

31/12/0015

MR P BULL

ERECTION OF TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE AT ROSEDALE, HENLADE, TAUNTON (AS AMENDED)

Grid Reference: 327156.124056

Full Planning Permission

RECOMMENDATION AND REASON(S)

Recommended Decision: Conditional Approval

The scheme would assist in providing the required accommodation for a disabled resident, where there are limited other options to achieve this and whilst not an ideal design, is not deemed to cause unacceptable detriment to the appearance of the property or the surrounding area. The proposal, as amended, is not considered to result in a material impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and will have no adverse impact on highway safety. As such, the proposal is in accordance with Policy DM1 (General Requirements) of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy and retained Policy H17 (Extensions to Dwellings) of the Taunton Deane Local Plan.

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:

(A1) DrNo 2512-02 Rev B Proposed Plans, Elevations and Section
(A4) DrNo 2512-03 Location Plan
(A4) DrNo 2512-04 Site Plan
(A1) DrNo 2512_05 Rev A Proposed Plans and Elevations - Garage

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

3. The accommodation hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as Rosedale.

Reason: The local planning authority is not of the opinion that the site is

capable of accommodating a further residential unit, 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 with the applicant and has negotiated amendments to the application to enable the grant of planning permission.

PROPOSAL

Rosedale is a brick and tile detached gabled bungalow with a gabled projection to the front. It lies in a row of two storey and chalet bungalow properties fronting the A358 at Henlade. The property is set back from the road with a large parking area to the front. A low brick wall with hedge above forms the boundary to the road.

This application seeks planning permission for a detached double garage to the rear of the property in the north-west corner to replace the single garage which is being converted into a sitting room. The garage would be of render and tile, with an external staircase to the rear to access the first floor. Two rooflights are proposed in the east elevation. It was initially proposed to erect a timber screen at the top of the staircase for privacy and following concerns raised by the case officer, this has now been extended to run alongside the full staircase. It is also proposed to erect a two storey rear extension to form a garden room with additional en-suite bedroom above. This would be of brick and tile to match the existing bungalow.

Supplementary information has been provided stating that the extension is required to meet the needs of the applicant's disabled daughter, who is wheelchair bound. The existing rooms on the eastern end of the bungalow are being adapted to provide a living area that meets her needs and as such replacement rooms are required. The query was raised by the case officer as to whether the additional accommodation could be provided by the conversion of the remaining loft, but it has been stated that this would require the installation of a second staircase, which would compromise the current rooms and circulation areas, which would be lost or made smaller. Alternatively the use of the current staircase in the west end of the dwelling would result in the loss of the existing first floor bedroom that would effectively become a landing. It was also stated that they required the existing storage provided in the loft.

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION RESPONSES

Consultees

SCC - TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT GROUP - This proposal represents no significant increase in the occupancy of the site so the principle of development is acceptable. The development is situated along Ilminster Road also known as the A358 a National Primary Route as stated in Policy 51 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review to which a 30mph speed limit past the site applies. From carrying out a site visit I observed that this is a heavily trafficked

road and can become congested at peak times.

In detail, the planning application seeks to erect a double garage and extension to the dwelling. Having made a site visit and studied the drawings accompanying the planning application, it is clear that the internal dimensions of the garage meet the guidelines set out in the Somerset County Council – Parking Strategy (adopted March 2012). Additionally the site will retain ample parking and space within the site to accommodate vehicle turning. Therefore taking into account the above information I raise no objection to this proposal and if planning permission, suggest condition.

RUISHTON & THORNFALCON PARISH COUNCIL - No comments received

Representations

None received

PLANNING POLICIES

DM1 - TD CORE STRATEGY - GENERAL REQUIREMENTS,
H17 - TDBCLP - Extensions to Dwellings,

DETERMINING ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed garage would be positioned to the rear of the dwelling at the bottom of the garden. The existing dwelling is set back from the road and largely screened by the front hedge and the garage would be to the rear of the dwelling. As such, the garage would not be in a prominent position and would be hardly visible from public viewpoint. The garage is proposed of gabled roof design to match that of the surrounding properties and the staircase to the rear with a timber screen is not considered to harm the appearance of the building. Whilst it would be usual for the garage to be brick to match the existing dwelling, in this instance it is positioned to the rear of Rosedale, reasonably close to Court Cottage, which is a rendered property. The use of render is therefore considered acceptable in this instance and would have no adverse impact on the street scene.

Although the garage would lie close to the boundary with Court Cottage and Highcroft, it would be a sufficient distance from the dwellings themselves and would not lie directly adjacent to the main amenity space. As such, it would not result in any loss of light or overbearing impact. The rooflights in the garage face into the garden of Rosedale and are positioned a sufficient distance from the neighbouring property to avoid overlooking concerns. The staircase would lie directly adjacent to the boundary with neighbouring properties, which would normally raise concern regarding overlooking. However, the addition of the timber screen on the landing and along the side of the staircase itself, would overcome concerns regarding a loss of privacy.

The proposed rear extension would be a two storey extension on a bungalow, the principle of which is generally unacceptable. By virtue of it's design and particularly the eaves level, it would not relate well to the existing dwelling and would change it's

overall character. However, it is noted that this is required to assist in providing adequate accommodation to meet the needs of the applicant's disabled daughter. There have been discussions between the case officer and agent to establish whether there is any other way of extending the property to achieve the required accommodation that would have less impact on its character. The limited alternative options would however result in significantly compromising existing accommodation available, along with losing the valued and much needed storage space.

It is therefore essential to consider whether the proposed extension would result in such detriment that would outweigh the needs of the disabled resident. Whilst the extension does not relate well to the existing property, it is pertinent to note that a large dormer extension could be erected on the rear of the dwelling under permitted development rights that could result in a similar impact on the character of the property than that proposed. Furthermore, a similar large two storey rear extension has been carried out next door at Barn Close, although by virtue of the original design of the property, it is noted that the extension did result in a lesser impact on its character. The proposed extension would lie to the rear of the property and whilst poor design does not become acceptable if it cannot be seen, it is important to note that any harm to the property and surrounding area would be very local. The rear extension is set away from the boundary with Highcroft and would not therefore result in any loss of light. As there are no windows facing that property above ground floor level, there would be no loss of privacy. The rear extension is a sufficient distance from Barn Close and Court Cottage to avoid impact upon their amenities.

On balance, whilst the extension is of poor design that does not relate well to the existing bungalow, taking into account the extension that has been undertaken on the neighbouring property, the extent of works that could be carried out under permitted development rights without the need for any planning permission and the limited harm to the surrounding area by virtue of its inconspicuous location, it is not considered that the extension would result in unacceptable detriment to the character of the existing building or that of the surrounding area that would outweigh the requirements of the disabled resident.

The County Highways Authority suggested a condition to prevent the garage from being used for business purposes, however it is important to note that this would in any event need planning permission and a condition to this effect is not therefore necessary. A condition has however been attached to ensure that the use of the accommodation permitted remains ancillary to the main residential use of Rosedale.

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

CONTACT OFFICER: Mrs K Walker Tel: 01823 356468