

## **ITEM**

<b>Application Reference</b>	<b>DC/082638</b>
<b>Location:</b>	12 Elmsway Bramhall Stockport SK7 2AE
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Proposed two storey side extensions, single storey side and rear extensions, loft conversion and new roof to existing residential property. (Re-submission of DC/080192)
<b>Type Of Application:</b>	Householder
<b>Registration Date:</b>	12.09.21
<b>Expiry Date:</b>	07.11.21
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Mark Shaw
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Nick Crosswaite
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Lee Harper

## **DELEGATION/COMMITTEE STATUS**

4 or more objections and called up to Area Committee by Cllr Bagnall.

## **DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT**

In June 2021 planning permission was approved for the erection of 2no. two storey side extensions, a single storey rear extension, loft conversion and new roof to existing residential property (DC080192 refers). This permission remains extant and capable of implementation.

This current planning application (DC082638) which is brought before Members for consideration also proposes the erection of a two storey side extension to either side of the house, a single storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and the formation of a second floor within a new and enlarged roof space. This application is therefore the same as that recently approved by DC080192 but with a revised roof form over.

In detail, this current application proposes the erection of a two storey side extension to the northern front corner of the house forming an 'L' shape with a maximum length of 3.6m and a maximum width of 2.5m. A two storey side extension is proposed to the south elevation rear corner also forming an L shape with a maximum length of 8.3m, a width of 2.9m and projecting 1.3m to the rear with a width of 7.1m. These two extensions will effectively square off the existing house and will project no further to the front and rear than that existing.

Over this resulting dwelling a new roof is proposed replacing the existing convoluted three pitched roofs to a single form to enable accommodation within the roofspace. As originally proposed by this current application the roof would have taken the form of a half hipped roof together with a large projecting gable to the rear roof plane (see superseded elevations appended to this report). Further to negotiations with the applicant the roof form has been revised such that a full hipped roof is now proposed and the rear projecting gable has been deleted altogether (see proposed elevations appended to this report). The height of the ridge will increase by 0.37m from 7.9m as existing to approximately 8.27m together with an increased pitch. Three rooflights are proposed to the front elevation and six to the rear. Due to the existing roof

arrangement which is varied the maximum roof height increase proposed is approximately 1.67m.

The single storey side extension to the north elevation will measure 0.85m wide and 3.5m deep. The extension will have a hipped roof mirroring the existing side element with a ridge and eaves height of 3.1m and 2.1m respectively.

The single storey rear extension will have a width of 7m with a length of 2.8m. The extension will contain a pitched roof with a ridge and eaves height of 3.5m and 2.3m respectively. The roof will also extend above a proposed patio area. Other works include a basement conversion.

To assist Members with the consideration of this application the existing, approved, superseded and currently proposed plans are appended to this agenda.

### **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

12 Elmsway is a large two storey brick built detached house with quite a complex existing roof structure incorporating a number of differing pitched roof elements including gable roofs to the front and rear elevations and hipped roof and lean to roof sections to the side elevations. The dwelling, like its neighbours, and those with the wider area, are all individually designed although the common feature is they are all generous size dwellings set within spacious grounds giving an attractive suburban character to the area. Whilst most properties are 2 storeys in height there is evidence of accommodation within the roofspace at second floor level served by rooflights in front and rear elevations.

### **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 31<sup>st</sup> 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 17<sup>th</sup> 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

H-1: DESIGN OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

CS8: SAFEGUARDING AND IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT

SIE-1: Quality Places

SIE-3: Protecting, Safeguarding and enhancing the Environment

#### **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.

## **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 and replaced the previous NPPF (originally issued 2012 & revised 2018 and 2019). 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”.

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”.

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 – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
- b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities’ health, social and cultural well-being; and
- c) an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.”

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;"

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.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. 130 "Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:  
a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

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."

