

Officer Recommendation Report - Householder (extension)

Site address: 6 Watling Street, Mountsorrel, Leicestershire, LE12 7BD

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Description: Single storey rear extension and associated works. | Ref: | P/21/1282/2 |
| | Initial & Date | |
| Officer Site Visit by: | JW 02/08/21 | |
| Officer Report by: | JW 24/08/21 | |
| Countersigned: | LM 24/8/2021 | |

1. Short description of proposal

The proposal seeks planning permission for a single storey rear extension which will provide a garden room. The rear elevation of the host dwelling will also be re-rendered to match the render on the front elevation. The elements to this proposal are as follows:

The proposed rear extension will project 4.94m from the rear wall of the existing kitchen and will measure 3.613m in width. The proposed extension will be 0.6m wider than the existing two storey outrigger it is attached to. In height, the extension will measure 2.738m to the eaves and 3.623m to the ridge of a monopitch roof, matching the design of the neighbouring rear extension it will adjoin. Two roof lights will be installed to the monopitch roof and UPVC patio doors are proposed on side elevation.

The materials used (render, slate roof tiles, UPVC windows and doors) for the extension and existing rear elevation will match the existing property.

2. Short Description of Site - Include Description of Neighbouring properties (window positions, window types, levels, boundary treatments etc)

The application site is a terraced, rendered property in the settlement limits of Mountsorrel. The rear elevation requires an updated render to match the front elevation, which is proposed under this application. The proposed extension matches the design features of the local area, using traditional materials associated with the Mountsorrel Conservation Area. The proposed development will not be visible from the street and will therefore have no significant impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

The property is neighboured by 4 Watling Street, 8 Watling Street (the adjoining properties), 8a Watling Street and 10a Watling Street. The proposed development will only impact amenity of 8 Watling Street, as the single storey rear extension at 4 Watling Street will shield the proposed development from the neighbouring dwelling.

The property has capacity for two off street parking spaces to the rear of the curtilage. No additional bedrooms are proposed and the existing parking provision will not be altered as a result of the proposal.

| 3. Relevant Development Plan policies: | |
|---|---|
| • Core Strategy Policies (list): | CS2, CS14 |
| • Saved Local Plan Policies (list): | EV/1, H/17, TR/18 |
| • Neighbourhood Plan Policies(list): | |
| 4. Relevant Material Considerations: | |
| • NPPF | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| • Leicestershire Highway Design Guide | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| • CBC Design SPD (2020) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| • National Design Guide | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| • Other (please state below) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Other - Mountsorrel Conservation Area Character Appraisal | |

| 5. Relevant Planning History |
|------------------------------|
| None relevant |

| 6. Comments Received |
|--|
| Consultees and Neighbours |
| Mountsorrel Parish Council- No objection |

| 1. Constraints | |
|------------------------------|---|
| • Conservation Area | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| • Listed Building | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| • Other Heritage | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| • Flooding | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| • Article 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| • Other (please state below) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Other - | |

| 2. Consideration of Issues – Design & Street Scene |
|---|
| a.) Is the proposal considered compliant with policies stated above with respect to the impact upon the street scene overall? |

Yes No (go to section e. below)

b.) If yes why?

- Roof design matches existing dwelling Yes
- Design features match existing dwelling Yes
- Windows in proportion Yes
- Within any defined building line Yes
- Matching materials to host dwelling Yes
- Subordinate to host dwelling Yes
- Remaining space between dwellings avoids terracing Yes
- Important landscaping retained Yes
- Other (please state) Yes

Other -

c.) Are any elements contrary to guidance with respect to design or the impact on the street scene?

Yes No

d.) If yes, what and why is this acceptable?

DESIGN BASED REFUSAL

e.) If the proposal is not in compliance with design policies and guidance, please set out below what the issues are. This should be a full account as it may form the justification for a reason for refusal :

3. Consideration of Issues – Amenity

a.) Does the proposal comply with the guidance in the Design SPD with respect to the following (complete the table for all neighbouring properties using an X to indicate no impact)?

| Neighbour | Sunlight | Daylight | Privacy | Outlook |
|--------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 4 Watling Street | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| 8 Watling Street | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| 8a Watling Street | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| 10a Watling Street | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |

b.) If yes to any impact in the table above, explain below which neighbour or neighbours are affected, how and why?

The proposed patio doors on the side elevation will face the ground floor habitable windows of 8 Watling Street. Currently, a small boundary wall sits on the boundary between 6 and 8 Watling Street and the existing side windows of these properties face each other, impacting occupier privacy. Future occupiers can install a 2m high fence on this boundary which will shield the side windows of both property's, as well as the proposed patio doors and increase privacy. On balance therefore, the proposal cannot be refused on amenity grounds as the introduction of a new opening on the side elevation will not further detrimentally impact neighbouring and occupier privacy.

c.) Are there any of the listed impacts, that have been raised by neighbours but are not selected in the table at b.) above?

Yes (describe these & why they comply with the guidance) No

d.) Are there any other impacts on neighbour amenity, (not identified above)?

Yes (list below) No

•

e.) If there are any identified impacts at b.) and/or c.) can they be mitigated and how?

Yes (explain below) No

f.) Will the proposal preserve the amenity of those that will live in the development?

Yes No (explain below)

g.) Are there any other material considerations that influence this assessment?

Yes (list below) No

•

h.) Overall, is the proposal considered compliant with the policies stated above with regard to neighbour and occupier amenity?

