



## Delegated Report

Reference no.	P/19/0316
Date	08 July 2019

<b>Planning proposal:</b>	Erection of two storey side extension with associated alterations
<b>Location:</b>	15 Reay Avenue East Kilbride G74 1QT

**Application Type :** Householder  
**Applicant :** Mr Derek Haughey  
**Location :** 15 Reay Avenue  
East Kilbride  
G74 1QT  
**Decision:** Application refused  
**Report by:** Area Manager (Planning & Building Standards)

**Policy reference:**  
**South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan (adopted 2015)**  
Policy 4 - Development management and placemaking  
Policy 6 - General urban area/settlements

**Development management, placemaking and design supplementary guidance (2015)**  
Policy DM1 – Design  
Policy DM2 - House extensions and alterations

**Proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2**  
Policy 3 - General Urban Areas and Settlements  
Policy 5 - Development Management and Placemaking  
Policy DM1 – New Development Design  
Policy DM2 - House Extensions and Alterations

**Assessment:**

Impact on privacy?	No
Impact on sunlight/daylight?	No
Impact on amenity?	Yes
Traffic issues?	No
Adheres to development plan policy?	No
Adverse comments from consultees?	No

**Representation(s):**

▶	0	Objection letters
▶	0	Support letters
▶	0	Comment letters

## **Planning Application Delegated Report**

### **1 Application Summary**

- 1.1 The applicant seeks detailed planning consent for the erection of a two storey side extension to an existing semi-detached dwellinghouse at 15 Reay Avenue, East Kilbride. The application site is located within an established residential area.
- 1.2 In terms of its design, the proposed two storey side extension would project approximately 2.7 metres from the existing side elevation of the property, and it would extend almost the full length of the existing dwellinghouse. It would be set back approximately 0.75m from the existing front building line, and the ridge height would be approximately 0.3m lower than that of the ridge of the dwellinghouse. The extension would be built up to the side boundary, and the agent has advised that the bins would need to be stored to the front of the property as there would be no external access to the rear garden. Three parking spaces are shown to the front of the property. However the centre space is significantly smaller than the other two spaces proposed and it does not achieve the minimum dimensions required (2.5m x 5m). It would not be able to be counted as a parking space.
- 1.3 The extension would allow for an additional bedroom and en-suite to be formed on the upper floor and a 'games room' and studio on the ground floor. One of the existing bedrooms has been re-labelled as a study on the proposed floor plan, however it is recognised that both it and the 'games room' could be used to serve as a bedroom for the applicants or for any future residents of the property. As such, the extension potentially increases the size of the property from a 3 bedroom to a 5 bedroom dwellinghouse.
- 1.4 On 29th May 2018 the Planning Committee approved the proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 (Volumes 1 and 2) and Supporting Planning Guidance on Renewable Energy. The new plan builds on the policies and proposals contained in the currently adopted South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan. For the purposes of determining planning applications the proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 is now a material consideration. In this instance Policies 3, 5, DM1 and DM2 are relevant.

### **2 Representation(s)**

- 2.1 Statutory neighbour notification was undertaken in respect of this application and no letters of representation have been received as a result of this publicity. No formal consultations were required to be undertaken in respect of this proposal.

### **3 Assessment and Conclusions**

- 3.1 The proposed development requires to be assessed against the provisions of the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan (SLLDP) and its associated Supplementary Guidance. The proposed development is located within a residential area where Policy 6 of SLLDP applies. Policy 6 – General Urban Area/Settlements states developments will not be permitted if they are detrimental to the amenity of residents. Policy 4 – Development Management and Placemaking of SLLDP also requires all development to take account of, and be integrated with the local context and built form. It provides a list of criteria to be met when assessing development proposals, including ensuring:
  - There is no significant adverse impact on adjacent buildings or streetscape in terms of layout, scale, massing, design, external materials or amenity;
  - The proposed development is accessible for all, provides suitable access and parking, encourages active travel and has no adverse implications for public safety; and that,

- It accords with other relevant policies and proposals in the development plan and with other appropriate supplementary guidance.

3.2 Policies DM1 – Design and DM2 – House Extensions and Alterations of Supplementary Guidance 3: Development Management, Placemaking and Design (SG3) support Policy 4 of SLLDP and provide further guidance. Policy DM1 requires proposals to meet design policy appropriate to the proposal, in this case Policy DM2. Policy DM2 states that house extensions and alterations will be considered favourably where it can be demonstrated that the proposal meets certain criteria, including ensuring:

- The siting, form, scale, design and materials respect the character of the existing dwelling and the wider area. Within this context, high quality, innovative design will be encouraged when it complements the character of the building and its surroundings;
- It does not dominate or overwhelm the existing dwelling, neighbouring properties or streetscene in terms of size, scale or height; and that,
- It retains adequate car parking, usable garden ground and bin storage within the site.

3.3 In addition to this, further guidance is provided within SG3 on two storey extensions and this includes the criteria that proposals of this type should:

- Be designed and positioned such that no significant loss of amenity occurs to neighbouring properties through overlooking, loss of light, overshadowing or sheer physical impact;
- Not if repeated on detached/semi-detached properties, result in the formation of a continuous terrace; and
- Be set back 1.0m from the front elevation and from side property boundaries by a minimum of 1.0m.

3.4 Following a detailed assessment of this proposal it is considered that it would have a significant adverse impact upon adjacent dwellings and the streetscape in terms of the size and scale of the proposed extension and its proximity to the boundary. The extension would be built up to the boundary and the Council's guidance on two storey extensions states that proposals should be set back from the boundary by a minimum of 1 metre to avoid a potential terracing effect if repeated on neighbouring properties. In addition the proposed extension is not set back sufficiently from the front elevation and the ridge height is only slightly lower than that of the existing roof. As a result the overall scale and mass of the extension is considered to be overdevelopment of the site. The size of the proposed extension would be out of character with other properties in the street, and the proposal would have an adverse impact upon the streetscape of the area.