### **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.

## **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

DC030871- Single storey rear extension, single storey rear conservatory and single storey side porch. Granted 07/07/08

DC080192 - Proposed two storey side extensions, single storey rear extension, loft conversion and new roof to existing residential property. Granted 18/06/21 and remains extant and capable of implementation.

## **NEIGHBOUR'S VIEWS**

The occupiers of 6 neighbouring properties have been notified of the receipt of this application. 5 letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:-

### **Plans as Originally Submitted**

We object on the grounds of the overbearing impact this disproportionate development would have on neighbouring homes. The proposal is totally out of scale, mass and proportion with surrounding properties and in no way accords with the character of the area. Neither this plan nor the original meet the requirements of the Development Plan.

The purpose of the roof design is to maximise bedroom number and totally disregards the style and character of neighbouring homes and includes windows that directly overlook surrounding gardens and have a direct sight into principle habitable rooms of neighbouring homes. The addition of a further storey to this property would prevent neighbours from enjoying their gardens and outlook.

The proposed development will increase the number of upper storey overlooking windows from two to nine creating an unreasonable loss of privacy and amenity for neighbours.

We are very concerned with the proposed development and would like it rejecting as we believe it fails several areas specified in the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings SPD in relation to character and appearance, the design of 2 storey side extensions and the design of roof extensions / dormers. In this respect the extensions will not respect the form, shape, symmetry and proportions of the existing dwelling or complement the character of the surrounding area nor will they appear subordinate in relation to the existing dwelling in terms of massing, scale and overall appearance. The roof level on the proposed building would be substantially higher than its current height and would in addition be higher than other houses on Elmsway, Thornway, Deneway and Bramway.

The roof extensions will not be in proportion to the roof nor set into the roof slope so will be a dominant feature. The application fails on the basis that it is not in proportion to the roof and results in undue overlooking of neighbours. Our belief is that a far smaller development would be more in keeping with other houses in the area and that if revised plans were submitted along these lines, approval should be on the basis that any construction is hours limited.

The increased height of the house and introduction of velux windows will result in a loss of privacy for the neighbours and loss of light. It also is excessive development given the size of the plot and will create a house with 6-7 bedrooms which seems a lot more than would be required for such a family house. If houses like this one are granted permission to extend in this way it will detrimentally change the character of the area.

### Plans as Amended

The original planning permission for this property (DC080192) should not have been granted as it clearly breached the policy guidelines in a number of significant areas.

The proposal will significantly increase the number of windows to the rear of the property resulting in overlooking and loss of privacy.

Despite the revised plans, in my opinion the proposed development still fails to comply with the SPD in relation to its impact on the character of the existing building as a result of the increase proposed and being constructed over three floors compared to two as existing.

The roof design still does not complement the existing dwelling given that it respects neither form or design, neither of the two-storey side extensions are set back from the main body of the existing house and the ridge line of the extensions are higher than that of the original house, despite the ridge line being reduced in height from the original application.

### **ANALYSIS**

This current application seeks planning permission for the same two storey side extensions, single storey side and rear extensions approved by DC080192 but with a revised roof form over the main 2 storey dwelling. The roof approved by DC080192 is of the same pitch as that existing but with a ridge height of 8.5m (which is 0.6m to 1.9m higher than that existing). That proposed by this current application will be of a slightly steeper pitch than existing but the ridge will be lower than that approved rising to 8.27m high (which is 0.37m to 1.67m higher than that existing). The large projecting gable and window to the rear elevation approved by DC080192 is now not proposed in this current application (having been negotiated out of the scheme by the Case Officer); instead 6 rooflights are proposed to the rear roofplane in lieu of the 2 already approved. As approved by DC080192 the resulting dwelling would comprise 6 bedrooms together with a utility and storage area in the basement. The resulting dwelling proposed by this application would comprise the same accommodation in terms of the number of bedrooms as that previously proposed albeit with an additional bathroom and study in the roofspace.

