

ITEM 1

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Application Reference | DC/081610 |
| Location: | 16 Seal Road Bramhall Stockport SK7 2JR |
| PROPOSAL: | Alterations to existing roof including raising of ridge and erection of rear dormer. Extension to rear elevation. Extension to garage and new porch to front elevation. Rendering of property. (Resubmission of DC/080521) |
| Type Of Application: | Householder |
| Registration Date: | 22.06.2021 |
| Expiry Date: | 22.10.2021 |
| Case Officer: | Sophie Anderson |
| Applicant: | Mrs Denise Green |
| Agent: | Mr Derek Watmough |

COMMITTEE STATUS

Bramhall & Cheadle Hulme South Area Committee. The application has been referred to Committee due to 5 letters of objection from neighbours and a further 5 anonymous letters of objection, contrary to the officer recommendation to grant.

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks planning permission for *“Alterations to existing roof including raising of ridge and erection of rear dormer. Extension to rear elevation. Extension to garage and new porch to front elevation. Rendering of property (Resubmission of DC/080521)”*

The overall height of the dwelling would increase from approximately 4.9m to 5.9m through the provision of a new roof. The rear roof would comprise a central flat-roofed dormer with lower hipped elements to either side. The dormer would be a flat roof design measuring 4m wide and 2.9m in height with doors and a Juliet balcony. Rooflights are proposed in the front, side and rear elevations of the roofslope.

The existing rear extensions would be demolished and the proposed rear extension would extend 6.65m from the original rear elevation of the property, it would run the full width of the property (14.3m) with a flat roof to the centre and two hipped elements either side measuring up to approximately 4.5m high. Glass doors and windows would be inserted in the rear elevation.

To the front elevation the garage would be extended 1m forward and the roof changed from a flat roof to a pitched roof with a forward facing gable end measuring approximately 4.4m in height. A new open porch would be erected measuring 1m in depth, 2.3m in width and 3.9m in height.

Two windows and a door would be inserted in the south east (side) elevation of the property.

The existing property and extension would also be rendered with a white rendered finish.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The applicant's property is a detached single storey property and dates from the mid-20th century. Vehicular access is gained from Seal Road and there is parking for two vehicles away from the highway. The site is fairly level with no significant change in the gradient in any direction. The property currently comprises of brick, white uPVC windows and concrete tiles to the roof. Existing extensions include a flat roofed garage and flat roofed rear extensions.

The immediate neighbouring properties are mostly detached brick built bungalows similar to this property. The ridge height of neighbouring property No. 14 Seal Road has been increased in height however planning records are not available for this property. The wider street scene is more varied, with two storey properties to the east of the site and a mix of materials (brick and render).

POLICY BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 ("PCPA 2004") requires that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan includes-

- Policies set out in the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review adopted 31st May 2006 which have been saved by direction under paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004; &
- Policies set out in the Stockport Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document adopted 17th March 2011.

Saved policies of the SUDP Review

CDH 1.8: RESIDENTIAL EXTENSIONS

LDF Core Strategy/Development Management policies

SD-2: MAKING IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING DWELLINGS

SIE-1: Quality Places

Saved UDP policy CDH1.8 "Residential Extensions"

UDP policy CDH1.8 states that the Council will grant permission for an extension provided that the proposal, amongst other issues, does not cause damage to the amenity of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion or loss of privacy.

Core Strategy Policy SIE-1 "Quality Places"

This states that specific account should be had of a number of issues, including provision, maintenance and enhancement of satisfactory levels of privacy and amenity for future, existing and neighbouring users and residents.

Core Strategy Policy SD-2 "Making Improvements to Existing Dwellings"

This policy requires the applicant to submit an "Energy Efficiency Checklist". Policy SD 2 requests that applicants undertaking extensions to residential properties should take reasonable steps, where possible and practical, to improve the energy performance of the existing dwelling.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance does not form part of the Statutory Development Plan; nevertheless, it does provide non-statutory Council approved guidance that is a material consideration when determining planning applications.

