



REFERENCE NO	PARISH/WARD	DATE RECEIVED
18/00638/APP	BUCKINGHAM The Local Member(s) for this area are: -	20/02/18
PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING REAR EXTENSION AND ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION ROSEWAY, STRATFORD ROAD, MK18 1TE MR & MRS A WAKEMAN	Councillor T Mills Councillor S Cole	
STREET ATLAS PAGE NO.41		

### 1.0 The Key Issues in determining this application are:-

- a) Impact on appearance and character of the dwellinghouse, street scene and wider area
- b) Impact on residential amenity
- c) Impact on highways & parking

The recommendation is that permission be **GRANTED, subject to conditions**

**APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:-

#### Conditions:

1. STC5 – Standard time condition
2. US04 – Matching materials
3. WIN3 – Windows rooflights

#### Reasons:

1. RE03 – To comply with Town and Country Planning Act and Section 51 of Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act.
2. RE11 - Satisfactory appearance
3. RE25 – Preserve amenities of adjacent dwelling

#### WORKING WITH THE APPLICANT/AGENT

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals and is focused on seeking solutions where possible and appropriate. AVDC works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by offering a pre-application advice service and updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application as appropriate and, where possible and appropriate, suggesting solutions. In this case, the applicant/agent was informed of the issues arising from the proposal and given the opportunity to submit amendments/additional information in order to address those issues prior to determination. The applicant/agent responded by submitting amended plans/additional information which were found to be acceptable so the application has been approved.

## **2.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 2.1 The application needs to be determined by committee as Buckingham Town Council has raised material planning objections (on both the original and amended plans) and confirms that it will speak at the Committee meeting.
- 2.2 In response to the Town Council's objections relating to the scale of the proposal, it is considered that the extension is of a suitably subordinate depth and height to host dwelling which is not dissimilar to extensions within the locality. Additionally, in relation to the Town Council's objection on the proposed extension's roof form, the case officer considers that the applicant/ agent have satisfactorily softened the appearance of the originally proposed flat roof through amended plans, including the addition of a parapet wall above the eaves and a long lantern rooflight. Moreover, by virtue of being a single storey rear extension and set down from the adjacent Cheyne Close, the proposal would not be visually prominent, if visible at all, and so would not materially impact on the appearance of the streetscene.

## **3.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION**

- 3.1 The application relates to a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the edge of a residential area to the north-east of Buckingham. It is situated on an unclassified road that runs parallel to a main highway, namely Stratford Road, which provides an east to west link across the north of the town. In the Buckingham Neighbourhood Plan, the dwelling is located in the 'Eastern Residential' Character Area.
- 3.2 The dwelling is constructed of red facing bricks and a roof comprising concrete barrel tiles. All fenestrations have white uPVC fittings while the window panes have a French style grid detail. The main dwelling has a hipped roof with a chimney on each the front and rear elevation pitched roof, both shared with adjoining dwelling, Wilmore.
- 3.3 To the side elevation pitch roof, there is a dormer window which has a ridge commensurate in height with the host dwelling and which is set back from the existing eaves. To the rear elevation pitch roof, there is a smaller dormer window whose ridge level is also commensurate in height with the existing dwelling and is noticeably set back from the existing eaves. **It should be noted that the case officer has found that these dormers are not regarded as permitted development. This has been brought to the attention of the applicant and will be dealt with accordingly, as confirmed by their agent.**
- 3.4 Extending along the north-east side elevation, there is a lean-to single storey section with a doorway towards the rear, mirroring a similar single storey section at Wilmore. This lean-to adjoins a single storey rear extension (Ref: 07/01058/APP) which extends across part of the rear elevation with a mono-pitched roof and constructed of materials to match the host dwelling.
- 3.5 There are three off-street parking spaces provided by the driveway and one by the garage.
- 3.6 The application dwelling has adjoining front and rear gardens, of approximately 18 and 34 metres in length respectively. Both of these gardens are upwardly sloping and so the dwelling sits on an elevated plane compared to the highway which is relatively level. Immediately to the rear of the dwelling, there is a small area of paving. The rest of the garden is notably upward sloping and comprises a lawn and some shrubs along the boundaries as well as a small summer house and a garden shed adjacent to the rear boundary. Additionally, the perimeter of the rear garden is bound by wooden waney edge fencing of approx. 1.8 metres in height.
- 3.7 The dwelling is situated at the end of a row of larger dwellings of mixed traditional architecture to the west. Adjacent to the application site, there is a public footpath and, further east, a row of distinctly modern dwellings which form part of a larger residential estate.

3.8 To the north of the application site, there is an area of amenity land. To the south, beyond the highway, there is a verge of vegetation providing screening between the dwellings and Stratford Road.

#### **4.0 PROPOSAL**

4.1 The proposal seeks full planning permission for the proposed demolition of the existing rear extension and erection of a single storey rear extension.

4.2 This proposal would involve the demolition of the existing rear extension. This would be replaced by a single storey extension which would adjoin the rear elevation. As amended, it would measure approximately 8.75 metres in width with a depth of approximately 4.5 metres on both sides. This depth is a 1 metre reduction on the original proposed plans.

4.3 As an amendment to the originally proposed flat roof and three rooflights, the extension would have a parapet wall above the eaves with a long lantern rooflight. The rooflight would create a ridge height of approx. 3.5 metres and an eaves height of approx. 2.8 metres.

4.4 The extension would approx. 0.2 metres from the boundary with Wilmore and approx. 1 metre with the boundary adjacent to the footpath.

