

22 DCNE2003/2307/F - TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING PROPERTY AT 29 BRONTE DRIVE, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR8 2FZ**For: Mr & Mrs P J Almond, Gibson Associates, Bank House, Bank Crescent, Ledbury, Herefordshire, HR8 1AA****Date Received:****29th July 2003****Ward:****Ledbury****Grid Ref:****70286, 37901****Expiry Date:****23rd September 2003**

Local Members: Councillor P Harling, Councillor D Rule MBE and Councillor B Ashton

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The property is located on the eastern side of a cul-de-sac road known as Bronte Drive in a residential area known as New Mills in Ledbury. The existing dwelling is a three bedroomed end of terrace property with open garden to the front and private garden to the rear, beyond which is a double garage partly owned by the applicants. The property is surrounded by a mixture of detached and semi-detached properties of varying sizes.
- 1.2 The applicants propose the construction of a two storey pitched roof rear extension to create a dining room and utility at ground floor and additional bedroom and shower room at first floor. The plans have been amended since the application was first submitted. The amendments are as follows:
- a) recessing of side wall of the extension 300mm inside the gable wall of the existing dwelling
 - b) reduction in the length of the extension from 3.7 to 3m.

2. Policies**Malvern Hills District Local Plan**

Housing Policy 16 – Extensions

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (deposit draft)

Policy H18 – Alterations and Extensions

3. Planning History

None.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

No statutory consultees required.

Internal Council Advice

4.1 Head of Engineering and Transportation – no objections.

5. Representations

5.1 Ledbury Town Council recommend approval.

5.2 Six letters of objection have been received from:

Miss Jane Wright, 36 Bronte Drive, Ledbury
Mr Boaler, 31 Bronte Drive, Ledbury
L H & C E Pickett, 27 Bronte Drive, Ledbury
Gary Bills-Geddes, 38 Bronte Drive, Ledbury
Mrs J R Jones, Little Frith, Off Knapp Lane, Ledbury
Ian Cockett, Eyebrook House, 41 Bronte Drive, Ledbury

The main points raised are:

- a) The extension would significantly reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight received by neighbouring properties and their gardens.
- b) The extension will dominate half of the rear garden of no.27 Bronte Drive particularly given that no.29 already projects some 1.7m beyond the rear elevation of no.27. The situation is exacerbated by the fact that no.29 is some 70cm higher than the immediate adjoining property, no.27.
- c) The windows proposed on the eastern and western elevations will directly overlook neighbouring properties and gardens removing all privacy, which is currently enjoyed.
- d) There will be an increase in noise levels and night time light pollution emanating from the extension if permitted.
- e) Existing residents already park on the highway and the larger family residence that would result if permission is given will aggravate the existing parking problem potentially causing problems for emergency vehicles accessing Bronte Drive.
- f) The extension would occupy nearly half the length of the existing relatively small garden and would be an overdevelopment of the land available.
- g) The extension is to be built close to the western boundary and would tower above existing properties on the far side of the road giving the feeling of being 'boxed in'.
- h) We are concerned with the possible nuisance caused by building work over a long period of time if permission is approved for the extension.
- i) A covenant exists on all properties in the area preventing any extensions within five years from 1st January 1999.
- j) The extension would spoil the appearance and residential environment of the recently built estate.

- 5.3 The full text of these letters can be inspected at Northern Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 As detailed in part 1 of the report, the plans have been amended slightly since the original submission to address concerns expressed by officers. Given the relatively minor changes the objections from local residents remain relevant.
- 6.2 The scale of the extension is now considered acceptable in relation to the existing dwelling, which has not been extended since first built. A clear visual and architectural distinction is drawn between the original dwelling and proposed extension ensuring the original dwelling remains the dominant feature. The design of the extension compliments the existing dwelling in terms of the roof pitch, fenestration and matching materials. The scale of the extension is also commensurate with the size of the plot and does not represent an over development of the land available as suggested by some of the objectors. Furthermore, the dwelling will not be out of character with other properties in the area in terms of its size or appearance.
- 6.3 With regard to the impact of the extension on the amenity of surrounding properties, there is sufficient distance between the extension and the neighbour immediately south to ensure that there will be no unacceptable increased loss of privacy through overlooking. It is not considered that the proposal will result in an unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight to the immediate neighbours given the height of the proposed extension and the distance and juxtaposition between the applicants and neighbouring properties. This is particularly so now that the extension has been reduced in length by 700mm. Windows are proposed on the eastern elevation of the extension serving a shower and utility room and a new window is proposed in the western gable of the existing dwelling to serve the fourth bedroom. To retain the privacy currently enjoyed by the properties immediately east and west of the site and to prevent any additional overlooking a condition is recommended that these windows be obscure glazed.
- 6.4 The applicants already have a garage and a single off-road parking space, which is considered satisfactory to serve the proposed dwelling if permission is given for the extension. The Transportation Manager raises no objection to the application. Other matters raised by objectors such as restrictive covenants within the deeds, the fact that property is for sale and the possible consequences of approving the extension on the value of surrounding properties are not material planning considerations.
- 6.5 The amended proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of its scale, design, materials and impact on neighbours in accordance with Housing Policy 16 of the Malvern Hills District Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be approved subject to the following conditions:

- 1 - A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission))**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 - A09 (Amended plans)(received 28th November 2003)

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the amended plans.

3 - B02 (Matching external materials (extension))

Reason: To ensure the external materials harmonise with the existing building.

4 - E19 (Obscure glazing to windows)(delete dwelling, insert windows on the east elevation of the extension and western elevation of the original dwelling)

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties.

5 - E18 (No new windows in specified elevation)(eastern or western elevations of the extension or original dwelling)

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties.

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.