'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' Supplementary Planning Document (adopted in February 2011) states that the issue of design is a highly important factor when the Council assessed proposals for extensions and alterations to a dwelling. The Council require all development to be designed to a high standard in order that it makes a positive contribution to the provision of an attractive built environment.

National Planning Policy Framework

A Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) on 20th July 2021 replaced the previous revisions. The NPPF has not altered the fundamental legal requirement under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 that decisions must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations (such as the NPPF) indicate otherwise.

The NPPF representing the governments up-to-date planning policy which should be taken into account in dealing with applications focuses on achieving a lasting housing reform, facilitating the delivery of a greater number of homes, ensuring that we get planning for the right homes built in the right places of the right quality at the same time as protecting our environment. If decision takers choose not to follow the NPPF, then clear and convincing reasons for doing so are needed.

N.B. In respect of decision-taking the revised NPPF constitutes a "material consideration".

Para.1 "The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. It provides a framework within which locally-prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced"

Para.2 "Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise".

Para.7 "The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future

generations to meet their own needs. At a similarly high level, members of the United Nations – including the United Kingdom – have agreed to pursue the 17 Global Goals for Sustainable Development in the period to 2030. These address social progress, economic well-being and environmental protection”.

Para.8 “Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):

- a) an economic objective*
- b) a social objective*
- c) an environmental objective”*

Para.11 “Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

For decision-taking this means:

c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
- ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole”.*

Para.12 “.....Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed”.

Para.38 “Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way..... Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible”.

Para.47 “Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Decisions on applications should be made as quickly as possible, and within statutory timescales unless a longer period has been agreed by the applicant in writing”.

Para. 120 (e) states that planning policies and decisions should “allow upward extensions where the development would be consistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene, is well-designed (including complying with any local design policies and standards), and can maintain safe access and egress for occupiers.”

Para.126 *“The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.”*

Para.134 *“. Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:*

a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or

b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.”

Para.157 states *“In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to:*

a) comply with any development plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable; and

b) take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption

Para.219 *“Existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).*

Planning Practice Guidance

The Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) is a web-based resource which brings together planning guidance on various topics into one place (launched in March 2014) and coincided with the cancelling of the majority of Government Circulars which had previously given guidance on many aspects of planning.

PLANNING HISTORY

DC/080521 - Proposal: Extending the garage and new porch to the front elevation. Extending the rear elevation. New slightly raised roof to allow residential space within the roof with an inverted balcony to the rear – Withdrawn - 22/06/2021

J/4809 - Proposal: Porch/garden store – Granted – 13/01/1976

NEIGHBOURS VIEWS

The owners/occupiers of 8 surrounding properties were notified in writing of the application. The neighbour notification period expired on the 23rd July.

To date, 9 representations have been received from stated addresses including 5 objections, 1 neutral comment and 3 letters of support. A further 5 anonymous representations were also received.

Planning points from stated addresses include:

The main causes of concern are summarised below as;

- The layout/density is out of proportion with neighbouring properties and the immediate area;
- The raised roof is much higher than the bungalows on Seal Road;
- The rear extension is longer than the houses in the area;
- There is a loss of privacy for all surrounding properties;
- Planning for an upward roof extension / Juliet balcony DC/062968 was declined and a single storey extension built in keeping with the bungalows in the area. This has set a precedent with the upward extension being declined at No. 16;
- The application form states that works have not started when they have started;
- If the applicant wants to live in a house they should have bought one;
- The proposed application is probably twice the size of the previous bungalow and will give the applicants a much bigger footfall and would be domineering and overbearing to neighbouring bungalows;
- The drawing of the street scene was very well done from the front perspective, but no Disney drawings of the rear, I wonder why?;
- The structure is overpowering both in height and length to the rear. This would affect my light and privacy;
- The extension would change the property from a bungalow to a two storey house;
- The balcony would encroach on many residents privacy;
- Seal Road is synonymous for older residents that's why the existing properties of bungalows are ideal and bungalows for the elderly are very scarce;
- Large increase in heavy goods vehicles / noise / dust and dirt / manoeuvring on road during construction; and
- Concerns about the creation of a balcony at a later date from the proposed Juliet balcony to the rear elevation at first floor level.

