

Officer Recommendation Report - Householder (extension)

Site address: 103 College Road, Syston. LE7 2AQ

Description: Proposed two storey extension to side of dwelling.	Ref:	P/21/1695/2
	Initial & Date	
Officer Site Visit by:	JL 13.09.21	
Officer Report by:	JL 06.10.21	
Countersigned:	JJ 15/10/21	

1. Short description of proposal

The application is seeking permission for a two storey extension to the side of the property.

The proposal will create a dining room and garage (not large enough to accept a car) at ground floor and an additional bedroom with en-suite at first floor. The proposal will largely follow the footprint of the existing garage and form part of the boundary with No. 101.

Bi-folding doors will give access to the rear garden from the proposed dining room and new bi-folding door serving the kitchen will replace existing French doors (to the rear garden) and a window. At first floor a window serving the new bedroom will face east (on the front elevation) and an obscurely glazed window facing the rear garden will serve the new en-suite.

The applicant provided a parking plan indicating space for three vehicles.

An existing garage and sunroom will be removed as part of the development.

For the avoidance of doubt the plans considered are:

Drawing No. 002 – Proposed floor plans and elevations

Drawing No. 003 – Proposed block plan with parking

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

The application site is level and relates to 103 College Road, a semi-detached brick built two storey dwelling in the settlement of Syston.

The attached dwelling (No. 76 Barkby Road) shares a boundary treatment to the front

comprising a 1m close board timber fence and to the rear a 1.8m close board timber fence.

There is currently no boundary treatment between the front gardens of Nos. 101 and 103. To the rear a 1.8m close board timber fence forms the boundary between adjacent dwellings. A small single storey extension to No. 101 (with no windows facing the site) is separated by approximately 3.5m at its closest point currently, but this will be reduced to less than a metre after development. A first floor window facing the site is obscurely glazed and serves a non-habitable room at a distance of approximately 3.5m from the proposal. Impacts of the proposal on this neighbour are discussed in section 3.

Dwellings facing the site are separated by approximately 19m with only the new window serving the new bedroom forming a new opening on the front elevation. Dwellings to the rear of the site are separated by a minimum distance of 55m with intervening trees providing screening between plots.

The proposal will be visible from the highway. Impacts on the street scene are discussed in section 2.

The area is characterised by a mixture of semi-detached and detached bungalows and two storey dwellings with finishes of both render and brick from different ages and of differing styles. Many dwellings have been extended in the area.





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:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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/83/1577/2	Garage with two bedrooms over to side of semi detached house.	13.09.21 Grant Conditionally

6. Comments Received

05.10.21	Highways: "Having reviewed the proposal and attached site plan, the LHA have no concerns and would not object to the proposal due to the loss of garage and additional bedroom. The block paving would also be fine."

1. Constraints	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation Area • Listed Building • Other Heritage • Flooding • Article 4 • Other (please state below) 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <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? <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes - Windows in proportion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes - Within any defined building line <input type="checkbox"/>Yes - Matching materials to host dwelling <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes - Subordinate to host dwelling <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes - Remaining space between dwellings avoids terracing <input type="checkbox"/>Yes - Important landscaping retained <input type="checkbox"/>Yes - Other (please state) <input type="checkbox"/>Yes <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 5px 0;"> <p>Other – The proposal is prominent in the street scene but the design of the proposal effectively joins the existing building line of the host dwelling with that of College Road resulting in a consistent overall aesthetic not at odds with the street scene or character of the area. The use of matching materials and scale of development also promotes the proposal and reduces visual impacts.</p> </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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>No</p> <p>d.) If yes, what and why is this acceptable?</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%; margin-top: 5px;"></div>

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
101 College Road	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
102 College Road	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes			
72 Barkby Road	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes			
74 Barkby Road	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes			
76 Barkby 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?

The two storey elevation facing No. 101 is to the north of its neighbour and is therefore considered not to impact day light. Although in close proximity, the only facing window serves a non habitable room and therefore is not considered to be significantly impacted by the proposal.

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)

•

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 appropriate to the host dwelling and consistent with the character of the area, resulting in acceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity and street scene. The proposal facilitates access to adequate off street parking 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. 002 – Proposed floor plans and elevations

Drawing No. 003 – Proposed block plan with parking

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