

**Planning Committee:** 11 July 2006

**Item Number:**

**Application No:** W 06 / 0762

**Registration Date:** 17/05/06

**Town/Parish Council:** Whitnash

**Expiry Date:** 12/07/06

**Case Officer:** Sarah Laythorpe

01926 456554 [planning\\_east@warwickdc.gov.uk](mailto:planning_east@warwickdc.gov.uk)

**15 Armstrong Close, Whitnash, Leamington Spa, CV31 2RA**

Erection of a single storey side extension and canopy roof to front elevation  
FOR Mr and Mrs McCutcheon

---

This item is reported to committee since it is a resubmission of an application refused by Planning Committee designed to overcome members' previous reasons for refusal.

**SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS**

**Town Council:** No objection

**Neighbours:**

17 Armstrong Close - objects on the grounds of creating a terracing effect in the street, over-development of the plot, noise / vibration of garaging cars.

16 Armstrong Close - objects on the grounds of over-development of plot, unneighbourly, overbearing and incongruous, noise from the garage, guttering would be non-maintainable, mismatch of brick colours and shapes.

4 Armstrong Close - objects on the grounds of extension would change the nature of the close.

2 Armstrong Close - objects to the application on the grounds that the extension would project forward of the existing building line.

12 Armstrong Close - supports the application.

11 Armstrong Close - no objections to the application.

6 Armstrong Close - no objections to the application.

14 Armstrong Close - supports the application.

**Ecology:** bat note to be added to any approval granted if the proposal affects the roofspace.

**RELEVANT POLICIES**

- (DW) ENV3 - Development Principles (Warwick District Local Plan 1995)
- DP1 - Layout and Design (Warwick District Local Plan 1996 - 2011 Revised Deposit Version)
- DP2 - Amenity (Warwick District Local Plan 1996 - 2011 Revised Deposit Version).

**PLANNING HISTORY**

W060293 - application refused for a single-storey side extension which projected to within 0.5metres of the front building line of the neighbouring property 16 Armstrong Close. This extension also proposed a kitchen extension to the front of the property and a pitched roof onto the existing rear extension. The application was refused on the following grounds:

*'In the opinion of the District Planning Authority, the proposed extension has been designed such that it almost aligns with the front wall of 16 Armstrong Close; consequently by reason of its excessive scale of extension at the front of the property, it would fail to harmonise in the streetscene by creating an incongruous feature. The extension would therefore result in an unacceptable unbalancing of the symmetry of the appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings.'*

It appears that a rear, single-storey flat-roofed extension was built under 'Permitted Development' in 1988.

## **KEY ISSUES**

### **The Site and its Location**

The application site relates to a 2-storey semi-detached property located on the west side of Armstrong Close. Due to the arrangement of properties in the streetscene, the dwelling on the application site is set back from 16 Armstrong Close by approximately 6 metres. The rear, flat-roofed extension runs along the shared boundary of the two properties into the rear garden of the application site.

### **Details of the Development**

This proposal is for an extension to the front of the existing garage which runs along the shared boundary of the property. The extension would be set back 1.7 metres from the front of 16 Armstrong Close which currently projects forward of the building line of the application site. This set-back is increased by 1.2 metres from the previous application W060293.

This application has omitted the kitchen extension to the front of the property and now proposes a canopy which projects out 1 metre from the front of the building. The pitched roof onto the existing rear extension has also been omitted from this application.

### **Assessment**

It is considered that this application would be acceptable in terms of size and scale. It complies with the 45 degree code from the front of 14 Armstrong Close and it is considered that it would not result in an overbearing impact on this property.

Whilst I note the objection from 16 Armstrong Close regarding the over-development of the plot size and unneighbourly development, it is considered

that the extension is single-storey and the majority of the extension already exists. The front projecting element of the extension would not, in my opinion, result in an incongruous, overbearing element which would warrant a refusal. The 'unbalancing' effect on the other half of this pair of semi-detached houses is also reduced by the removal of the previous front kitchen extension which projected out by 2 metres and its replacement by the canopy roof with a 1 metre projection.

With regard to the comments made regarding the potential terracing effect within the streetscene as a result of this proposal, I consider that the set-back of 1.7metres from the front building line of 16 Armstrong Close is sufficient to prevent this.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

GRANT subject to the conditions listed below.

- 1 The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.  
**REASON** : To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
  
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details shown on the approved drawing (10/12/05 Rev A), and specification contained therein, submitted on 17th May, 2006 unless first agreed otherwise in writing by the District Planning Authority.  
**REASON** : For the avoidance of doubt and to secure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Local Plan Policy ENV3.
  
- 3 All external facing materials for the development hereby permitted shall be of the same type, texture and colour as those of the existing building.  
**REASON** : To ensure that the visual amenities of the area are protected, and to satisfy the requirements of Policy ENV3 of the Warwick District Local Plan.

### **INFORMATIVES**

For the purposes of Article 22 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2003, the following reason(s) for the Council's decision are summarised below:

In the opinion of the District Planning Authority, the development respects surrounding buildings in terms of scale, height, form and massing and does not adversely affect the amenity of nearby residents. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with the policies listed.

-----