

Report

Report to:	Planning Committee
Date of Meeting:	22 November 2006
Report by:	Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)

Application No	HM/06/0378
Planning Proposal:	Erection of Extension to Rear of Dwelling and Erection of Garden Store

1 Summary Application Information

- Application Type : Detailed Planning Application
- Applicant : Mr James Lennon
- Location : 1 Lanark Road
Rosebank
Carluke

2 Recommendation(s)

2.1 The Committee is asked to approve the following recommendation(s):-

- (1) Grant Detailed Planning Permission based on Conditions Listed Overleaf.

2.2 Other Actions/Notes

3 Other Information

- ◆ Applicant's Agent: Neville Design Ltd
- ◆ Council Area/Ward: 51 Dalserf
- ◆ Policy Reference(s): **Hamilton District Local Plan**
Policy RES1 – Residential Areas – General
Policy EN4 – Conservation Areas
Policy EN25 – Heritage Preservation
South Lanarkshire Planning Policies
SLP6 – Development Control – General
South Lanarkshire Local Plan
Finalised Plan, (August 2006)
RES6 – Residential Land Use Policy
ENV24 – Conservation Areas Policy

- ◆ Representation(s):
 - ▶ 1 Objection Letters
 - ▶ Support Letters

▶ Comments Letters

◆ Consultation(s):

- ▶ Historic Scotland
- ▶ Architectural Heritage Society for Scotland (AHSS)

Planning Application Report

1 Application Site

- 1.1 The application relates to a previously extended single storey semi-detached sandstone cottage which sits immediately adjacent to the main Lanark Road in Rosebank. The site forms part of a long narrow plot bounded to the north by the River Clyde and to the west by a Public Park. Residential properties are located to the east and south of the application site, which is located within the Rosebank Conservation Area.
- 1.2 The house is a Category C(S) listed building built in the mid 19th Century with later additions in the form of a modern brick built lean-to extension to the rear, the main building comprising of sandstone walls, slated roof and traditional timber sliding sash and casement windows (in part).

2 Proposal(s)

- 2.1 This proposal is for the erection of a rear extension on two levels to accommodate an extended living room and utility room on the ground floor and additional bedroom together with landing and shower room on the upper level. The footprint will extend 6.0 metres in depth behind the existing modern brick built extension and will be some 6.6 metres in width. An ancillary garden store within the grounds is also proposed as part of the overall development.
- 2.2 The extension is set back 1.0 metre from the eastern boundary with the neighbouring property. No windows will be positioned on this garden boundary elevation apart from a rooflight at the upper level. The external finishes will be in wet-dash render for the walls, natural slate for the roof covering and traditional timber sliding sash and casement windows for the new openings on the side (western) and gable elevation.
- 2.3 The applicant states in the supporting statement to the application that the proposed extension will provide additional accommodation to ensure the optimum use of the house as a family home and address existing internal layout issues with the existing extension. It should be noted that the original submission has been subject to amendments following discussions with the applicant/agent.

3 Background

3.1 Local Plan Status

- 3.1.1 In terms of the adopted Hamilton District Local Plan the site is identified as being within a General Residential Area as defined by Policy RES1. Within these areas the Council will seek to protect the residential character of the area and will not support bad-neighbour or non-conforming uses which would give rise to effects which would be detrimental to residential amenity. The application will also require to satisfy the terms of South Lanarkshire Planning Policy SLP6 which is a material consideration in the determination of the application as it contains the Council's approved policy on the criteria that will be used to assess proposals for house extensions and alterations.
- 3.1.2 The site is also identified in the adopted Hamilton District Local Plan as being located within the Rosebank Conservation Area as covered by Policy EN4. The Council seeks to ensure that an environment of high design quality is delivered within this area. In addition, in accordance with Policy EN25 – Heritage Preservation, of the Local Plan, the proposal will require to be sympathetic to the character of the

Category C(S) listed building. The proposal will also require to be in accord with the residential or visual amenity Policies of the South Lanarkshire Local Plan, Finalised Plan (August 2006) as contained within Policy RES6 of this Local Plan. Policy ENV 24 also requires that the design, materials, scale and siting of new development should be appropriate to the character of the Conservation Area.

3.2 **Planning History**

There have been no recent previous applications relating to this site.

3.3 **Relevant Government Guidance**

Government guidance on proposals which may have an affect on the character of a listed building or a Conservation Area are set out within Historic Scotland's Memorandum of Guidance on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. The proposal must therefore be assessed against this guidance which aims to protect and enhance the built heritage.

