

Report for Resolution

Report to Planning Applications Committee
Date 23 August 2012
Report of Head of Planning Services
Subject 12/01164/F 86 St Clements Hill Norwich NR3 4BY

Item
5 (3)

SUMMARY

Description:	Erection of rear extension and associated internal alterations.
Reason for consideration at Committee:	Objection
Recommendation:	Approve
Ward:	Sewell
Contact Officer:	Jo Hobbs Planner 01603 212526
Valid Date:	6th July 2012
Applicant:	Ms J Cramp
Agent:	Mr Neal Lewis

INTRODUCTION

The Site

Location and Context

1. The application site is located on St Clements Hill in the ward of Sewell to the north of the city. The site is located within the Sewell Conservation Area and the dwelling itself is a locally listed building. The site is located close to the junction of Chamberlain Road to St Clements Hill.
2. Surrounding the site are other residential dwellings to the north, west and south, with Sewell Park College to the east. The land level in the rear garden of the application site is lower than 84 St Clements Hill but around the same level as 88 St Clements Hill.
3. The existing dwelling is set in a long plot of land with a front garden and good size rear garden. The dwelling has a garage which can be accessed between 1 and 1a Chamberlain Road. The dwelling itself is a two storey dwelling with a semi basement.
4. There are large mature trees within the curtilage of the property and also trees within neighbouring properties which are within falling distance of the proposed extension.

Planning History

5. There have been four other applications relating to the rear extension of this dwelling in recent years:
 - **09/00845/F** - Removal and replacement of existing single storey rear extension. Refused on 05/11/2009.

- **10/01486/F** - Erection of rear garage. Approved on 21/10/2010.
- **10/01746/F** - Erection of single storey rear extension and associated internal alterations. Withdrawn on 15/12/2010.
- **11/00673/F** - Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of single storey rear extension. Approved 14/06/2011)

Equality and Diversity Issues

6. There are no significant equality or diversity issues. However see paragraph 31 for further information raised in letters of representation.

The Proposal

7. The application is for a replacement single storey rear extension. The proposed extension will have a footprint of 4.3m wide by 5.85m deep. The extension would have a pitched roof with a ridge height of 3.5m and eave height of 2.3m. The materials proposed are facing brick and a slate roof.
8. The existing extension is 2.7m wide by 5.3m deep along side the north boundary of the property with 88 St Clements Hill. The existing extension has a pitched, pantile roof that is 3.1m at the ridge line and 2.2m at the eaves.

Representations Received

9. Advertised on site and in the press. Adjacent and neighbouring properties have been notified in writing. Two letters of representation have been received citing the issues as summarised in the table below.

10.

Issues Raised	Response
Use of slate roof not consistent with other extensions in the area and will appear darker.	See paragraph 17.
Inaccuracies in Design and Access Statement over length of extension and eaves height, and height of previously approved extension on cross section plan.	Amended in revised statement and plan received on 09 August 2012.
Design compromised to increase internal space.	See paragraphs 13-17.
Larger than previously approved extension on site.	The application must be assessed on its own merits. Whilst previous applications have a bearing on what has previously been acceptable, all applications must be considered individually for their impacts and acceptability in planning terms.
Loss of daylight, in particular to neighbouring resident who is restricted to rear ground floors rooms due to limited mobility.	See paragraphs 27-30 and paragraph 31.

Consultation Responses

11. None undertaken.

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Relevant Planning Policies

National Planning Policy Framework:

Statement 7 – Requiring good design

Statement 12 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Relevant policies of the adopted East of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy 2008

ENV6 - The Historic Environment

ENV7 - Quality in the Built Environment

Relevant policies of the adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2011

Policy 1 – Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets

Policy 2 – Promoting good design

Relevant saved policies of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004

HBE8 – Development in conservation areas

HBE12 - High Quality of Design

EP22 - General Amenity

Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance

Trees and development SPD (2007)

Other material planning considerations

Sewell Conservation Area Appraisal

Principle of Development

12. The principle of an extension to the existing dwelling is acceptable in principle. The key considerations are the design, impact on the conservation area and heritage assets, impact on adjacent trees and impact on residential amenity.