Yes No (describe at i. below)

AMENITY BASED REFUSAL

i.) If the proposal is not in compliance with policies and guidance relating to amenity, please set out below what the issues are. This should be a full account as it may form the justification for a reason for refusal :

4. Consideration of Issues – Parking/Highways

a.) Size of existing dwelling (beds):

1 2 3 4+ Not Known

b.) Size of extended dwelling(beds):

1 2 3 4+ Not Known

c.) Amount of off road parking available (meeting minimum LHA standards)

Existing

1 2 3+ Not Known

Proposed

1 2 3+ Not Known

d.) Does the development have the required amount of parking set out in TR/18 and the relevant LCC advice?

Yes No

e.) If No, are there other material considerations that make this acceptable?

Yes (describe below) No

f.) Are there any other highway safety issues to consider?

Yes (describe below) No

g.) Overall, is the proposal considered compliant with the policies stated above with respect to highway safety and avoid a severe impact upon the highway as a result?

Yes No (describe at h. below)

HIGHWAY/PARKING BASED REFUSAL

h.) If the proposal is not in compliance with policies and guidance relating to highways and parking, set out below what the issues are. This should be a full account as it may form the justification for a reason for refusal :

5. Consideration of Issues – Heritage (where applicable only)

a.) What heritage assets could be impacted by the proposal (list)

- Mountsorrel Conservation Area

b.) Please describe the significance of each asset:

Mountsorrel Conservation Area- The boundaries of the Conservation Area generally define the extent of the original village as it existed at the end of the 19th century. By that time Mountsorrel had developed as a distinctive linear settlement on a narrow tract of land

between the River Soar and the steep edge of the Charnwood Forest, being described in White's Directory of 1863 as 'picturesquely seated on the west side of the river Soar, at the foot of the lofty and abrupt termination of a ridge of rocky hills, which extend west through Charnwood Forest to Derbyshire'. The Conservation Area includes large areas of open land: The Green; extending west from The Green a finger of land which was set aside as common land at the time of the 1782 Enclosure Awards and an area of meadow alongside the River Soar that is crossed by a mineral railway line constructed in 1860.

c.) How does the proposal impact on the significance of each of these assets (if there is no impact please state)?

The proposed development is situated to the rear of property and will not be visible from the street. It will therefore have no impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

d.) Based on this, is the proposal considered to cause substantial or less than substantial harm to the significance of any of the identified heritage assets?

Yes (please describe which asset is harmed, the level of harm and why) No

e.) Is this harm outweighed by public benefits of the scheme?

Yes (list below) No N/a (no harm)

•

f.) In accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Special regard/attention has to be given to the Listed Building(s) and/or the Conservation Area affected by this development. Does this proposal preserve or enhance the significance of the heritage assets?

Yes No

g.) Does the proposal comply with policy CS14?

Yes No

HERITAGE BASED REFUSAL

h.) If the proposal causes harm to a heritage asset that is not outweighed or fails to conserve the significance of that asset, please set out below what the issues are. This should be a full account as it may form the justification for a reason for refusal :

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| |
|--|
| 6. Consideration of Issues –Flooding (where applicable only ie only if within a flood zone) |
|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>a.) Overall, is the proposal considered compliant with the policies stated above with respect to flood risk? <input type="checkbox"/>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>No (describe at c. below)</p> <p>b.) If yes Why? - Floor levels set no lower than existing <input type="checkbox"/>Yes - No significant increased water displacement due to garage being demolished <input type="checkbox"/>Yes - Water proofing included where appropriate <input type="checkbox"/>Yes - Sockets installed 300mm above finished floor level <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes</p> <p><u>FLOODING BASED REFUSAL</u></p> <p>c.) If the proposal causes flood risk, please set out below what the issues are. This should be a full account as it may form the justification for a reason for refusal :</p> <table border="1"><tr><td> </td></tr></table> | |
| | |

| |
|--|
| 7. Any Other issues (set out below) |
|--|

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| |
|----------------------|
| 8. Conclusion |
|----------------------|

| |
|---|
| <p>In accordance with policy CS2 of the Core Strategy and saved policy EV/1, the proposed development would not be detrimental to the appearance of both the property and the street in design and character. The extension will not cause any material impact upon residential amenity in line with policies CS2, EV/1 and H/17 and no additional bedrooms are proposed, meaning the property still adheres to paragraph 111 of the NPPF and TR/18 as it will not be increasing parking requirements.</p> <p>It is not considered that the proposed extension would have any impact on the setting of the conservation area or listed building thus causing no harm to the significance of these heritage assets in accordance with CS14, the NPPF and Section 72 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas).</p> |
|---|

| |
|--------------------------|
| 9. Recommendation |
|--------------------------|

| |
|---------------------|
| Grant Conditionally |
|---------------------|

10. Conditions or Reason for refusal

- 1) The development, hereby permitted, shall be begun not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
REASON: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:
 - Applications Plans –
Drawing no. CBP-21-RS-03, CBP-21-RS-04, CBP-21-RS-05 - received by the Local Planning Authority on 27th May 2021.
Drawing no. CBP-21-RS-02 (Rev A) - received by the Local Planning Authority on 14th June 2021.
 - Heritage Statement - received by the Local Planning Authority on 14th June 2021REASON: To define the terms of the planning permission.

- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the new works hereby permitted shall match as closely as possible those of the existing building.
REASON: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development.