Neutral comments;

- No objection provided it does not look over gardens.

Points raised as support can be summarised as;

- The property is in need of renovation and the works would enhance the property, the road and complement surrounding properties;
- Levels of privacy would not be affected;

- The garden is very long so cannot see that the privacy of the surrounding houses at the rear would be affected even with the addition of the upstairs bedrooms;
- The increased roof height appears no higher than 14 Seal Road;
- The increased roof height would be in keeping with many other bungalows on Seal Road that have also undergone improvements, one of which has roof space with dormers. One bungalow, round the corner on Fir Road, is being developed into a 2 storey house;
- The workmen have worked in a clean and tidy manner;
- Bramhall has several 'pockets' of bungalows so is reasonably well catered for;
- Construction works would be necessary even if kept as a bungalow, resulting in dust and noise;
- Google (satellite view) for this stretch of Seal Road shows that every one of the houses has been developed or extended in some way, some of which seem to indicate attic conversions and skylight windows;
- The application DC/062968 at No. 11 Seal Road was withdrawn, not declined, therefore not setting a precedent.
- Most of the objectors will not be affected, adversely or otherwise, by the proposed changes and have been rallied by just two of the road's residents who are prepared to 'gang up' on new buyers, which is extremely distressing and stressful.

Anonymous planning points raised as objections can be summarised as:

- The layout/density is out of proportion with neighbouring properties and the immediate area;
- The raised roof is much higher than the bungalows on Seal Road;
- The rear extension is longer than the houses in the area;
- There is a loss of privacy for all surrounding properties;
- Planning for an upward roof extension / Juliet balcony DC/062968 was declined and a single storey extension built in keeping with the bungalows in the area. This has set a precedent with the upward extension being declined at No. 16;
- If the applicant wants to live in a house they should have bought one;
- The structure is overpowering both in height and length to the rear. This would affect my light and privacy;
- The proposed application is probably twice the size of the previous bungalow and will give the applicants a much bigger footfall and would be domineering and overbearing to neighbouring bungalows;
- It's a four bedroom house and not a bungalow;
- The drawing of the street scene was very well done from the front perspective, but no Disney drawings of the rear, I wonder why?;
- Seal Road is synonymous for older residents that's why the existing properties of bungalows are ideal and bungalows for the elderly are very scarce.

ANALYSIS

The site lies within a Predominately Residential Area as identified on the Proposals Map of the SUDP Review. In assessment of the application, it is considered that the main issues of contention are the visual impact of the proposed extension in relation to the existing property, the character and appearance of the area and the potential harm to the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

Design

CDH 1.8: Residential Extensions of the UDP Review states that extensions to residential properties are only permissible where they complement the existing dwelling in terms of design, scale and materials and do not adversely affect the character of the street scene.

Policy SIE-1 of the Core Strategy recognises that specific regard should be had to the sites' context in relation to surrounding buildings and spaces.

The Council require all development to be designed to a high standard in order that it makes a positive contribution to the provision of an attractive built environment. This does not mean that a new development has to exactly replicate the style and character of the existing building or its locality, but it should be harmonious with what is already there. The character of an area is reflected in the layout, massing, scale, height, style and materials of buildings and the spaces around them.

