

Report

10

Report to:	Hamilton Area Committee
Date of Meeting:	30 November 2011
Report by:	Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)

Application No	HM/11/0421
Planning Proposal:	Erection of Rear Extension and Installation of Front Dormer to House at 8 Dunlop Crescent, Bothwell

1 Summary Application Information

- Application Type : Detailed Planning Application
- Applicant : Mr and Mrs John Houston
- Location : 8 Dunlop Crescent
Bothwell
G71 8SG

2 Recommendation(s)

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

- (1) Grant detailed planning permission (Subject to conditions – based on the conditions attached)

2.2 Other Actions/Notes

- (1) The Area Committee has delegated powers to determine the application.

3 Other Information

- ◆ Applicant's Agent: BM Design
- ◆ Council Area/Ward: 16 Bothwell and Uddingston
- ◆ Policy Reference(s): **South Lanarkshire Local Plan (adopted 2009)**
Policy RES6 – Residential Land Use
Policy DM1 – Development Management
Policy DM4 – House extension and alterations

- ◆ Representation(s):
 - ▶ 10 Objection Letters
 - ▶ 7 Support Letters
 - ▶ 0 Comments Letters

- ◆ Consultation(s):
None

Planning Application Report

1 Application Site

- 1.1 The application site is located at 8 Dunlop Crescent, within a residential area of Bothwell, outwith the conservation area. The site accommodates a detached bungalow located within a large plot at a corner of the crescent.
- 1.2 Dunlop Crescent has a mixture of semi-detached and detached bungalows of varying shapes and sizes, many of which have been extended previously by various means including one and a half storey rear extensions, single storey rear and side extensions, conservatories and dormer installations. Indeed the properties immediately adjoining the site (Nos. 6 and 10 Dunlop Crescent) have both been previously extended.
- 1.3 Dunlop Crescent was built in the 1930's and the various properties display characteristics of this period notwithstanding numerous alterations/extensions. In terms of levels, the site is relatively flat and accommodates a single garage at the rear of the site. Due to its corner position the property has a generous side garden area.
- 1.4 The neighbouring bungalow to the east (No. 6) has, in general terms, a slightly higher ground level.

2 Proposal(s)

- 2.1 The applicant seeks detailed planning permission for the erection of a rear extension with pitched roof and the installation of a front dormer to their property. In addition the existing garage will be demolished.
- 2.2 The one and a half storey extension will be approximately 10.8 metres wide (the same width of the house) and 4.05 metres in depth, (approximately 44 square metres) rising to a height of approximately 7 metres at the top of the pitched roof. Internally the proposed extension will accommodate a breakfast/living room on the ground floor and an ensuite master bedroom on the upper floor.
- 2.3 At the same time the internal arrangements of the house, including the roofspace, will be altered/remodeled to provide additional bedroom accommodation in the roof (4 bedrooms including the master bedroom referred to previously and bathroom provision). At ground level new doors will be formed, including two sets of bi-fold doors in the proposed extension, one of which will be installed in the side of the extension facing Dunlop crescent. Rooflights will be installed in both sides of the roof, those nearest to No. 6 being for non-habitable rooms.
- 2.4 The proposed rear extension will have a gable end roof facing the property at the rear. High level (1800 mm above floor level) triangular windows are proposed for this elevation at roof level.
- 2.5 The property is finished in roughcast with concrete tiles and the materials proposed for the extension will match the existing.
- 2.6 The proposed site plan also illustrates that a section of the existing front/side garden and wall will be partially removed and the kerb dropped to form a new access and car parking. The existing driveway at the rear will be reinstated as garden ground. The applicant has also confirmed in writing that fencing will also be replaced and/or renewed to match existing. These changes however would be 'permitted development' and therefore do not require planning consent.
- 2.6 The applicant has submitted a letter in support of their proposal which also addresses, from their perspective, concerns raised in the letters of representation.

3 Background

3.1 Local Plan Status

3.1.1 In terms of the South Lanarkshire Local Plan the site is identified as being within a Residential Area therefore Policy RES6 – Residential Land Use - is relevant. Policy RES6 states that the Council will oppose the loss of houses to other uses and will resist any development that will be detrimental to the amenity of those areas. Policy RES6 notes that developments must relate satisfactorily to neighbouring properties in terms of scale, materials and massing. Development should also be of a good quality design.

3.1.2 Policy DM1 – Development Management - is also relevant and requires all planning applications to take account of the local context and built form and should be compatible with adjacent buildings and surrounding streetscape in terms of scale, massing, design, external materials and impact on amenity. Developments should enhance the quality and appearance of the local environment and when assessing planning applications, the Council will require proposals to comply with a number of criteria.

3.1.3 Policy DM4 – House Extensions and Alterations - provides detailed criteria with respect to house extensions and alterations. Proposals should have respect to the character of existing dwellings and the wider area in terms of their scale, design and materials. Proposals should not dominate or overwhelm the existing dwelling or neighbouring dwelling and should not adversely affect neighbouring properties in terms of privacy, sunlight or daylight. House extensions should retain adequate off street car parking and useable garden ground.

