

Officer Recommendation Report - Householder (extension)

Site address: 8 Went Road, Birstall. LE4 3BG

Description: Single storey extension to rear of semi-detached dwelling.	Ref:	P/21/0177/2
	Initial & Date	
Officer Site Visit by:	JL 03.09.21	
Officer Report by:	JL 28.09.21	
Countersigned:	LM 4/10/2021	

1. Short description of proposal

The application is seeking planning permission for a single storey extension to the rear of the host dwelling.

The proposal will create a utility room with a small north facing window and door opening onto the rear garden.

For the avoidance of doubt the plans considered are:

Drawing No. 2020/11/BW/01 REV C – Existing and proposed rear and side plans and elevations

Drawing No. 2020/11/BW/02 REV A – Proposed front elevation

Drawing No. 2020/11/BW/03 REV A – Proposed side elevation

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

The application site is sloping and relates to 8 Went Road, a part rendered brick semi-detached dwelling in the settlement of Birstall.

The front garden comprises off street parking and remains unaffected by the proposals.

An existing outbuilding forms part of the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling (No. 6), followed by a 1.5m close boarded timber fence followed by an 2m hedge that encloses the remaining rear garden.

The proposal will extend 2.1m along the boundary beyond the rear elevation of the existing outbuilding and have a slight increase in eave height.

A window serving the kitchen of No. 6 faces the site with a separation distance of 2.5m, impacts of the proposal are discussed in section 3.

There are no buildings overlooking the rear of the application site.

The location of the modest proposal to the rear of the existing outbuilding results in no impact on street scene.

The area is characterised by part rendered, brick built semi-detached dwellings facing the highway.

There are no changes proposed to the parking and access arrangements. Adequate parking remains on site to meet the requirements for the host dwelling and therefore highway safety remains unaffected.



3. Relevant Development Plan policies:	
• Core Strategy Policies (list):	CS2
• Saved Local Plan Policies (list):	ST/2, 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes
Other -	

5. Relevant Planning History		
P/21/0178/2	Single storey extension to rear (self Assessment form A completed)	27.01.21 – Planning Permission Required

6. Comments Received	
08.09.21	Parish Council reply "No Comment"

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 type="checkbox"/> Yes
Other -	

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?</p> <p><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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes - Design features match existing dwelling <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Windows in proportion <input type="checkbox"/> 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
6 Went Road	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes			
10 Went Road	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes			
2 Copeland Road	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes			
11Goscote Hall Road	<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?

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

- A non habitable room faces the application site – largely the existing outbuilding, with a separation distance of approximately 2.5m. Due to the modest scale of the proposal it is considered that no significant loss of light will occur.

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)

-

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)

a.) Overall, is the proposal considered compliant with the policies stated above with respect to flood risk?

Yes No (describe at c. below)

b.) If yes Why?

- Floor levels set no lower than existing Yes
- No significant increased water displacement due to garage being demolished Yes
- Water proofing included where appropriate Yes
- Sockets installed 300mm above finished floor level Yes

FLOODING BASED REFUSAL

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 :

7. Any Other issues (set out below)

--

8. Conclusion

The scale of the proposal, the materials and design are considered to be consistent with the host dwelling and the character of the area resulting in no adverse impact on neighbouring amenity or street scene. The proposals do not impact the number of parking spaces available and therefore highway safety will not be impacted.

9. Recommendation

Under the terms of the constitution, there is no requirement that this decision be referred to the elected members of the planning committee. Therefore, the decision is recommended under delegated authority.

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 plan drawing numbers:

Drawing No. 2020/11/BW/01 REV C – Existing and proposed rear and side plans and elevations

Drawing No. 2020/11/BW/02 REV A – Proposed front elevation

Drawing No. 2020/11/BW/03 REV A – Proposed side elevation

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt.

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.