Any extension or alteration to a property should:-

- Respect the form, shape, symmetry and proportions of the existing dwelling and compliment the character of the surrounding area (DESIGN)
- Generally appear subordinate in relation to the existing dwelling in terms of massing, scale and overall appearance (SCALE)
- Respect the architectural integrity of the existing dwelling. External materials and finishes should be durable and of good quality. They should be visually appropriate for their surroundings and sympathetic in terms of colour, texture and detail in relation to the existing dwelling (MATERIALS).

Special attention should be given to matters such as siting, scale, height, massing, detailed design and appropriate use of materials. The Council wishes to protect the boroughs buildings and residential areas from unsympathetic changes by ensuring that new extensions are designed in context with their surroundings.

Para. 6.1 of the SPD states:

“Extensions to the front of a property can often have the greatest visual impact. Front extensions should:

- *Leave sufficient space between the extension and the front boundary of the house to retain the appearance of openness around the dwelling.*
- *Not be obtrusive, prominent features in the streetscene.*
- *Respect the size and proportions of the existing house.*
- *Respect the architectural features, brickwork, stonework, colour and texture of the existing house.*
- *Front porches usually look best where the materials, glazing pattern and degree of roof pitch, match the existing house.*
- *Where there is a strong building line or an architectural cohesiveness to the street which would be broken, front extensions are unlikely to be acceptable.”*

Para. 6.3 of the SPD states:

“Rear extensions are sometimes visible from public areas and may be prominent for neighbours to the side and rear. Wall and roof materials should match those of the existing property. Rear extensions should respect the shape and form of the existing dwelling with a roof design that complements the existing appearance.”

Para. 6.4 of the SPD states:

“Extensions which would result in the increased height of a property, through the provision of extra storeys, often raise additional planning concerns to other forms of extension. Their effect on neighbourhood amenity and the street scene is usually more significant. In determining proposals for upward extensions the most satisfactory design solution will depend on the individual character of the property and neighbouring properties. This form of development will normally only be appropriate on detached properties in residential areas of varied design and roof height.

Where an upward extension is acceptable in principle, it must respect the established character of the area. The emphasis should be on height, massing, use of materials and roof pitches, which complement both the original house and the locality. Extensions which cause an unacceptable loss of privacy or outlook to neighbouring properties, or look out of keeping with the character of the street, will be refused.”

Para. 6.5 of the SPD states:

“A dormer at the rear of the house is usually more acceptable than one at the front as it will be less readily seen by the public. Exceptions may occur where such features are typical of the local area.”

The SPD confirms that dormers should:

- “- Be designed to be in proportion to the roof and set into the roof slope so that they are not a dominant feature, small dormers set below the existing ridge line are likely to be more acceptable.*
- Have a pitched roof, flat roof dormers added to pitched roofs look out of place and are generally unacceptable.*
- Echo the window design and attempt to align vertically with the fenestration below.*
- Be constructed from materials to match the existing roof. i.e clad in tiles / slates matching the colour and texture of the existing roof. Dormers clad in UPVC or board are unlikely to be acceptable.*
- Not result in undue overlooking of a neighbouring property.*
- Dormers should form part of the roof instead of dominating the roof scene.”*

Letters of objections from neighbouring properties have raised concerns that the proposals would be too large and would not be in keeping with the surrounding properties and the area.

The scheme has been amended from the previously withdrawn application (Planning Ref: DC/080521). The roof extension has been reduced in size and massing and the inverted balcony on the rear roof pitch of the previous application has been removed.

Properties along Seal Road are all detached, are of various styles and designs and there is a mix of one and two storey dwellinghouses. The ridge height of the neighbouring property No. 14 Seal Road is greater than the application property and the proposed increase in height would

not exceed the ridge height of this neighbouring property. Furthermore, it is possible make upward extensions to properties under permitted development subject to design and prior approval. The eaves height of the property would not be increased and the three rooflights to be inserted in the front roofslope are considered appropriate in terms of their size and position. As such, it is considered that the proposed increase in ridge height and changes to the front roof slope would not look out of character with the existing property or the wider streetscene.