3.5 The size of the proposed extension also results in bin storage for the property being required to the front as there is no external access to the rear garden. Four waste bins would need to be stored at the front. No details have been provided of screening to minimise the visual impact of this. In addition, a property of this size requires the provision of a minimum of 3 off-street parking spaces (minimum 2.5m x 5m dimension), and only two spaces can be provided on this basis. A third space is indicated on the drawings, however it is too short to be considered as a space and the location in relation to the front door is such that it could not be practically used even by a shorter than average vehicle. It would also require the front garden to fully hard surfaced to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area. It is for these reasons that the proposal is considered to be contrary to the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan and its Supplementary Guidance.

3.6 The agent has provided examples of other side extensions within the local area. However none of these examples were directly comparable to this proposal. The applicant's property is positioned further forward in the plot to many other dwellings within the estate,

limiting the depth of the front garden and there is limited curtilage to the side to extend. In assessment of the examples provided by the agent and applicant none of the examples exhibited the same site characteristics or positioning within the plot and streetscene. As such, none of these examples are considered to result in a terracing effect or a material change to the streetscape. Furthermore there is appropriate parking to serve these enlarged properties. For these reasons, I cannot agree that the proposed extension is directly comparable to these proposals or that they would justify a departure from the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan and its associated Supplementary Guidance.

- 3.7 The proposed development has also been considered against the relevant policies in the proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 (SLLDP2) and it is noted that these policies are broadly consistent with the current adopted South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 1. It is therefore considered that the proposal is also contrary to Policies 3, 5, DM1 and DM2 in the proposed SLLDP2.
- 3.8 Throughout the assessment of this application a number of alternative proposals were discussed with the agent to attempt to resolve some of the concerns expressed by the Planning Service. However no agreement could be reached on these and the applicant's agent has confirmed the final set of drawings to be considered in the assessment of this proposal. The relevant policies of SLLDP and the proposed SLLDP2 have been fully considered against these and for the reasons detailed above the proposed development is considered to be unacceptable.
- 3.9 It is therefore considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact upon adjacent dwellings and the streetscape in terms of the size, scale and design of the proposed extension and its proximity to the boundary. As such, the proposal would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the area and does not comply with the relevant policies of the development plan. Planning consent is therefore refused in this instance.

#### **4 Reason for decision**

- 4.1 Due to its size, scale and design, the proposal is considered to be overdevelopment of the site and contrary to the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan and Supplementary Guidance (Policies 4, 6, DM1 and DM2) and the proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 (Policies 3, 5, DM1 and DM2). There are no material considerations that would justify a departure from the development plan.

**Delegating officer: Gwen McCracken**

**Date: 8 July 2019**

#### **Previous references**

- ◆ None

#### **List of background papers**

- ▶ Application Form
- ▶ Application Plans
- ▶ South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2015 (adopted)
- ▶ Development management placemaking and design supplementary guidance (2015)
- ▶ Proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2
- ▶ Neighbour notification letter dated 12 March 2019
- ▶ Correspondence with agent, various dates

Contact for further information

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

Andrew Muir, Planning Officer, Montrose House, 154 Montrose Crescent, Hamilton, ML3 6LB

Phone: 01698 455058

Email: [andrew.muir2@southlanarkshire.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.muir2@southlanarkshire.gov.uk)

## Planning Application

Application number: P/19/0316

### Reasons for refusal

01. The proposal is contrary to Policies 4 and 6 of the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan as it will have a detrimental impact on residential amenity due to the size, scale and design of the proposed extension and its proximity to the boundary. It will also result in inappropriate parking arrangements and bin storage to serve the enlarged dwellinghouse to the detriment of the amenity of the area and will not accord with the other relevant policies contained within the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan and Supplementary Guidance.
02. The proposal is contrary to Policies DM1 and DM2 of the Development Management, Placemaking and Design Supplementary Guidance as the siting, form, scale and design of the proposed extension does not respect the character of the existing dwelling and the wider area and may result in the formation of a continuous terrace as the extension has not been set back 1 metre from the front elevation and from the side boundary. It is overdevelopment of the site as it will result in inappropriate parking arrangements and bin storage and will not accord with the other relevant policies contained within the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan and Supplementary Guidance.
03. The proposal is contrary to Policies 3, 5, DM1 and DM2 of the Proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 as it will have a detrimental impact on residential amenity due to the size, scale and design of the proposed extension and its proximity to the boundary. It will also result in inappropriate parking arrangements and bin storage to serve the enlarged dwellinghouse to the detriment of the amenity of the area.

### Reason(s) for decision

Due to its size, scale and design, the proposal is considered to be overdevelopment of the site and contrary to the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan and Supplementary Guidance (Policies 4, 6, DM1 and DM2) and the proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 (Policies 3, 5, DM1 and DM2). There are no material considerations that would justify a departure from the development plan.

### Informatives

01. This decision relates to drawing numbers:

Reference	Version No:	Plan Status
1 of 12	B	Approved
2 of 12	B	Approved
3 of 12	C	Approved
4 of 12	B	Approved
5 of 12	B	Approved
6 of 12	B	Approved
7 of 12	C	Approved
8 of 12	C	Approved

9 of 12	C	Approved
10 of 12	C	Approved
11 of 12	B	Approved
12 of 12	C	Approved