3.2 Relevant Government Advice/Guidance

3.2.1 Given the nature of the proposal there is no specific government guidance relative to the determination of this application.

3.3 Planning Background

3.3.1 As detailed above in paragraph 1.2, there are several properties within the immediate area that have been extended in a variety of ways including the erection of rear extensions and the installation of front dormer windows.

4 Consultation(s)

4.1 No consultations were required to be carried out in respect of this application.

5 Representation(s)

5.1 Statutory neighbour notification procedures were undertaken in respect of the proposal. Ten letters of objection and seven letters of support were received.

5.2 The grounds of objection are summarised as follows: -

a) Inaccurate plans and planning application form.

Response: It is accepted that when the application was lodged there were a number of inaccuracies in the drawings. Amended plans have however been submitted which have addressed the inaccuracies highlighted. They also illustrate the other works that are to be carried out within the application site which on their own would not require planning consent as detailed above in paragraph 2.6. In addition an amended application form has been submitted to address the section on parking.

- b) **Proposal is out of character with the street and the area. Proposal is overdevelopment of site and will result in a loss of amenity. No other properties in the surrounding area have been developed to this height or scale.**

Response: Dunlop Crescent consists of semi-detached and detached bungalows of varying shapes and sizes. It is not a conservation area or other recognised environmentally sensitive location and on this basis every house must have potential to extend all other factors being acceptable. Indeed, a number of the neighbouring houses have already been extended, some in a similar manner to that now proposed.

The extension has been designed to reflect the existing house and in many ways resembles other extensions that have been approved by the Council. The plot is relatively large and it is considered that there is sufficient space for the extension to be accommodated. In addition it will not be too close or overburden neighbouring properties in an unacceptable manner. Indeed other rear extensions of a similar depth have been approved in the locality.

It is accepted that the application site is at a prominent corner location and that the rear extension will therefore be visible from the street. Nevertheless, the impact of the proposal on the character or visual amenity of the house or street scene will still be within acceptable limits; many rear extensions are visible from public roads and there are many extensions that occupy 'corner' locations. On this basis there is no reason to assume that it will be out of context or result in a negative visual impact.

The front dormer element of the proposal raises no issues and is a common feature on various properties in the immediate area. In a similar manner so are rooflights which in normal circumstances can be installed without the need for planning consent.

- c) **Loss of privacy as a result of overlooking.**

Response: Amended drawings have been submitted which have replaced upper floor bedroom doors on the proposed rear elevation with rear facing high level windows 1.8 metres above floor level to prevent direct overlooking. Additional rooflights are also proposed to comply with building regulations which will not have an adverse impact on privacy. The proposed velux windows adjacent to 6 Dunlop Crescent will be for non-habitable rooms. In addition the size of the proposed extension has also been reduced in depth from 4.26 metres to 4.05 metres so that it is not as close to the rear boundary as originally proposed. Overall it is considered that the proposal will be within acceptable parameters, all aspects considered, and will not result in a material loss of privacy. In this connection it must be accepted that absolute privacy in an established residential area is difficult to achieve and that a degree of mutual overlooking is commonplace.

- d) **Overshadowing of neighbouring bungalows.**

Response: All forms of development will generate a shadow of some description and therefore it is the extent and size of shadow that is important. In this regard the gardens of neighbouring houses are relatively large. The depth of the proposed extension has been reduced so that it is not as close to the rear boundary as originally proposed. Furthermore the extension will be approximately 3.5 metres high at its nearest point (1250 mm) to the common boundary, with No. 6 Dunlop Crescent after which there is the width of the

neighbour's driveway which sits at a slightly higher level than the applicant's existing dwellinghouse.

The highest part of the extension will be 6670 mm from the mutual boundary of No.6, nearly the same distance as its height. It is accepted that this extension will be immediately to the west of No.6, but given the distances involved, I am not persuaded that any impact in terms of overshadowing will be material. In reaching this view it is acknowledged that the rear garden of No.6 is enclosed by hedging and a garage which themselves will result in some shadowing.

The proposed extension will be approximately 4 metres from the rear boundary and over 10 metres from an extension at 10 Dunlop Crescent. Given these distances, the size of gardens, the travel path of the sun and the relationship between neighbouring properties, it is considered that there will not be a significant or material impact in terms of overshadowing that would merit refusal of this application.

e) No adequate provision for usable rear garden ground.

Response: After development there will be approximately 50% of usable rear garden ground remaining which is in accordance with policy. In addition it is proposed to reinstate part of the original side garden area and therefore I am of the view that sufficient amenity space will remain.

5.2 The grounds of support are summarised as follows: -

a) The sympathetic development will upgrade the area whilst safeguarding the property and its essential architectural features. The proposal represents investment in the property. The site is clearly in need of improvement. Many other houses in the area have been updated. It is considered that the proposal will enhance the appearance of the existing house and the area in general and will not affect neighbouring properties.

