

**8 DCCE2005/0248/F - TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO PROVIDE DOUBLE GARAGE AND STUDY WITH TWO BEDROOMS OVER. PITCHED ROOF OVER EXISTING KITCHEN AT 175 AYLESTONE HILL, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 1JJ**

**For: Ms. J. Brown, 175 Aylestone Hill, Hereford, HR1 1JJ**

**Date Received: 25th January 2005      Ward: Aylestone      Grid Ref: 52375, 41751**

**Expiry Date: 22nd March 2005**

Local Members: Councillors D.B. Wilcox and A.L. Williams

### **Introduction**

Members will recall this application from the Central Area Planning Sub-Committee (6th April, 2005) and the subsequent site inspection on 18th April, 2005. There is no further information to report and as such the attached report and recommendation remains unchanged.

### **1. Site Description and Proposal**

1.1 The site is located on the western side of the A465 (known as Aylestone Hill) on the north eastern fringes of Hereford City. Occupying the site is a detached two storey dwelling with a rendered finish under a natural slated roof with brick quoin detailing. Immediately north is a detached bungalow with a further detached dwelling to the south. The site lies within the Settlement Boundary as identified in the Hereford Local Plan and also falls within a Conservation Area.

1.2 The applicants propose the construction of a two storey side extension with double garage and utility room at ground floor with two additional bedrooms, one of which would be en-suite at first floor. Also proposed is the enlargement of the existing single storey rear extension along with the construction of a pitched roof in place of the existing flat roof.

### **2. Policies**

#### **2.1 Hereford Local Plan:**

H16	-	Alterations and extensions
CON12	-	Conservation areas
CON13	-	Conservation areas – development proposals

#### **2.2 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft):**

H18	-	Alterations and extensions
HBA6	-	New development within conservation areas

### 3. Planning History

- 3.1 CE2004/2489/F - Single storey and two storey extension, new pitched roof over existing extension. Application withdrawn 4th October, 2004.

### 4. Consultation Summary

#### Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 None required.

#### Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Traffic Manager: No objections subject to conditions concerning the provision of off-street parking and vehicle manoeuvring area.
- 4.3 Conservation Manager: In general the proposal is an improvement on the previous proposal and is therefore acceptable. Slates, bricks and render should match existing. We would also recommend using timber windows rather than Upvc.

### 5. Representations

- 5.1 Hereford City Council: No objection.
- 5.2 One letter of objection has been received from Mr. J.R and Mrs. M.O. Jenkins, 177a Aylestone Hill, Hereford. The main points raised are:
- The proposed extension would have a detrimental effect on our property;
  - The proposal would cause a significant loss of light to our living room;
  - The proposed windows at first floor serving bedroom are to be obscure glazed, if these windows were of the opening kind or plain glazing inserted in the future our living area would be constantly open to view from this proposed upstairs room;
  - A window is proposed in the side elevation of the garage which would directly overlook our driveway and garden thus reducing our privacy even further.
  - The extension is to be built very close to our boundary and builders are likely to require constant access from our property to erect scaffolding. This permission would not be given;
  - We would have no objection if an extension were proposed on the other side of the house between 173 and 175 Aylestone Hill, where it would not effect any neighbouring properties;
  - If planning permission is approved we request than a restriction be imposed preventing the property from being used for any commercial purpose;
- 5.3 The full text of these letters can be inspected at Central Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

### 6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 This application has been submitted following the withdrawal of a similar proposal in October last year. Plans have been amended to address concerns expressed by your Officers and the objector. The amendments being:
- a) reduction in width of the extension by 0.56 metres

- b) use of obscure glazing for the two windows serving the bedroom at first floor of the rear elevation;
  - c) introduction of a hipped roof on the rear of the extension facing the objectors property;
  - d) continuation of the brick quoin detailing on the front elevation down to ground floor;
  - e) construction of a window at ground floor on the side elevation serving the garage.
- 6.2 The scale of the extension is now considered to be in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling. The recessing of the front wall of the extension behind the face of the existing property and the lower eaves and ridgeline also ensures that the extension is visually and architecturally subservient to the original dwelling. The scale and design will also have minimal impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area subject to the use of natural materials to match the existing dwelling.
- 6.3 The proposed siting of the extension being the nearest point to the objectors property and the juxtaposition of the two properties will mean that the proposed extension will have an impact on the amenity of the objectors property. However, the amendments undertaken are now considered sufficient to ensure that any impact is not so significant as to be unacceptable both in terms of any overlooking or loss of daylight/sunlight. A condition is recommended should permission be approved to restrict the first floor openings to obscure glazed and non-opening windows. There is currently insufficient off-street parking and manoeuvring space and therefore a condition is also recommended to ensure that appropriate parking/manoeuvring area is provided. A concern expressed by the objector regarding the need for builders to gain access via his property is a civil matter.
- 6.4 Finally, the applicant does buy and sell cars from the property, which are purchased and sold on the internet. However, the scale of the business (an average of one vehicle per week) is not presently considered sufficient to require formal planning permission. Nevertheless, this activity shall be monitored to ensure that the turnover of vehicles does not significantly increase.
- 6.5 The proposal is considered acceptable in accordance with Policies H16 of the Local Plan and H18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**That planning permission be granted 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 A06 (Development in accordance with approved plans)**

**Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development.**

**3 B02 (Matching external materials (extension))**

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

**4 E19 (Obscure glazing to windows)**

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

**5 E18 (No new windows in specified elevation)**

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

**6 H05 (Access gates)**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety.**

**7 H12 (Parking and turning - single house)**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway.**

**INFORMATIVES:**

**1 N03 - Adjoining property rights**

**2 N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC**

Decision: .....

Notes: .....

.....

**Background Papers**

Internal departmental consultation replies.