

42/14/0047

MR A LEHNER

**ERECTION OF THREE STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR, FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION TO SIDE, ALTERATIONS TO FRONT AND DETACHED GARAGE AT OAKLANDS, TRULL**

Location: OAKLANDS, 7 GATCHELL MEADOW, TRULL, TAUNTON, TA3 7HY

Grid Reference: 321150.122033

Full Planning Permission

---

**RECOMMENDATION AND REASON(S)**

Recommended Decision: Conditional Approval

**RECOMMENDED CONDITION(S) (if applicable)**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 91 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- (A3) DrNo 14.26.01A Location Plan and Block Plan
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.02A Existing Site Plan
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.03A Proposed Site Plan
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.04 Existing Ground Floor Plan and Existing Cross Section
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.05 Existing First Floor Plan
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.06 Existing Second Floor Plan
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.07 Existing Roof Plan
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.08 Existing Front and Rear Elevations
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.09 Existing Elevations (Sides)
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.10 Proposed Ground Floor Plan and Proposed Cross Section
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.11 Proposed First Floor Plan
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.12 Proposed Second Floor Plan
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.13 Proposed Roof Plan
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.14 Proposed Front and Rear Elevations
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.15 Proposed Side Elevations
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.16 Proposed Garage Plan and Elevations
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.17 Exploded 3D Model Images
- (A3) DrNo 14.26.18 3D Model Views

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out and thereafter retained as such, in accordance with the approved details as above, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy.

4. (i) Before any part of the permitted development is commenced, a landscaping scheme, which shall include details of the species, siting and numbers to be planted, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- (ii) The scheme shall be completely carried out within the first available planting season from the date of commencement of the development, or as otherwise extended with the agreement in writing of the Local Planning Authority.
- (iii) For a period of five years after the completion of each landscaping scheme, the trees and shrubs shall be protected and maintained in a healthy weed free condition and any trees or shrubs that cease to grow shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of similar size and species, or the appropriate trees or shrubs as may be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy.

#### Notes to Applicant

1. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework the Council has worked in a positive and pro-active way and has imposed planning conditions to enable the grant of planning permission.

#### **PROPOSAL**

The proposal is to erect a rear and side extension with replacement balcony, a first floor side extension and new double garage to the front of the large existing detached property. The double garage will be 5.4m x 5.8m and constructed of materials to match the house. This garage reflects that granted in 2009 and will be sited to the south of the access point off the existing drive. The rear extension will project between 2.4m and 3m from the rear of the existing dwelling and 2.2m to the

side. The house extension increases the size of the kitchen and living room on the ground floor, provides additional space in two bedrooms an enlarged balcony and new ensuite at first floor and provides a gym in the gable set into the roof space.

## **SITE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY**

The property is a large detached dwelling set in a large plot at the end of a cul de sac of detached properties and was built in the early 1990's. To the north lies Gatchell Oaks, a complex of retirement homes built in the grounds of the former squash club, while to the south lies a line of modern detached houses built off a private road.

The original outline permission for the dwelling here was granted in 1992, ref. 42/91/0049, while the detailed permission was granted in April 1993 ref. 42/93/0006. A full permission for a garage was granted in 2009, ref. 42/09/0035.

## **CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION RESPONSES**

### **Consultees**

*TRULL PARISH COUNCIL* - Support this application. Councillors felt the design bore similarities to a neighbouring extended property and was therefore acceptable. They have taken on board concerns raised about mutual overlooking from the new balcony but felt these were of insufficient merit to object to the application.

### **Representations**

Ward Cllr Edwards - "I am extremely concerned at the impact the property has on two near neighbours, in one instance the changes to this existing property and the vast expanses of glass will directly look into Burches the property of Mr and Mrs Tooze which I find completely unacceptable. Then in the instance of Mr and Mrs Hall at Kingsthorpe the new glass fronted balcony now extends towards their property at an angle and will directly over look their back garden, I believe the existing balcony is quite close enough as it is. I must also add that I am not satisfied that the drawings submitted are accurate as the new balcony seems to me to be much closer in reality than the drawings show and I would like this point to be checked.