Members are advised that as application DC080192 remains extant and capable of implementation, it constitutes a fallback position against which this current application should be considered. If permission is refused for the current proposals, then that approved by DC080192 could be implemented. Whilst the differences between the 2 applications relate only to the roof, for sake of completeness, the application as a whole is assessed below. The main issues for consideration are the impact of the proposals upon the character of the area and the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

### Impact on the Character of the Area

Saved policy 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 NPPF sets out the Government's most up to date position on planning policy and confirms that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Planning decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the quality of the area, establish a strong sense of place, optimise the potential of a site to accommodate development, respond to local character and history, reflecting the identity of local surroundings and materials whilst not preventing or discouraging innovative design and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. Planning decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is however proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

To assist applications of this nature the Council's SPD 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' advises that all development should 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.

As described above the character of the area is derived from individually designed detached dwellings, mainly of a generous size and set within spacious grounds giving an attractive suburban character to the area. Whilst most properties are 2 storeys in height there is evidence of accommodation within the roofspace at second floor level served by rooflights in front and rear elevations. Many houses occupy nearly the full width of their plot over 2 storeys either through their original construction or as a result of being extended. Front elevations are broken up only by projecting bays with hipped or gable roofs over.

The application property contrasts with this character in that to the south side of the house is a single storey garage which results in the 2 storey element being positioned a distance from the boundary. The front elevation of the house is staggered on account of the projection of the bay window and setting back of the front entrance, staircase and living room. When viewed from Elmsway, the existing house is of a smaller scale than many other houses on this street.

Like the development approved by the grant of DC080192, this application effectively proposes the squaring off the existing house by way of 2 storey extensions to either side of the house. Above this, a new pitched roof is proposed to the front bay and a hipped roof a slightly steeper pitch than that existing to the main dwelling. Materials are proposed as matching existing.

The resulting dwelling would project no further forward than that existing and would be positioned 1.4m off the northern side boundary and 1.2m off the southern side boundary. The siting of the resulting dwelling relative to the boundaries of the site is considered reflective of the character of area where there are other examples of 2 storey dwellings of a similar footprint and position. The eaves height would be no higher than existing and whilst it is proposed to raise the height of the roof such that the ridge would be 0.2m higher than the houses to either side, it is not considered that this would be harmful to the character of the streetscene noting the variety in roof heights that exist at present.

The application also proposes increasing the pitch of the roof from 40 degrees to 55 degrees so to allow for more accommodation within the roofspace than that already approved. The pitch of all roofs in the locality has not been verified and therefore it is not clear if that proposed is similar to others. It is however noted that the character of the locality is derived from a variety of roof forms such that there is little uniformity. On the basis that the resulting dwelling in terms of its footprint, position relative to the boundaries and height is acceptable, it is not considered that the change in the pitch of the roof will cause such harm to the character of the streetscene or wider area as to justify the refusal of planning permission.

Objectors comment that the design of the 2 storey side extensions do not comply with the Council's advice as set out in the above mentioned SPD. Members are advised that in relation to such extensions the SPD advises that they should respect the form and design of the existing dwelling with a roof design that complements the existing appearance. Ideally 2 storey extensions should appear subservient to the main dwelling with the ridge level being set below the main ridge line of the original house. To avoid a linked or infill effect between neighbouring dwellings a visibly adequate gap should be retained between the boundary and the side wall of the extension. Whilst it is necessary to consider each situation individually, the Council is concerned that where two storey side extensions are proposed to homes in areas of mainly detached or semi detached housing the character should not be lost through terracing extensions. In such areas houses should not be physically or visually linked, particularly at first floor level. In these instances 2 storey side extensions should be set back from the front of the property by a minimum of 1m behind the front main wall of the house, or by 1m from the side boundary.

