



REFERENCE NO	PARISH/WARD	DATE RECEIVED
19/01281/APP	WATERMEAD The Local Member(s) for this area is/are: -	10/04/19
PROPOSED TWO STOREY SIDE/REAR EXTENSION	Councillor Ashley Bond	
5 CURLEW HP19 0WG		
MR & MRS PETERNEV		
STREET ATLAS PAGE NO.101		

1.0 The Key Issues in determining this application are:-

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

The recommendation is that permission be **GRANTED**

APPROVED subject to the following conditions:-

1.1 It is recommended that the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:-

1. STC5 – Standard time condition
Reason: RE03
2. US04 – Matching materials
Reason: RE11
3. The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with drawing No. 1831-PL-02 Rev D received by the Local Planning Authority on the 31 July 2019.
Reason: RE39

WORKING WITH THE APPLICANT/AGENT

In accordance with paragraphs 38 and 39 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 /agent was informed of the issues arising from the proposal and given the opportunity to submit amendments in order to address those issues prior to determination. The

agent responded by submitting amended plans which was found to be acceptable so the application was considered to be acceptable.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 The application needs to be determined by committee as the Parish Council has raised material planning objections and confirms that it will speak at the Committee meeting.

3.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site comprises a two storey semi detached three bedroom dwelling located within a quiet cul de sac of residential dwellings comprising a mix of terraced, semis and cluster homes.

3.2 The host dwelling faces south west towards the highway and is attached on the south east side to No.7. On the north west side there is a detached block of two garages, one of which belongs to the host dwelling and there is space for one car to be parked to the front of the garage.

3.3 To the rear (north east) is an enclosed rear 10m in depth garden with the parking/garaging area for No's 1 & 3 over the garden wall. The garage and parking space for the host dwelling is accessed from this area.

3.4 The dwelling is set back 2.6m from the highway to the front and the front curtilage of the dwelling is landscaped. There is also a parking bay to the front providing 2 spaces.

4.0 PROPOSAL

4.1 The application seeks consent for the removal of the garage and the erection of a two storey side and rear extension. The existing dividing wall between the two garages would be retained and the new extension would be built abutting this wall.

4.2 The extension would be 3.65m in width at the front, 8.3m in length and 4m in width at the rear wrapping slightly round the rear elevation and projecting 1.05m further to the rear.

4.3 The roof would be gable ended to match the existing roof but set down 200mm and set back 500mm and would have a gable feature to the rear set down 1.1m below the new roofline.

4.4 The new accommodation would provide an extended living room and kitchen/dining room at ground floor and a larger master bedroom with en-suite facilities at first floor. Fenestration would include a ground floor window and obscure glazed first floor window to the front and a ground floor kitchen window and a window to the rear.

4.5 The application as originally submitted sought to increase the number of bedrooms from three to four, however revised plans were submitted which included internal alterations so that only three bedrooms would be provided.

5.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

6.0 PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

6.1 Watermead Parish Council have objected on the grounds that the proposal is not in keeping in the area and be unduly eye catching failing to retain the character and appearance of the area which would conflict with the character of the street and fail to

retain the openness and character of the surrounding area.

- 6.2 They refer to other recent extensions and garage conversions on the estate and the loss of parking has impacted on the character and original design concept for the Watermead estate and have agreed that this application is overdevelopment potentially intrusive to neighbouring properties and would only exacerbate the parking problems on Curlew.

7.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 7.1 Buckingham and River Ouzel Internal Drainage Board – No comments to make regarding this application.

8.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 8.1 One letter of representation has been received from the occupier of No. 3 to the rear who has objected on the grounds that it would compromise daylight to the front of the property and result in their lounge window to the front being overlooked.
- 8.2 Another letter has been received from the occupier of No.7 Curlew who has written on behalf of prospective buyers of this dwelling raising concerns that if the space to the front of the existing garage is used, this may cause difficulties for the other 3 dwellings that share the parking court to manoeuvre in and out of their spaces. The author also states that as the boundary line is close to the parking space, some of the land may be owned by No. 7.

9.0 EVALUATION

Impact on appearance and character of the dwellinghouse, street scene and wider area

- 9.1 AVDLP GP9 indicates that proposed extensions should accord with SPG advice, and should respect the appearance of the original dwelling and show respect for the setting of the dwelling and other buildings in the area. AVDLP GP35 requires that development respects and complements the physical characteristics of the site and its surroundings, the building tradition of the locality, and the scale and context of the setting, the natural qualities and features of the area and the effect of the development on important public views and skylines. The NPPF sets out guiding principles including that authorities should always seek to secure high quality design.
- 9.2 The dwelling is set back from the road frontage occupying a corner plot and although the proposed extension would be prominent within the street scene, it is not considered that it would appear overly dominant and therefore not considered to have any adverse impact upon the existing dwelling or the character of the area.
- 9.3 The proposed two storey side extension would be set down and set back from the existing dwelling which accords with the advice contained within the Design Guide and it is considered that the proposal has been designed in such a way as to not appear out of character in terms of the relationship with the original dwelling. The rear roof projection has been set down over 1m from the main roof line and has a gable roof with a matching pitch that would appear subservient in its design and would subsequently retain the character and appearance of the dwelling and would maintain a sufficient degree of subservience in relation to the host dwelling as to not adversely impact upon its character and appearance.
- 9.4 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 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.

Impact on residential amenity

- 9.5 The development would be to the north east side of the dwelling away from the attached neighbour, No. 7, and although the small rear projection would be visible to the occupiers of this dwelling, it would not impact on residential amenities. The proposal would involve the removal of a garage that is attached to the garage of No.7 but the plans show that the dividing wall would be retained and the extension would abut the remaining garage but this would not impact on the garaging arrangements of No.7
- 9.6 To the rear approximately 14.5m from the rear elevation of No.5 are 2 and 3 Curlew, a pair of semi-detached dwellings are present with open plan frontages that face towards No. 5 with a parking area between.
- 9.7 The occupier of No.3 has objected to the proposal stating that the development would overlook their lounge window and result in a loss of light. It is agreed that the proposal would be more prominent in views from these dwellings but given the separation between the two dwellings and limited rear projection, it is not considered that a significant loss of light would occur.
- 9.8 The extension would not be enclosed within the boundary wall of the host dwelling and as such both the ground floor window and first floor window to the rear would be visible to the occupiers of these semi detached dwellings to the north east, however the ground floor window would serve the new kitchen area and look into the parking area and although the first floor window would be closer to No.3 than the existing rear facing bedroom windows, it is not considered that an unacceptable arrangement would take place, given the separation distance, the parking of cars between the properties and the general open public nature of the intervening land.
- 9.9 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.

Impact on highways and parking

- 9.10 The development would not result in the increase in the number of bedrooms which would remain at three but would result in the loss of one parking space within the garage. The Council's SPG on parking requires that for a 3 bed dwelling, two parking spaces should be provided, with at least one within the curtilage of the dwelling. The amended plans show that the dwelling would retain one parking space to the front of the former garage that is within the curtilage of the dwelling and there is another parking space to the rear that is under the ownership of the applicant. On the basis of this information, it is considered that the parking for the property would be considered to accord with GP.24 of AVDLP and NPPF and the Council's SPG Parking Guidelines.
- 9.11 The occupier of No.7 has raised concerns that the use of the spaces to the rear for parking may cause obstructions to the other users of the parking court. However, this space is already being used for parking and with a clearance of 5 metres to the rear of the parking space, it is not considered that a car parked in this space would cause obstructions to other users of the parking court. It has also been confirmed that no enclosure would be erected around the parking spaces so as not to impede the use of the adjoining garage.