I have attached a photograph on behalf of Mr Hall of the present view from his back garden of the house as it is presently which I agreed to send on his behalf. There are a number of other points raised by near neighbours which I am sure you will take into consideration whilst considering this application but I just wanted to highlight these specific concerns.

9 letters of OBJECTION raising issues of

- scale of extension and garage are disproportionate to footprint of existing property
- inappropriate overbearing 3 storey extension,
- increase in size and change of appearance would be out of keeping,
- balcony area causes overlooking to an unacceptable degree and loss of privacy,
- poor design,

- stone wall to side replaced with glass and will be an eyesore,
- glass walls and zinc roof do not fit into Trull environment and likely to be contrary to neighbourhood plan,
- west elevation totally out of character with existing building and traditional materials of property in the area,
- there are significant differences between the extension at No.8 and Oaklands. The glass atrium visually appears as a large structure as windows are set in a zinc surround on all sides. The projection from the ridge is 6.3m with vertical clad zinc walls. The elevation is nearly all glass and zinc and is significant increase in the mass of the building and is out of character
- materials inappropriate,
- first floor "wrap around" balcony is an unwelcome intrusion on privacy of neighbours
- change is out of character with surrounding houses and looks like a cathedral frontage more akin to structures in central London,
- the property is visible from the surrounding area and footpaths and reflective materials would form a blot on the visual landscape,
- new garage could be used for business and should be controlled by condition.

## **PLANNING POLICIES**

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework,  
 DM1 - TD CORE STRATEGY - GENERAL REQUIREMENTS,  
 H17 - TDBCLP - Extensions to Dwellings,

## **LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS**

The proposal is not CIL liable.

The development of this site would not result in payment to the Council of the New Homes Bonus.

## **DETERMINING ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS**

The proposed works involve rear and side extensions and a new garage. The new garage is similar to that approved in 2009 but wasn't implemented. It is not considered to have an adverse impact on neighbours and is considered acceptable. It is not considered necessary to impose conditions in respect of this use as any alternative business use that concerns have been raised over would need a separate planning application and therefore a condition is unnecessary.

The side extension at first floor level to the north provides an ensuite and is constructed in materials to match the main house. The rear extension projects a maximum of 3m where the proposal extends the living room and balcony above, while the main upper floor extension only projects just over 2m. The scale of the extension is not considered disproportionate to the existing dwelling. The ground floor extension to the living room is angled to be more parallel to the boundary so it faces more directly down the garden. At ground floor level this element of the extension is constructed in stone to match the existing, while the rear projections to

the north are clad in zinc that is dark grey in colour. This extension is designed to be subservient to the main dwelling and while parts of the extension are in matching materials to the existing, such as the garage and side extensions, some of the rear elements of the extension are in a contrasting zinc. It is not considered that the contrasting zinc elements at the rear have such a visual impact to be so out of keeping to warrant refusal. It is not uncommon for modern extensions to be constructed in a contrasting material. The neighbour to the north for example has utilised timber cladding. The relevant section of Core Strategy policy DM1 is paragraph d "The appearance and character of any affected landscape, settlement, building or street scene would not be harmed by the development". The proposed extension is not considered to harm the street scene and it is not considered that the elements at the rear that are in zinc have such an impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling to warrant a refusal.

The other element of the extension that has raised a concern is the impact on privacy of the new balcony. The property as existing already has a balcony at the rear and from this it is possible to see directly into the rear garden at Kingsthorpe. It is not considered that the balcony will directly impact on other dwellings. The extension will see the blocking of the existing side wall and creation of a new wrap around balcony. This will project marginally closer to the boundary to the south and would be 9m away from the boundary and around 33m to the neighbouring house. This is more than the standard window to window distance. The issue here is whether this change is such an adverse impact over and above the current situation to harm the amenity of the neighbour to warrant a refusal contrary to policy H17(A). The applicant intends to plant a number of trees along the boundary to limit overlooking and prevent views of their balcony. It is considered appropriate to condition this mitigation which would improve the situation in terms of visibility to and from the balcony. With appropriate conditions it is considered that the impact of the proposed extension would be an acceptable one and the application is therefore recommended for approval.

**In preparing this report the Planning Officer has considered fully the implications and requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998.**

**CONTACT OFFICER: Mr D Addicott Tel: 01823 356463**