In response to this guidance Members are advised that the 2 storey extensions proposed by this application form part of the wider proposals to replace the roof of the house with that of a different design. The guidance contained within the SPD in relation to side extensions is not intended to address more extensive proposals such as that which are the subject of this application but rather seeks to inform those where the remainder of the dwelling is being retained in its current form and simply being extended. In this instance it should also be noted that there is no need for the 2 storey side extensions to be set back from the front of the existing property by 1m



as they will be positioned more than 1m from the side boundary of the site and therefore comply with the guidance.

Objectors also comment that the proposed roof to the resulting dwelling does not comply with the guidance in the Council's SPD. In relation to upwards extensions the SPD advises that 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 look out of keeping with the character of the street, will be refused.

In response to Members are referred back to the comments made above in relation to the impact of the increased height and revised roof form on the character of the area. The SPD notes that the upwards extension of a property will normally only be appropriate on detached properties in residential areas of varied design and roof height. The application site comprises a detached house in an area which is characterised by a variety of roof heights and designs. Whilst that proposed will be different to that existing it is considered that it will complement the locality and cause no harm to it or the streetscene in compliance with the guidance in the SPD.

The advice in the SPD relating to roof extensions is aimed at proposals that seek to retain the existing roof form and simply extend it either, for example, through a dormer window or the extension of a hipped roof to another form such as a half hip or gable end. As such it is not considered relevant to the consideration of this application.

Objections are made on the grounds that the resulting dwelling will be 3 storeys high compared to 2 as existing. This is indeed the case, however, the resulting dwelling will still retain the appearance of a 2 storey dwelling as the presence of accommodation within the roofspace will only be evident on account of the inclusion of rooflights. Like the existing dwelling, most houses in the locality benefit from Permitted Development rights that enable the creation of habitable accommodation in the roofspace served by rooflights and dormer windows. The implementation of such rights has the potential to change the character of the area creating accommodation at second floor level where there is currently none. Whilst most properties on Elmsway appear to comprise only 2 floors of accommodation it is noted that 9 Elmsway diagonally opposite the application site has accommodation at second floor level served by front and rear facing rooflights. It is therefore considered that the inclusion of accommodation within the roof as proposed by this application will not cause harm to the character of the area.

For the above reasons Members are advised that the proposed development will not cause harm to the character of the area and is compliant with saved UDP Review policy CDH1.8, Core Strategy policy SIE1, the NPPF and advice contained within the

SPD Extensions and Alterations to Existing Dwellings. A condition should be imposed to ensure that materials of external construction match those of the existing dwelling or such other materials that have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

#### Impact on 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.

This is reiterated in Core Strategy policy SIE1 which confirms that specific account should be had to the provision, maintenance and enhancement (where suitable) of satisfactory levels of privacy and amenity for neighbouring residents. The NPPF confirms that development should create places that promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The main issues in the consideration of impact on residential amenity are overlooking/loss of privacy, loss of light and visual intrusion. These are explored below.

The Council's SPD advises that at ground and first floor there should be a minimum of 25m between habitable rooms windows on the private side of dwellings (28m at second floor). 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.

Neighbouring occupiers are entitled to a reasonable level of privacy, both within their homes and outside in their private gardens. In determining planning applications, the Council will ensure that new extensions do not impose an unacceptable loss of privacy on the occupants of neighbouring dwellings. 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.

In response to this position it is noted that in a suburban location there is an accepted degree of mutual overlooking of properties and it can rarely be concluded that there will be no overlooking whatsoever; compliance with the SPD will however ensure that an unacceptable degree of overlooking does not occur.

The distance between the proposed rear facing windows and those of neighbouring properties to the rear would be 31m. This not only complies with the Council's SPD requirement of 28m but also exceeds it. The distance between the proposed front facing windows and houses on the opposite side of Elmsway will be circa 28m as existing. This not only complies with the Council's SPD requirement of 24m but also exceeds it. The development is acceptable in this respect.

