

Officer Recommendation Report - Householder (extension)

Site address:

31 Paddock Close
Quorn
LE12 8BJ

Description: Proposed single storey extension to rear of dwelling. Replacement of roof tiles and timber clad and render finish to dwelling.

Ref:

P/21/1179/2

Initial & Date

Officer Site Visit by:

06/08/21

Officer Report by:

29/09/21

Countersigned:

SR: **01/10/2021**

1. Short description of proposal

The planning application seeks permission for a proposed single storey extension to the rear following demolition of the conservatory and replacement of roof tiles and timber clad and render finish to the existing dwelling.

The proposed extension to the rear would measure 2.569m in length, and 3.955 wide, where it aligns with the existing extension. The extension and existing rear extension would comprise of a flat roof of 3.07m high. The rear extension would consist of a render finish.

Other works include fenestration alterations of replacement roof tiles, timber cladding above first floor level, and render finish to remainder of the host dwelling.

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

The property is a detached brick, timber cladding and tile dwelling located on the northern side of this cul-de-sac which features large detached dwellings standing in spacious plots, several of which have been extended, with a variety of materials being used, including timber cladding. The property has a spacious front lawn, shrubs and hedging and driveway parking for 6 cars.

3. Relevant Development Plan policies:	
• Core Strategy Policies (list):	CS2
• Saved Local Plan Policies (list):	EV/1, H/17, TR/18
• Neighbourhood Plan Policies(list):	Quorn Neighbourhood Plan Policy S2 - new development should reflect the guidance of the Quorn Village Design Statement and that new development will be supported where it respects the character or appearance of the neighbourhood area and, where appropriate, incorporates vernacular building materials.
4. Relevant Material Considerations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPPF • Leicestershire Highway Design Guide • CBC Design SPD (2020) • National Design Guide • Other (please state below) 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Other -	

5. Relevant Planning History
<p>P/02/0818/2 - Erection of first floor extension to side and single storey extension to rear of detached house. Grant – 13/06/02</p> <p>P/82/2845/2 – Extension to side for study. Grant – 19/11/82</p>

6. Comments Received
Consultees and Neighbours
None received

1. Constraints	
• Conservation Area	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>Other - <u>Quorn Village Design Statement (2008)</u> This document seeks to record the natural and built features of Quorn that are valued by its residents with the purpose of safeguarding and enhancing the village with appropriate and contextually sympathetic development. This document states that new development should respect the diverse origins of the village and avoid uniformity. Variety and innovative contemporary design is encouraged subject to harmonizing with the scale and character of the immediate locality and the village as a whole. The document seeks to ensure that future developments preserve the essential character of Quorn and to suggest opportunities for appropriate restoration or enhancement. The aim of the document is to safeguard the integrity and independence of the village so that succeeding generations will continue to enjoy, understand and defend its historic foundation.</p>	

2. Consideration of Issues – Design & Street Scene	
<p>a.) Is the proposal considered compliant with policies stated above with respect to the impact upon the street scene overall? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (go to section e. below)</p> <p>b.) If yes why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roof design matches existing dwelling <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Design features match existing dwelling <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Windows in proportion <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Within any defined building line <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes - Matching materials to host dwelling <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Subordinate to host dwelling <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes - Remaining space between dwellings avoids terracing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes - Important landscaping retained <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Other (please state) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Other -</div> <p>c.) Are any elements contrary to guidance with respect to design or the impact on the street scene? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>d.) If yes, what and why is this acceptable?</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> The proposed render finish to the host dwelling would be visible within the street scene, given properties with the vicinity comprise of the use of varies materials. It is considered not to adversely impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. </div> <p>DESIGN BASED REFUSAL</p> <p>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 :</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div>	

3. Consideration of Issues – Amenity

By virtue of the location and separation distance of the proposed single storey extension to the rear of the host dwelling. There are no other neighbouring properties within the vicinity that would be impacted in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, overbearing impact or privacy.

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
29 Paddock Close, Quorn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes			
33 Paddock Close, Quorn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

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

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 h.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)

•

b.) Please describe the significance of each asset:

--

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

--

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>The proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing garage and host dwelling and would not result in any adverse harm in respect of the character and appearance of the local area, including the streetscene of Paddock Close. Furthermore, the proposed development would not affect the residential amenity of the occupants to adjoining and neighbouring dwellings, nor will it result in any adverse harm in respect of highway safety.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development accords with Policy CS2, of the Charnwood Local Plan 2011 - 2028 Core Strategy and “saved” Policies EV/1, H/17 and TR/18 of the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan (12th January 2004). Furthermore, the development would be considered to be in compliance with the Design SPD of CBC and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>

9. Recommendation

Grant

10. Conditions or Reason for refusal

--

Time, plans and materials