Design and impact on heritage assets

13. With reference to design, the appearance of the rear extension ties in well with the existing building. Whilst the rear extension would be larger than the existing extension it would still be of subservient scale and form to the main dwelling.

14. The height, scale, mass, form, choice of materials and design details are all considered to be appropriate and in keeping with the existing locally listed building.

15. The extension would require an existing ground floor rear window on the dwelling to be removed. This window is a wooden sash window in the same design as other windows on the dwelling. Whilst the loss of this window is regrettable as the building is not statutorily listed and this window is a rear window not visible to the wider area it would not be reasonable to insist this window is retained.

Impact on Conservation Area

16. The property is situated within a conservation area, but the rear extension will only be visible to a limited extent when viewed across from Chamberlain Road. The existing built form and mature landscaping does screen this development from the wider conservation area to a large degree.
17. The ridge line has been reduced in pitch insofar as possible through the use of slate tiles instead of pantiles. Pantiles are typically used on rear extensions to buildings even if the main dwelling has a slate roof. This was historically because pantiles were cheaper than slates and so the preferred material. Whilst there are pantiles on the majority of other rear extensions within the area of the proposed extension this is not considered to be a significant feature or part of the character of the conservation area that needs to be retained. The Sewell Conservation Area Appraisal (2010) identifies roofs in the area around the application site are typically slate with a slope of less than 35 degrees. The use of pantiles on rear outbuildings is not noted as a particular feature that forms part of the character of the conservation area. Therefore the use of slate tiles is considered to be acceptable. Conditions are recommended however for the materials to be agreed, including the use of conservation rooflights, to ensure a high quality design finish.

Trees and Landscaping

18. There are several important trees on and near the site which contribute to the character of the wider conservation area. An Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA), Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan have been submitted with the application identifying that the works can be carried out without any adverse impacts on adjacent trees, provided the recommended precautions are carried out.
19. Conditions are therefore recommended for compliance with the AIA, the use of tree protection barriers and an agreed scheme of arboricultural site monitoring with the Council.

Impact on Living Conditions

20. The key considerations in relation to residential amenity are overlooking, loss of outlook and overshadowing.

Overlooking

21. The proposed extension would have windows and doors on the west elevation facing the garden. There are no residential windows visible on neighbouring properties to the west from the rear garden.
22. There would also be two high level rooflights to the south side of the extension roof slope which would provide limited views of 84 St Clements Hill, but not directly into the upper floor windows. Therefore there would be no significant loss of privacy from the proposed extension.

Loss of outlook

23. The extension would be 0.55m longer than the existing extension on the site. The ridge height would be 0.4 higher whilst the eaves would be 0.1m higher than the existing extension. The ridge line would be located more centrally within the plot, which would be further away from 88 St Clements Hill but closer to 84 St Clements Hill.

24. The additional length would lead to some further loss of outlook to the rear ground floor windows of 88 St Clements Hill. The rear garden of 88 St Clements Hill already contains a single storey extension adjoining the house that takes up some of the garden. The existing extension at 86 St Clements Hill is built against the boundary of the two properties and so leads to a narrow outlook at present. The replacement extension would add another 0.55m to the length of the extension.
25. This additional length to the extension would lead to some loss of outlook to 88 St Clements Hill. The extent to which the residents of this dwelling will have a loss of outlook would however not be significant enough to merit refusal of the application. Given the large existing rear extension it is not considered reasonable to refuse the application on the grounds of this additional length.
26. Due to a 2m wall on the south boundary with 84 St Clements Hill the views through to 86 St Clements Hill are limited. The existing roof line of the existing extension can be seen however from the ground floor rooms in 84 St Clements Hill. The increase in ridge height and movement of the ridge closer to the boundary with this dwelling will lead to some loss of outlook. The extent of loss of outlook again is not significant enough to merit refusal of the application. Due to the existing 2m wall there are limited views and the additional height of the extension would not be sufficient to merit refusal of the application on this ground.