It is accepted that the resulting dwelling will have more windows than that existing especially to the rear elevation and there may be views from them into the

neighbouring gardens to either side on Elmsway however these windows do not directly face these adjacent gardens. Such overlooking is commonplace within a suburban setting and could not constitute grounds for the refusal of planning permission. The ensuite window in the side elevation to first floor level can be fitted with obscure glazing and secured by condition.

It should also be noted that the proposed first floor windows are no different to those approved by DC080192 and therefore will have no greater impact than that which could lawfully be constructed through the implementation of this extant planning permission. This current application proposes only rooflights at second floor level and omits the window proposed in the projecting gable at roof level approved by DC080192 and originally proposed by this current application. Whilst there will be more rooflights than that already approved, the nature of rooflights in that they are small in size (0.5m wide by 0.3m high) and are fitted into a sloping roof angled upwards, assists in reducing the ability to gain views downwards towards ground level. It is therefore not considered that any views from the accommodation in the roofspace would be unacceptable or justify the refusal of planning permission.

In relation to loss of light, the Council's SPD advises that an extension which is sited close to a window belonging to a habitable room of a neighbouring dwelling or its private garden area, can create a poor living environment for the occupier in terms of overshadowing and intrusiveness. Most extensions are likely to cause some degree of shadowing, it is the position of the extension relative to the path of the sun (orientation), combined with its height, shape and massing which, will determine the amount of shadow that will be cast.

An extension to a property should not harm a neighbouring occupiers' daylight to an unacceptable degree. When assessing this, the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the dwelling as a whole will be considered. Particular attention will be given to protecting principal habitable room windows. The Council will not normally protect daylight to secondary, high level and obscure windows or where windows have been added to the dwelling under permitted development rights.

Extensions should not unduly reduce the amount of daylight or natural sunlight entering the original, principal habitable room windows of neighbouring dwellings. The bulk, height and overall massing of an extension along or adjacent to common boundaries should be kept to a minimum. Original principal habitable room windows should not be made to look out directly onto two storey side elevations of extensions. Single storey rear extensions should not normally project more than 3 metres along or adjacent to a common boundary close to a window belonging to a habitable room of a neighbouring dwelling. Two storey rear extensions along or adjacent to common boundaries should be avoided, even more so on the south facing side. This form of development will only be acceptable if it can be demonstrated that it will not result in an unacceptable loss of daylight or outlook to neighbouring properties.

The 2 storey side extension to the southern side of the house, which will also wrap around the existing rear elevation will be sited to the north of 10 Elmsway, will be positioned 1.2m from the boundary and 3m from the side elevation of this neighbouring house. This extension will be positioned behind the front elevation of 10 Elmsway. There are no principal habitable room windows in the side of 10

Elmsway and as such this element of the proposal will have no adverse impact in relation to loss of light.

To the rear the proposed 2 storey extension will not project beyond the adjacent ground floor rear elevation of 10 Elmsway but it will project approximately 1.6m beyond the adjacent first floor elevation. Being positioned over 5.5m from the adjacent first floor rear facing windows and to the north, it is not considered that there will be any adverse impact to these rooms in relation to light.

Being to the north of 10 Elmsway, the alterations to the roof will have no impact on light entering this neighbouring house or garden.

The single storey side extension adjacent the boundary with 14 Elmsway will be 3.8m from the side elevation of this neighbouring house and the 2 storey side extension to the northern side elevation (front corner) will be 5m distant. There are no original principle habitable windows within this neighbouring side elevation and as such this element of the proposal will cause no impact in relation to loss of light. The projection of the 2 storey extension 1.6m beyond the adjacent front elevation of 14 Elmway will cause no adverse impact on light being positioned 5m away.

