

## **COUNCIL'S STATEMENT OF OBSERVATIONS**

### **Planning Application No. P/21/0959**

#### **Erection of front extension with associated alterations**

#### **1.0 Planning Background**

- 1.1 A planning application was submitted by Mr Gordon Hope to South Lanarkshire Council on 25 May 2021 seeking permission for the erection of a front extension with associated alterations. The application was validated on 10 June 2021. After due consideration in terms of the Local Development Plan and all other material planning considerations, the application was refused by the Council under delegated powers on 1 September 2021. The report of handling explains the decision and the reasons for refusal are listed in the decision notice. These documents are available elsewhere in the papers.

#### **2 Assessment against the development plan and other relevant policies**

- 2.1 Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended requires that an application for planning permission is determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 2.2 The development plan comprises the South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 (2021). The site was identified as being located within the General Urban Area/Settlement where Policy 3 applies. The main requirement of this policy is that any proposal must relate appropriately with its surroundings in terms of scale, massing, materials and intensity of use.
- 2.3 Policy 5 - Development Management and Placemaking is relevant to the assessment of this proposal, as it is to all planning applications. The policy states that all development proposals will require to take account of and be integrated with the local context and built form. Policy DM2 specifically relates to House Extensions and Alterations. The policy states that extensions should

not dominate or overwhelm the existing dwelling or street scene in terms of size or scale.

2.4 In addition to the above policies, the guidance contained within the Development Management, Placemaking and Design Supplementary Guidance (2015) remains a material consideration in the assessment of applications for house extensions and alterations. Specifically on porches and front extensions, the guidance states that;

- It is preferable that a front porch or extension should not project more than two metres beyond the front elevation of the house unless it can be shown that a greater degree of projection would not look out of place or form an intrusive feature in the street.
- The porch should be in proportion to the size of the house and its height should relate to the front door height.
- The roof of the porch or extension should be pitched or sympathetic to the style of the existing house.
- The porch or extension should be finished in materials that match or are compatible with the existing house.
- It may be appropriate to design the porch to match one already adjacent; if possible, where properties have adjoining front doors, it would be beneficial to match porches

2.5 The proposal failed to comply with Policies 3, 5 and DM2 of the adopted Local Development Plan 2, for the reasons set out in the report of handling associated with the application. The proposed extension is near the neighbouring property to the east (number 10), and it is considered that it would have an adverse impact upon the neighbouring properties because of its position and scale in relation to the neighbour's front elevation. The street and, in particular, the immediate properties either side of the site have an open aspect onto the streetscape. As a result, the extension would introduce a sense of enclosure due to the proposed projection and increase of roof height.

### **3 Observations on applicants Notice of Review**

3.1 Through their agent, the applicant has submitted a statement to support their review. This was submitted partly to respond to the matters raised in the Officer Report. The grounds are summarised below:

- (a) **Full consideration of the proposal has not been undertaken. A site visit should be undertaken to illustrate the comparison between the existing building line with the street scape and the little impact it would have.**

**Response:** A full consideration of the proposal was taken prior to the decision of the original application being made. This included a site visit and an assessment against the properties in the locality, including those immediately to each side of the site.

- (b) **Contrary to the statement ‘a significant adverse impact upon visual amenity in the local area’ in the Report of Handling, it should be clarified that the proposed extension would not obscure the existing view of any surrounding properties on the street. The true impact on the street scape has not been considered accurately.**

**Response:** The statement quoted from the Report of Handling above, does not relate to loss of view. Loss of view is not a material planning consideration. The quote relates to how the visual impact of the extension, when viewed together with the existing properties on the street, will be detrimental to the street scape. Again, the Planning Service has fully assessed the proposal against all the relevant policies in the local development plan.

- (c) **In the Reason for Decision paragraph, the summary refers to a ‘proposed two storey extension. This statement suggests that the drawings have not been reviewed correctly and responded to with a well-considered response.**

**Response:** This sentence was typed in error, and it is clear from the rest of the Report of Handling and the summary of the proposal by the

case officer, that a two-storey extension is not proposed. The reason for refusal also does not refer to a two-storey extension. The reasons for refusal were that the extension projects beyond the established building line of the street and that the proposal would detract from the streetscape.

## **4 Conclusions**

- 4.1 In summary, the proposed development does not accord with the provisions of the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 in relation to house extensions, development management and development in the general urban area/settlement. In addition, there are no material considerations which outweigh the provisions of the development plan. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Review Body uphold the decision to refuse detailed planning permission for the proposed development.