Response: Noted.

5.3 These letters are available for inspection in the usual manner and on the Planning Portal.

6 Assessment and Conclusions

6.1 The applicant seeks detailed planning permission for the erection of a rear extension and the installation of a front dormer to their property at 8 Dunlop Crescent, Bothwell. The determining issues in consideration of this application are its compliance with local plan policy, and in particular, its impact on the amenity of the adjacent properties.

6.2 In terms of the content of the South Lanarkshire Local Plan, the application site is within a residential area where the applicable policy (RES6) resists any development that would impact negatively on the character or amenity of such an area. It is considered that the proposed development from a land use perspective raises no issues.

6.3 In terms of the details associated with the proposed extensions, Policies DM1 and DM4 are relevant. It is considered that the proposed extension is located sufficient distance away from neighbouring properties to ensure that it will have no material or adverse impact in terms of loss of sunlight and daylight. The scale and design of the extension has been amended as detailed previously following comments from the

Planning Service to reduce its size and ensure that it does not have an adverse impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties. In addition, the installation of the front dormer raises no issues and is a common feature on various properties in the immediate area. It is considered that the amended extension has taken cognizance of the local context and built form in terms of finishing materials, design, massing and scale and overall that the proposed development is in accordance with these policies.

- 6.4 With regards to the representations received these aspects have been considered in detail in section 5 of this report. It is considered that the issues raised are not, either individually or collectively, of sufficient weight or merit to justify refusal of this application in this instance.
- 6.5 In view of the above it is considered that the normal presumption in favour of granting consent for proposals that comply with the development plan should prevail. The issue of planning consent subject to conditions is therefore recommended.

7 Reasons for Decision

- 7.1 The proposal has no adverse impact on either residential amenity or road safety and complies with Policies RES6 and DM1 of the South Lanarkshire Local Plan.

Colin McDowall
Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)

9 November 2011

Previous References

- ◆ None

List of Background Papers

- ▶ Application Form
- ▶ Application Plans
- ▶ South Lanarkshire Local Plan
- ▶ Neighbour notification letter, dated 20 September 2011
- ▶ Press Advert, dated 29 September 2011
- ▶ Amended drawings received 27 October 2011

► Representations

- Representation from : Dr Adele Warrilow, 5 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell G71 8SG, DATED 10/10/2011
- Representation from : Dr Daniel Silcock, 5 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell G71 8SG, DATED 10/10/2011
- Representation from : Frances Colgan and Martin Colgan, 18 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell,G71 8SG, DATED 19/10/2011
- Representation from : Mr and Mrs Fleming, 1 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell,G71 8SG, DATED 19/10/2011
- Representation from : Mrs A Mills, 24 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell G71 8GF, DATED 25/10/2011
- Representation from : Mrs Caroline Wratten, 4 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell,G71 8SG, DATED 17/10/2011
- Representation from : Mr and Mrs J McManus, 12 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell,G71 8SG, DATED 11/10/2011
- Representation from : Joseph Keatings, 20 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell,G71 8SG, DATED 02/11/2011
- Representation from : June Ann Cook, 7 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell,, DATED 21/10/2011
- Representation from : Maxwell C Black, 10 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell,G71 8SG, DATED 07/10/2011
- Representation from : Alison C Black, 10 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell,G71 8SG, DATED 07/10/2011
- Representation from : Gordon P Smith, 3 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell G71 8SG, DATED 10/10/2011
- Representation from : Patricia Walker, 15 Silverwells Crescent,Bothwell,G71 8DR, DATED 18/10/2011
- Representation from : Mrs Mary McWhinney, 23 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell,Glasgow,G71 8SG, DATED 18/10/2011
- Representation from : James Warrilow, 6 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell,G71 8SG, DATED 10/10/2011
- Representation from : Rita Warrilow, 6 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell,G71 8SG, DATED 10/10/2011
- Representation from : Mr and Mrs William Prentice, 11 Dunlop Crescent,Bothwell, DATED 20/10/2011

Contact for Further Information

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

Murray Reid, Planning Officer, Montrose House, Hamilton
Ext 3625 (Tel :01698 453625)
E-mail: planning@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

Detailed Planning Application

PAPER APART – APPLICATION NUMBER : HM/11/0421

CONDITIONS

- 1 This decision relates to drawing numbers:
 - 1 (Rev A)
 - 2 (Rev A)
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5 (Rev A)
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8 (Rev A)
 - 9 (Rev A)
 - 10 (Rev A)
- 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 the face and cheeks of the dormer hereby approved shall be finished in tiles to match the existing roof.
- 4 That for the avoidance of doubt no other window openings other than those expressly authorised by this consent shall be installed at any time in the development hereby approved without the submission of a further planning application to the Council as Planning Authority.

REASONS

- 1 For the avoidance of doubt and to specify the drawings upon which the decision was made.
- 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 satisfactory integration of the proposed extension 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.

For information only

For information only