To the rear, the resulting dwelling as extended will project 4.8m beyond the rear elevation of 14 Elmsway (3m more than that existing) at ground floor level. In this adjacent rear elevation is a bay window at ground floor level; it is not known what room it serves but it would appear to be a habitable room from the nature of the bay window. It is noted that the SPD advises that a single storey rear extension should not normally project more than 3 metres along or adjacent to a common boundary close to a window belonging to a habitable room of a neighbouring dwelling. In this instance the siting of the proposed single storey extension off the boundary by 2.3m, the screening afforded by that boundary and the siting of this extension some 4.3m from this neighbouring bay window is such that an unacceptable impact on light to this window is not anticipated.

The alterations to the roof will have no impact on light entering this neighbouring house. Any impact on the rear garden in the afternoon or early evening would not result in unacceptable noting that there would be no further impact at other times of the day. Noting also that light to the remainder of the habitable rooms in this house will not be affected by the proposal, it is concluded that the amenity enjoyed by the occupiers of this neighbouring property in relation to light will not be adversely affected.

Existing properties opposite the application site and to the rear will suffer no adverse impact as a result of the extensions in relation to light noting their separation from the resulting dwelling (28m to the front and 31m to the rear).

In relation to visual intrusion, the main consideration is the impact on neighbouring gardens from the resulting mass of the development above ground floor level as at ground level, the proposed single storey rear extension, being relatively low in height and of limited depth, will not appear visually obtrusive above the existing rear garden boundaries. The resulting house at first floor level will generally be aligned with the front and rear elevations of the neighbouring properties projecting only 1.6m beyond the main first floor rear elevation of 10 Elmsway and no further than that existing

beyond the rear elevation of 14 Elmsway. Given the siting of the resulting dwelling off the boundaries with the neighbouring properties (1.2m to 10 Elmsway and 2.6m to 14 Elmsway) together with the retention of the existing eaves height, it is not considered that the height of the house rising to a point only 0.2m above those to either side, will result in a visually obtrusive form of development when viewed from the adjacent rear gardens.

From the opposite side of Elmsway, the siting of the house off the side boundaries in a manner that reflects the character of the area and the retention of the existing eaves will ensure that the main bulk of house, over 28m from the front elevation of the houses opposite and some 22m from their front garden boundaries, does not appear visually obtrusive. Whilst the ridge will be 0.2m higher than those to either side, this will not be prominent nor unduly out of keeping with the pattern of development in the locality.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposed development will not result in an unacceptable impact upon the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and the proposal is compliant with saved UDP Review policy CDH1.8, Core Strategy policy SIE1 and the NPPF together with advice contained within the Council's SPD.

#### Fallback Position

Material also to the consideration of the application is the fallback position afforded by the grant of application DC080192. This permission remains extant and can be implemented irrespective of whether this current application is approved or refused.

The current application is no different to that approved at ground or first floor level and therefore will have no greater impact than that approved. This needs to be afforded significant weight when considering the impact of the proposal in this respect. The only difference is the roof over the resulting dwelling which as currently proposed and whilst of a slightly greater pitch, will be 0.23m lower to ridge than that approved and will no longer include the large gable feature to the rear roof plane.

The existing, approved and proposed plans, elevations and streetscenes are appended to this report for Members to consider. In terms of the impact of the development upon the character of the area, it is not considered that the revisions to the roof beyond that already approved will cause harm noting the variety of roof forms and heights in the locality. In terms of impact on amenity, the removal of the large projecting gable to the rear roof plane as proposed by this application (in which would be a window) is considered to be an improvement upon that approved and one that will not only reduce the vertical height of the development as seen from neighbouring gardens but also reduce views from the resulting house at roof level.

As such it is considered that the development proposed by this current application would have no greater impact on the character of the area or amenities of the neighbouring occupiers than that already approved and capable of implementation.

#### Conclusions

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.

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.

Other material considerations such as the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings SPD and the NPPF have also been considered and as well as the fallback position afforded by the grant of application DC080192.

For the reasons set out within the report, the application is considered compliant with the development plan and as such it is considered that planning permission should be approved.

**RECOMMENDATION** GRANT WITH CONDITIONS