4 **Consultation(s)**

4.1 **Historic Scotland** – their informal comments on the original proposal raised concerns over the scale of the development and also the roof profile and height – the proposed roof being positioned above the historic roofline. To date, Historic Scotland have made no response on the amended proposal.

Response: Noted. The amended proposal involves a reduction in floor area by reducing the depth of the extension by 2 metres, from 8 metres to approximately 6 metres in length. The roof profile will be changed to provide a shallower pitch thereby reducing the visual impact for the neighbouring property. The height of the extension will be reduced to be in line with the existing historic roofline and the extension will be set back by approximately 1 metre from the neighbouring (eastern) boundary thereby again reducing the visual impact for the neighbouring property. I am therefore satisfied that the amended scheme represents an improved and satisfactory design, which address Historic Scotland's concern.

4.2 **Architectural Heritage Society for Scotland (AHSS)** – consider that the proposal is not detrimental in terms of what is existing, however have raised concerns over the inclusion of a gable balcony feature and the lack of 'conservation style' rooflights.

Response: Noted. After negotiation the applicant has now amended the proposal to omit the balcony feature and include 'conservation style' rooflights as well as other more traditional finishing treatments and window design which will improve the overall quality of the proposal.

5 **Representation(s)**

5.1 Statutory neighbour notification was undertaken and the proposal advertised in the local press. One letter of objection has been received in respect of the proposal. The grounds of objection can be summarised as follows:

(a) The objector wishes it to be made known to the Area Committee that the applicant for the proposal is an employee of Enterprise Resources, Planning Services.

Response: Noted. This will be brought to the Area Committee's attention.

(b) The proposed extension will be too large in terms of scale, being two storeys in height.

Response: After negotiation, the proposed extension has been amended in design and now is of a scale and massing which is sympathetic to the appearance of the

existing listed building and will not give rise to overbearing or visual dominance effects for the neighbouring property and garden area. The depth of the extension within the amended design has been reduced by 2 metres and set back 1 metre from the neighbouring (eastern) boundary such that its proximity to the neighbouring garden area and visual impact is acceptable. The extension has also been reduced in height such that it is no higher than the existing cottage. The proposed extension will also leave an acceptable amount of rear garden area undeveloped within this substantial plot.

(c) The proposed development will give rise to overshadowing of the objectors conservatory.

Response: The amended plans now show a set-back of approximately 1 metre from the neighbouring (eastern) boundary and this combined with the reduction in scale will provide separation from the objector's conservatory so as to avoid any potential overshadowing effect.

(d) The proposed extension will give rise to overlooking of the objector's property.

Response: The objector's property is separated by a sufficient distance from the proposed extension so as to avoid any significant overlooking or privacy impact. Notwithstanding this fact, there will be no windows on the garden boundary elevation and it is not considered that the proposed rooflight will undermine privacy due to its positioning and the angle of the roofslope. It should also be noted that the objectors property includes a lean-to conservatory to the rear which is glazed on all sides and currently affords minimal privacy for the objector given that it is in close proximity to the garden boundary.

(e) The proposed extension will adversely affect the character of the Conservation Area.

Response: I am satisfied that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the character of the Conservation Area or the listed building. Traditional materials will be used for wall and roof finishes and timber sash and casement windows will be used for new openings. The replacement of 'modern' finishes within the existing lean-to extension with traditional finishes will also be carried out. The extension although retaining a minimal flat roof section will not break the original ridgeline of the cottage and will not be visually dominant due to its siting at the rear of the property.

(f) The proposed extension could lead to an increase in occupancy numbers with a resultant adverse impact on the ability of the septic tank to deal with an increase in discharge of effluent and waste water.

Response: I am satisfied that in planning terms, the proposed development is acceptable. It is the responsibility of the owner to ensure that any drainage arrangements associated with the extension comply with all relevant legislation.

(g) The proposed development will have an adverse effect on the objectors property value.

Response: Property value is not a material planning consideration.

This letter has been copied and is available for inspection in the usual manner.

6 Assessment and Conclusions

6.1 The determining issues in the consideration of this application is whether it accords with local plan policies and its impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property. I will deal with these matters in turn.