4.5 There would only be fenestrations to the rear elevation of the extension, namely two sets of glass doors with uPVC fittings.

4.6 The doors and walls of the extension would be constructed of materials to match the host dwelling. The rooflight would also have aluminium fittings while the flat roof component would be an EPDM rubber material.

4.7 The extension would accommodate a family/ dining area and kitchen.

#### **5.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

5.1 07/01058/APP - Single storey rear extension - Approved

#### **6.0 TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS**

6.1 Buckingham Town Council responded to object to both the original and amended proposed plans for this application.

6.2 On the original plans, the Town Council objected on the following grounds:

- Scale: Believed that the proposed extension was very large.
- Appearance: Believed that the flat roof gave rise to a 'box-like appearance' that was incongruous to the form of the host dwelling.

6.3 On the amended plans, the Town Council sustained their objections on the following grounds:

- Scale: Believe that the proposed extension is still too large and not subservient to the existing dwelling.
- Appearance: Believe that the addition of the parapet wall made no improvement.

#### **7.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

7.1 No consultations were issued for this application.

#### **8.0 REPRESENTATIONS**

8.1 No representations were received on this application.

## 9.0 EVALUATION

### **a) *Impact on appearance and character of the dwellinghouse, street scene and wider area***

- 9.1 The proposed single storey extension would extend rearwards across the rear elevation. The roof would have a parapet wall above the eaves and a long lantern rooflight. As amended, it is considered that the lantern rooflight and parapet wall would satisfactorily soften and improve the appearance of the originally proposed flat roof and rooflights. In addition, although small in scale, the pitched form of the lantern rooflight would echo the hipped roof of the host dwelling. It would also be built using materials to match those used for the existing dwelling (excepting the fittings of the rooflight), thereby satisfactorily integrating with its appearance.
- 9.2 As a single storey extension, the proposal would be relatively small in height with a lower ridge level in comparison to the host dwelling. In addition, the extension is slightly set in from the boundary with Wilmore. Consequently, it would be subservient to the existing dwelling. In relation to the plot size, the extension would extend rearwards by 4.5 metres, as amended, occupying a small proportion of the rear garden which is approx. 34 metres in length. It would therefore not cause overdevelopment of the plot. In addition, the extension width would allow an approx. 1 metre gap between its side elevation and the boundary adjacent to the footpath, thereby maintaining access to the rear garden.
- 9.3 As a rear extension visible only partially from Wilmore (to the west) and from nos. 9 and 6 Cheyne Close (to the east and north-east respectively), the design and form of the proposal is considered sufficient since it would not be visible from the public highway. Moreover, due to the slope on which the application dwelling is situated, the extension would be notably set down from the dwellings on Cheyne Close and less visually prominent than the roof of the current rear extension. Consequently, it is not considered that the extension would have a material impact on the streetscene.
- 9.4 It is considered that the form, materials and scale of the extension would respect the character of its setting and the locality in general. In particular, the form of the proposed extension would not be incongruous with other similar extensions on adjoining properties within the locality. It is considered that the proposal would represent a relatively small addition to the host dwelling. With respect to the proposed materials, this would correspond with the host dwelling and so maintain a sympathetic appearance within a locality of dwellings with mixed architecture and appearance.
- 9.5 In summary, the proposal is considered to be of a scale and design that respects the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and does not overwhelm it. In addition, it is considered that the proposal would not appear overly prominent within the streetscene or the locality in general. The proposals are therefore considered to comply with GP9 & GP35 of the AVDLP, the Council's Design Guide Residential Extensions and NPPF.

### **b) *Impact on residential amenity***

- 9.6 As the proposed extension would have rear glass doors and a lantern rooflight, this would allow natural light to access the extension.
- 9.7 With respect to the neighbouring dwelling to the west (Wilmore), the extension would be sited on approximately the same plane as the adjacent garden area at Wilmore. This

means that the rooflight ridge would be 1.7 metres above the height of the existing fence on the boundary with Wilmore, while the eaves height would be 1 metre above this boundary. At this height and with the relatively shallow depth of the extension (at 4.5 metres), it is not considered that it would cause shadowing of the neighbour's garden.

- 9.8 To the east, since the application site is adjacent to a footpath, there is a sufficient gap between the dwelling and no.9 Cheyne Close, it is not considered that any overshadowing would be incurred by the proposed extension on no.9.
- 9.9 With regards to overlooking, it is not considered that the proposal would cause any impact in this respect since there are only fenestrations to the rear elevation of the extension which would not face any dwellings. They would also be sufficiently screened by the upward sloping garden and existing boundary fence. Moreover, the doors would not cause any additional overlooking, compared to the windows and doors of the existing extension.
- 9.10 In summary, given the positioning of the proposal and its relationship relative to the neighbouring properties in terms of scale, position of windows and orientation it is considered that the proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse impact upon the neighbouring amenity. Therefore the proposal accords with GP.8 of AVDLP and NPPF.

**c) *Impact on highways and parking***

- 9.10 The proposed extension would accommodate a family/ dining area and kitchen. In view of this, it would not prejudice the dwelling parking provision since it does not involve the creation of any new bedrooms. Furthermore, the proposal would not alter the existing parking arrangements.
- 9.11 Therefore, the proposal is considered to accord with GP.24 of AVDLP, the NPPF and the Council's SPG Parking Guidelines.

***Other matters***

- 9.12 For the avoidance of doubt, there are no policies in the Buckingham Neighbourhood Plan which are relevant to the consideration of this application.

Case Officer: Jacqueline Stables

Telephone No: 01296 585 283