Other changes to the front elevation include the replacement of the flat roof of the garage and the erection of the open porch. The pitched roof of the garage is preferable in design terms to the existing flat roof and it is noted that neighbouring properties No. 14 Seal Road and No. 12 Seal Road have made amendments to have a pitched garage roof. The open porch would replace the existing porch and is modest in scale. The works to the garage and porch would be subservient to the host dwelling and respect the architecture of the host dwelling and the wider streetscene.

The existing property and extension would have a white rendered finish. It is noted that other neighbouring properties are rendered including No. 11, 17, 19 and 21 Seal Road and this would not be out of keeping with the streetscene.

The existing rear extensions would be demolished and the proposed rear extension would extend 6.65m from the original rear elevation of the property. The extension would be erected along the property boundary with No. 14 Seal Road to the north west and would be a distance of approximately 1m from the side elevation of the property boundary with No. 18 Seal Road to the south east. Although relatively substantial in size, this projection is less than the 8m distance allowable under permitted development (subject to prior approval). It would have an acceptable design and it would be subservient to the existing dwelling on account of its reduced height. It would be sited to the rear elevation and not readily visible from public vantage points.

To the rear at first floor level, amendments have been made from the previously withdrawn application (Planning Ref: DC/080521) to reduce the scale and massing of the rear roof slope. The roof would comprise a central flat-roofed dormer with lower hipped elements to either side ensuring that it would be subservient to the main roof. The use of a flat roof dormer is noted however it would be located to the rear of the property and away from public vantage points. The dormer would be set back from the eaves and the glazed doors would align vertically with the glazed doors at ground floor level. It is noted that dormers have been erected to the rear of nearby residential properties including No. 5 Seal Road, No. 7 Ashness Drive and No. 1 Ashness Drive. Furthermore, it is possible make upward extensions to properties under permitted development subject to design and prior approval. As such, the rear dormer is considered acceptable in design.

It is considered that the proposed works would be in proportion with the main dwelling and would not be out of character with the area.

In view of the above, it is considered that the development would respect the design, scale, materials, character, appearance and proportions of the existing dwelling and surrounding area and would not result in harm to the character of the street scene, the visual amenity of the area in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1.

Residential Amenity

CDH 1.8: Residential Extensions of the saved UDP states that extensions to residential properties are only permissible where they do not adversely cause damage to the amenity of neighbours by reason of overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion or loss of privacy. The Council's SPD advises that there should be a minimum of 25m between habitable rooms windows on the private side of dwellings. Extensions which cause an unacceptable loss of privacy or outlook to neighbouring properties, or look out of keeping with the character of the street, will be refused.

New extensions should not impose an unacceptable loss of privacy on the occupants of neighbouring dwellings. An unreasonable loss of privacy will often occur when windows of habitable room windows look into or overlook a principal window belonging to a habitable room of a neighbouring dwelling. A loss of privacy can also occur when windows look into or overlook private gardens belonging to a neighbouring dwelling.

Dormer extensions must not result in undue overlooking of a neighbouring property. Extensions which cause an unacceptable loss of privacy or outlook to neighbouring properties, or look out of keeping with the character of the street, will be refused.

The SPD states that a single storey rear extension should project no further than 3 metres along a party boundary close to a habitable room window of a neighbouring property. A rear extension must not allow unrestricted views of neighbouring properties. Any side windows, should either be obscure glazed, high level or screened by a fence of appropriate height.

Letters of objections from neighbouring properties have raised concerns that the proposal would be overbearing and lead to loss of light and loss of privacy, particularly from the Juliet balcony.

