## Planning Committee: 24 April 2018

Application No: <u>W 18 / 0247</u>

Registration Date: 06/02/18 Expiry Date: 03/04/18

Town/Parish Council:StoneleighCase Officer:Holika Bungre01926 456541

01926 456541 Holika.Bungre@warwickdc.gov.uk

### 17 Stoneleigh Close, Stoneleigh, Coventry, CV8 3DE

Erection of first floor and ground floor side extension (resubmission of application ref: W/17/0517) FOR Mr & Mrs Allard

\_\_\_\_\_

This application is being presented to Committee as the Parish Council supports the application and it is recommended for refusal.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Planning Committee is recommended to refuse this application for the reasons set out at the end of the report.

#### **DETAILS OF THE DEVELOPMENT**

This application is a resubmission of a similar application which was refused last year and was subsequently dismissed at appeal. Amendments have been made to the scale and design of the proposal. As before, the application seeks permission to add a first floor to the bungalow by raising the ridge height from 5.5m to 7m with a dominant front gable of a slightly shallower pitch than the previous application. It is also proposed to add to the side extension to its front. The proposed increase in eaves level from 2.5m to 5.15 as previously proposed has been reduced to 3.7m. This has reduced the proposed floor space at first floor in comparison to the previous application. A chimney is proposed to be added to the property together with some internal reconfiguration and other external alterations.

The previous application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed increase of 105.52% and the increased height and volume of the building would amount to a disproportionate addition, which is inappropriate development within the Green Belt, harmful by definition, and the extent of harm to openness of the Green Belt was also considered moderate. There were no very special circumstances to overcome this.

2. Due to the relationship of the property with its neighbours, the property already breached the 45 degree angle to the windows in the rear elevation of No.18, which would be further affected by the increase in height, impacting their outlook and daylight. This would also be the case for the ground floor side windows serving No. 16 which light the lounge, and this room's daylight and outlook would also be affected in the same way. This would be harmful to the living conditions of the neighbours.

# THE SITE AND ITS LOCATION

The application relates to a detached bungalow situated to the northwest of Stoneleigh Close and is washed over by Green Belt. The site and the street are sloping, with the property in an elevated position compared to the entrance of its driveway and is also elevated in comparison to the properties on the opposite side of the street. It is at a similar level to that of the properties to either side.

The original property was built in the 1960's, and has since had a side extension which includes the utility, and a forward extension of the garage.

### **PLANNING HISTORY**

 $W/17/0517\,$  - Refused and dismissed at appeal - Erection of first floor to bungalow and erection of single storey side extension

4133 - 1962 - Granted - Erection of bungalow and garage

4086 - 1961 - Granted - Erection of bungalow and garage

### **RELEVANT POLICIES**

• National Planning Policy Framework

The Current Local Plan

- BE1 Layout and Design (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- BE3 Amenity (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- DS18 Green Belt (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- H14 Extensions to Dwellings in the Open Countryside (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- NE2 Protecting Designated Biodiversity and Geodiversity Assets (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)

#### Guidance Documents

- Residential Design Guide (Supplementary Planning Guidance April 2008)
- The 45 Degree Guideline (Supplementary Planning Guidance)

### SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

#### Stoneleigh & Ashow Parish Council: Support

**WCC Ecology:** Recommended bat note, bird note and reptiles and amphibians note

### **ASSESSMENT**

Whether the proposal is appropriate development in the Green Belt and, if not, whether there are any very special circumstances which outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm identified

Warwick District Local Plan Policy DS18 states that extensions to dwellings will be permitted unless they result in disproportionate additions to the original dwelling which do not respect the character of the original dwelling; do not retain the openness of the rural area; or substantially alter the scale, design and character of the original dwelling. This reflects the approach to development in the Green Belt in the NPPF.

Policy H14 indicates that an extension of more than 30% of the gross floor space of the original dwelling is likely to be considered disproportionate in the Green Belt.

The total original floor space of the application property is calculated to be 157.53m<sup>2</sup>. Existing extensions amount to 27m<sup>2</sup> which equate to 17.14%. The proposed extensions taken together with the existing extensions would amount to 282.37m<sup>2</sup> which equates to an overall <u>79.25%</u> increase in floor space over and above the original dwelling, which is significantly in excess of what could be considered to be proportionate in accordance with Policies H14 and DS18. The proposal is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is harmful by definition and by reason of harm to openness. In accordance with the NPPF, this harm must be afforded significant weight.

No very special circumstances have been presented which outweighs the harm identified.

#### Design, Scale and Impact on the Street Scene

With regard to the small expansion of the side extension at ground floor only, the proposed chimney and the other alterations, these are considered acceptable proportionate and suitable in character to the main house.

The scale and design of the proposed house and the eaves height are improved in comparison to the previous application and will be more in keeping with the scale and design of the neighbouring properties to either side. Therefore, the proposed extensions are not considered to harm the character and appearance of the street scene.

#### Impact on Neighbour Amenity

In terms of overlooking, the proposed first floor side window could be conditioned to be obscure glazed to prevent overlooking, as it is to the stairway and not a habitable room and would therefore be made acceptable in planning terms. Concerning the eight proposed first floor side roof lights (to bedrooms, an ensuite and a bathroom) the same would apply, as each bedroom has a front or a rear window providing a suitable level of outlook while the ensuite and bathroom do not require clear glazed windows. As such, the proposal would not result in material harm by reason of overlooking and loss of privacy.

However, the property as it stands already breaches the 45 degree angles from the rear of No.18 and the front and side of No.16. The proposed addition at first floor will therefore also result in a breach, and will result in material harm to the neighbours by reason of loss of light and outlook. This is exacerbated as both of

these properties are bungalows. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE3.

# Summary/Conclusion

The proposal would constitute a 79.25% addition to the house as originally built and is therefore considered to result in disproportionate additions which are inappropriate within the Green Belt harmful by definition and by reason of harm to openness as the addition of the first floor to this property will substantially increase the bulk and mass of the dwelling, and therefore the proposals are contrary to the NPPF and Policies DS18 and H14.

The proposals would result in material harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties by reason of harm to light and outlook and it is considered that the scheme has not been amended such as to overcome the previous reasons for refusal which were upheld at appeal.

### **REFUSAL REASONS**

1 The application property is within the Green Belt, wherein the Planning Authority is concerned to ensure that the rural character of the area will be retained and protected in accordance with national policy guidance contained in the NPPF which states that the limited extension of existing dwellings in Green Belt areas may be appropriate provided that it does not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. Policy H14 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 defines disproportionate as in excess of 30% of the floor area of the original dwelling.

The proposals would constitute a 79.25% addition to the house as originally built and is therefore considered to result in disproportionate additions which are inappropriate within the Green Belt harmful by definition and by reason of harm to openness as the addition of the first floor to this property will substantially increase the bulk and mass of the dwelling.

It is considered that the proposed development would radically alter the scale and character of the original dwelling, thus constituting an undesirable extension and consolidation of a residential property likely to affect detrimentally the character of this rural locality, thereby constituting inappropriate development conflicting with the aims of Green Belt and Local Plan policy.

No very special circumstances have been presented which outweigh the harm identified.

2 Policy BE3 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 states that development will not be permitted which has an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby uses and residents and/or does not provide acceptable standards of amenity for future users/occupiers of the development. Due to the 1.5m increase in height together with the associated bulk, the proposal would result in a material loss of light and outlook to both adjacent neighbours, exacerbated by the fact that both are bungalows. The proposal is considered to be an unneighbourly form of development which is contrary to the aforementioned policy.

-----