

13 DCNE2005/0960/F - TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY AT 7 THE HOPKILNS, BISHOPS FROME, WORCESTER, WR6 5BP**For: Mr & Mrs M J McGladdery per Lett & Sweetland Architects, 58 London Road, Worcester, WR5 2DS****Date Received:**
23rd March 2005**Ward:**
Frome**Grid Ref:**
66143, 48494**Expiry Date:**
18th May 2005

Local Member: Councillor R Manning

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The Hopkilns is a small residential development within Bishops Frome comprising 11 modern detached dwellings.
- 1.2 The application relates to no. 7. It is a property that backs onto open countryside, with neighbours to either side. These are staggered with the dwelling to the west, known as Sedona, set forward from the application site, whilst that to the east (no. 8) is set back.
- 1.3 The gardens of each of the properties in this part of the development are terraced and there is a considerable change in level; well in excess of two metres, from the rear elevation of the dwelling to the end of the garden, a distance of approximately 15 metres.
- 1.4 The proposal seeks to create an extension off the rear elevation. It is centrally positioned and is of a contemporary design, being two-storeys with a cantilevered roof overhanging a balcony. The plans have been amended since the applications original submission and a set of external steps down into the garden have been removed and two obscure glazed screens proposed to either side of the balcony.
- 1.5 The extension is shown to be finished in a combination of brickwork at ground floor level, cedar boarding at first floor with a substantial area of glazing on the northern gable end, all under a tiled roof to match the existing. It has a combined floor area of 36m² as opposed to the main dwelling which has an area of 150m².

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

Housing Policy 16 – Extensions

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan – (Revised Deposit Draft)

H18 – Alterations and Extensions

3. Planning History

3.1 None relevant to this application.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 None required.

Internal Council Consultations

4.2 Transportation Manager - No objections.

5. Representations

5.1 Bishops Frome Parish Council - In response to the original application commented as follows:

'The occupant of Farrow House has expressed concerns about the loss of privacy in his back garden and would therefore request that the upstairs window on the west elevation be made from opaque glass and non-opening. He has also requested that the balcony be walled off so as to restrict the view of his garden. Otherwise there are no objections to the application'.

In light of re-consultation following the receipt of amended plans they now comment:

'Two nearby homes are affected by the proposed development. The occupant of Farrow House objects to the plans on the grounds that the changes are not in keeping with the rest of the building and they represent an intrusion into his privacy. The extension will directly overlook his garden and hot tub.

The occupant of Kintail agrees with the comment that the proposals are not in keeping. He believes that the material used should be brick, and that there should not be a balcony'.

5.2 Letters of objection have been received from Mr & Mrs McBarnet, Sedona, The Hopkilns in response to the original application and subsequently amended scheme. In summary the points raised are as follows:

1. Concerns regarding potential overlooking both regarding windows and the proposed balcony.
2. Design is not in keeping with its surroundings.

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 Housing Policy 16 of the Malvern Hills District Local Plan is most relevant to this proposal. It highlights a number of issues that are of relevance when dealing with applications. The three most relevant in this case are as follows:

- a) be at a scale and mass which ensures that the architectural character of the original building is retained and continues to dominate,
- b) be to a high standard of design with size, siting and external materials complementing the character and appearance of the original building and its surroundings, and
- c) not result in undue loss of residential amenity to nearby properties.

6.2 Scale and Mass

As the comparative floor areas indicate, the extension is subservient to the main dwelling. It is attached to the rear elevation and not readily visible from the road frontage. The original dwelling will continue to be the dominant architectural feature and the proposal is considered to comply with this aspect of the policy.

6.3 Design

The existing dwellings generally have an attractive appearance but are not of any particular architectural style or quality. The proposed extension is of a much more contemporary style and does reflect current architectural trends in terms of its design and choice of materials. It is a high quality design but clearly differs from the appearance of the host building. The removal of the cantilevered roof and balcony would probably address third party concerns in this respect, but the applicant has chosen to retain these features. On balance, it is your officer's opinion that their retention is not sufficient to refuse the application on design grounds. The scheme is therefore acceptable in this respect.

6.4 Residential Amenity

In its original form, the first floor balcony was not screened and arguably would have caused some overlooking of neighbouring properties. However, the introduction of glazed screens in effect renders the outlook from the balcony no different to that from a first floor window. Any overlooking will only be of the end part of the garden of Sedona, and similarly of no. 8. An assessment must be made as to whether this is significantly injurious over and above the situation as it exists at present with first floor windows and a degree of overlooking caused by the change in levels within the garden. Again it is your officers balanced view that it will not cause a significant loss of privacy to warrant refusal.

6.5 It is therefore concluded that the proposal accords with the local plan policy and is consequently recommended for approval.

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 - A09 (Amended plans)

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

3 - B01 (Samples of external materials)

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

4 - E19 (Obscure glazing to windows)

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

Informative:

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

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.