/04/18

Drg. no. ADS2018/871/4 Site Plan/ Block Plan (revised) Date rec. 11/06/18

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3) The materials to be used in the approved works shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

REASON: In the interests of amenity