- 6.2 The amended proposal involves a reduction in depth with the footprint being reduced by approximately 2.0 metres to 6.0 metres behind the modern brick built lean-to extension and will be some 6.5 metres in width. The height of the extension will also be reduced to be in-line with the original ridgeline of the cottage and consequently the roofslope will be shallower in pitch. Consequently, this will involve the introduction of a small narrow flat-roof section as part of the roof design. The garden boundary elevation will have no windows and the set-back will be increased to approximately 1 metre as part of the amended proposal. This will assist in addressing any visual impact and overbearing effect concerns for the adjacent property.
- 6.3 The external finishes of the proposed rear extension have been improved within the amended proposal and involve natural slate for the roof covering, wet-dash traditional render for walls and timber sash and casement windows for new openings on the gable and side (western) elevation. The existing modern brick faced lean-to extension will be re-finished in a more sympathetic wet-dash render treatment. The amended finishes are now compatible with the existing dwelling and with other dwellings in the locality. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal will not adversely affect the character of the listed building or the Conservation Area. Taking all these matters into account it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with the adopted Local Plan Policies EN4 and EN25. Further, the proposal also complies with the terms of Policy ENV24 of South Lanarkshire Local Plan (Finalised Plan) in terms of its design, materials, scale and siting and its appropriateness to the character of the Conservation Area. A condition will be imposed to ensure that the use of the garden store shall be restricted to private use incidental to the enjoyment of the house. Conditions will also be imposed to ensure that compatible materials are used for external finishes.
- 6.4 One objection has been received in relation to issues pertaining to scale, privacy, overshadowing and overlooking. As set out in Section 5 above, I am satisfied that the amended proposal, which involves a reduction in scale, a change to the roof design, and an increased set-back from the neighbouring (eastern) boundary addresses these concerns and consequently complies with the terms of Policy RES 1 of the adopted Hamilton District Local Plan and South Lanarkshire Planning Policies SLP 6, which seek to resist development which would be detrimental to residential amenity. In addition I am satisfied that the proposal complies with the terms of Policy RES 6 of South Lanarkshire Local Plan (Finalised Plan) with respect to retaining residential amenity.
- 6.5 In view of the above I therefore recommend that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

7 Reasons for Decision

- 7.1 The proposal has no adverse impact on either residential or visual amenity and complies with Policy RES1 of the Hamilton District Local Plan and guidance on house extensions contained within the South Lanarkshire Planning Policies. It complies with Policy ENV1 and ENV25 of the adopted Local Plan in that the character of the listed building or the appearance of the Conservation Area will not be affected. The proposal complies with Policy RES6 and ENV24 of the South Lanarkshire Local Plan Finalised Plan (August 2006) which seek to retain residential

amenity and ensure that the standard of design is compatible with the character of the Conservation Area.

Iain Urquhart
Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)

6 November 2006

Previous References

None

List of Background Papers

Application Form

Application Plans

▶ Consultations

- Architectural Heritage Society for Scotland 19/06/06
- Historic Scotland 14/06/06

▶ Representations

Representation from : Mrs Sheila MacDonald
Poets Cottage
3 Lanark Road

Rosebank (via Bishops Solicitors LLP.) DATED 08/06/2006

Contact for Further Information

If you would like to inspect the background papers or want further information, please contact:-

Angus Clark, Planning Officer (Conservation), Montrose House, Hamilton
Ext: 5939 (Tel :01698 455939)
E-mail: Enterprise.hq@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

CONDITIONS

- 1 That the development hereby permitted shall be started within five years of the date of this permission.
- 2 That the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the plans hereby approved and no change to the design or external finishes shall take place without the prior written approval of the Council as Planning Authority.
- 3 That the facing materials to be used for the external walls and roof of the extension hereby approved shall match in colour and texture those of the existing adjoining building on the site to the satisfaction of the Council as Planning Authority.
- 4 That notwithstanding the terms of Condition 3 above and for the avoidance of doubt the roof of the extension hereby approved shall be finished in natural slate and the walls finished in wet-dash render to match the existing building on the site.
- 5 That before any development commences on site or before any materials are ordered or brought to the site, details and samples of all materials to be used as external finishes on the development shall be submitted to and approved by the Council as Planning Authority.
- 6 All external colours shall be agreed in writing with the Council as Planning Authority prior to the commencement of works.
- 7 That for avoidance of doubt, no part of the extension hereby approved shall project above the ridge height of the existing roof and that the ridgeline shall not be broken or altered in any way.
- 8 That the use of the garden store hereby permitted shall be restricted to private use incidental to the enjoyment of the house on the site and no commercial activity shall be carried out in or from the garden store.

REASONS

- 1 To accord with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.
- 2 In the interests of amenity and in order to retain effective planning control.
- 3 To ensure satisfactory integration of the proposed extension with the existing building both in terms of design and materials.
- 4 To ensure a satisfactory integration of the proposed development with the existing building both in terms of design and materials
- 5 In the interests of amenity and in order to retain effective planning control.
- 6 In the interests of amenity and in order to retain effective planning control.
- 7 In the interests of the visual amenity of the area.
- 8 To retain effective planning control and safeguard the amenity of the area.

For information only

For information only