Two windows, one door and a rooflight are proposed in the side elevation facing the neighbouring property to the south east, No. 18 Seal Road however conditions will be used to require these are obscure glazed to prevent any loss of privacy. There are no original, principle, habitable room windows to the side elevation of the neighbouring property No. 18 Seal Road. The rear elevation of this neighbouring property has been extended with a conservatory however as it is not original it is not afforded amenity protection as per guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document. There would a distance of approximately 1m from the side elevation of the property boundary with No. 18 Seal Road and the rear extension would not project more than 3m past the existing conservatory, which is in full compliance with the guideline for extensions in such locations as found in the SPD. As such, the proposal would not be overbearing or cause any undue loss of light, outlook or general amenity to this property.

No windows are proposed in the side elevation facing the neighbouring property to the north west, No. 14 Seal Road. There are no original, principle, habitable room windows to the side elevation of the neighbouring property No. 14 Seal Road. The rear elevation of No. 14 Seal Road has been extended however as the extension is not original it is not afforded amenity protection as per guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document. The proposed rear extension on the application property would not project more than 3m past the existing extension on this neighbouring property, which is in full compliance with the guidelines for extensions in such locations as found in the SPD. As such, the proposal would not be overbearing or cause any undue loss of light, outlook or general amenity to this property.

The rear dormer would have double doors and a Juliet balcony at first floor level and the rear extension at ground floor level would have glass doors to the rear. The Juliet balcony would be

positioned centrally in the rear roofslope and would be physically separated from the neighbouring properties on either side. The property has a large rear garden and there would be a large separation distance of approximately 37.8m between the rear of the extended dwelling and the property boundary with properties to the rear on Colwyn Road, this exceeds the Council's separation distance of a minimum of 25m between habitable rooms windows on the private side of dwellings. There would also be a distance of at least 9m from the rear of the extended property to the property boundary with No. 13 Ashness Drive to the south west. As such, the proposal would not cause an unacceptable loss of privacy or outlook to neighbouring properties or properties to the rear.

The rooflights to the front and rear of the property would not cause undue loss of amenity or privacy to any neighbouring property.

The increase in roof height of 950mm would not adversely affect the amenity of any of the neighbouring properties.

As such, it is considered that the proposal would not unduly impact on the residential privacy or amenity of any surrounding property in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1.

Other Matters

Concerns were raised that the application would change the property from a bungalow to a house and that bungalows for the elderly are scarce in the area.

National planning policy enables homeowners to adapt and extend their property including making an upward extension to their property. A shortage of bungalows in the area to meet demand is not relevant to this application.

Objections from neighbours raised the issue that a planning application for an upward roof extension / Juliet balcony at 11 Seal Road (Planning Ref: DC/062968) was declined and a single storey extension built in keeping with the bungalows in the area. This has set a precedent and the upward extension being declined at No. 16.

The application at 11 Seal Road (Planning Ref: DC/062968) was for a "*Proposed side and rear extension, alterations to existing roof to provide additional 1st floor accommodation, first floor Juliet balcony and part demolition of existing garage.*" The application was withdrawn on 17/10/2016. A planning application was approved at 11 Seal Road (Planning Ref: DC/064071) for a "*Proposed single storey side & rear extension to existing bungalow*" on 25/01/2017.

An objection from neighbours states that the building work has started contrary to the information on the application.

Works that have taken place at the time of writing this report are allowed under permitted development.

Concerns that the application would lead to a large increase in heavy goods vehicles / noise / dust and dirt / manoeuvring on road during construction.

These concerns are applicable to any building works and are not a justification for an objection.

Concerns about the creation of a balcony at a later date from the proposed Juliet balcony to the rear elevation at first floor level.

Any change from the Juliet balcony to a normal balcony would require planning permission.

Car parking arrangements would be unaffected.

SUMMARY

The proposal would not unduly impact on the residential amenity and privacy of the surrounding properties and would comply with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1.

The general design of the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of its relationship to the character of the street scene and the visual amenity of the area in accordance with UDP policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy policy SIE-1.

Other material considerations such as the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings SPD and the NPPF have also been considered and it is judged the proposal also does comply with the content of these documents.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant subject to conditions.