Overshadowing

27. The orientation of the dwellings is such that the rear of the dwellings only experiences direct sunlight later in the evening as they face due west. The presence of mature trees around the site also creates a certain amount of overshadowing to rear windows of the dwellings.
28. The only dwelling to be affected by loss of direct sunlight would be 88 St Clements Road. This dwelling already receives a loss of daylight from the rear extensions to 84 and 86 St Clements Hill, but also the mature tree in the rear garden of 86 St Clements Hill. The level of sunlight this property already receives is low. The additional built form 0.55m deep by 2.3m high at eave level to 3.5m ridge level would not lead to a loss of sunlight that would be significant enough to merit refusal of the application.
29. Similarly the loss of daylight would not be significant enough to merit refusal of the application as the additional extent of development would not be great enough.
30. The replacement extension would also bring development closer to the rear windows of 88 St Clements Hill. There is considered to be sufficient distance however between these rear windows and the proposed extension for there not to be a loss of daylight from this extension.

Equality and diversity

31. A neighbouring resident has raised concerns over the loss of daylight to the rear ground floor windows of their property. They predominantly spend time in these rooms due to limited mobility. The internal layout of the dwellings at 84-88 St Clements Hill entails a change in level with steps in between the front and back rooms in the houses.
32. Whilst the impact of development on groups with protected characteristics is a material consideration in planning applications, the current application must be considered for its impact on neighbouring residents regardless as to whether they use affected rooms or not. If the room is a main habitable room then the impact of the development must be considered. In this instance the impact of loss of daylight and overshadowing are considered on the basis that neighbouring residents use their rooms. Therefore the issue of limited mobility is taken into account and fully considered.

Other material considerations

33. The demolition of the existing extension must be considered in relation to disturbance to protected species. The existing extension is in use and not disused which reduces the chance for protected bat species to be using the roof space, but bats still may be using the cavities under the pantiles to access the roof. Should any bats be found on site the applicant is reminded of the requirement under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) to obtain a European Protected Species Licence before disturbing any protecting species. An informative note is recommended as such.

Conclusions

34. Whilst the rear extension would increase in size from the existing rear extension it is not considered to be to a scale that would be detrimental to the character of the existing dwelling or to the setting of the wider conservation area, as the extension would still be subservient to the main dwelling and not highly visible to the surrounding conservation area.
35. The use of slate tiles is considered to not be detrimental to the character of the conservation area as pantiles were only used as a cheaper alternative to slate where slate is present on the main roof.
36. The larger extension would lead to some loss of outlook and direct sunlight to neighbouring properties, but this is not considered to be sufficient to merit refusal of the application.
37. Subject to the recommended conditions it is therefore considered that the design of the proposed extension is in keeping with the existing property and that the proposal is unlikely to have an adverse impact either on the adjacent trees or the amenities of adjacent neighbours by virtue of the distance of the extension to 84 St Clements Hill and the small additional extent of loss of outlook and direct sunlight that 88 St Clements Hill would experience.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To approve application no 12/01164/F "Erection of rear extension and associated internal alterations" and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Standard time limit
- 2) In accordance with plans
- 3) Prior approval of facing bricks, roof tiles and use of conservation rooflights
- 4) In accordance with Arboricultural Implications Assessment
- 5) Tree protection barriers
- 6) Arboricultural site monitoring

Reasons for approval:

The decision is made with regard to policies NE8, HBE8, HBE12 and EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, policies 1 and 2 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy March 2011 and all material considerations.

The design of the extension is in keeping with the existing property and is unlikely to have an adverse impact either on the adjacent trees or the amenities of adjacent neighbours by virtue of the distance of the extension to surrounding trees, the distance to 84 St Clements Hill and the small additional extent of loss of outlook and direct sunlight that 88 St Clements Hill respectively.

Informative Notes:

- 1) Tree protection barriers
- 2) Protected species licence



© Crown Copyright and database right 2012. Ordnance Survey 100019747.

Planning Application No 12/01164/F

Site Address 86 St Clements Hill

Scale 1:750



NORWICH
City Council

PLANNING SERVICES

