

20/2005/023

MR & MRS HEAYNS

**ERECTION OF ANNEXE WITH GLAZED LINK/CONSERVATORY AT MILLFIELD HOUSE, PARSONAGE LANE, KINGSTON ST MARY.**

22268/29076

FULL

---

**PROPOSAL**

The application relates to the erection of an annexe, linked to the north gable end of Millfield House by a double pitched, glazed link/conservatory. The annexe measures 7.1 m x 12 m x 5.5 m to the ridge and the glazed link/conservatory measures 6 m x 4 m x 4.2 m to the ridge. The annexe is single storey and is of simple form with materials to match the existing dwelling with three sets of patio doors to the west elevation. The glazed link/conservatory is linked to the existing property by a new door formed in the gable end and by a door to the annexe. The proposed accommodation comprises a lounge/diner/kitchen, bedroom and bathroom. The north boundary hedge of the existing garden is proposed to be relocated 4.5 m to the north to accommodate the annexe.

**CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS**

LANDSCAPE OFFICER no objections subject to replacement hedge and tree planting it should be possible to integrate the proposals into the local landscape.

PARISH COUNCIL objections raised. In reference to application 20/2005/007 (Erection of dwelling at land adjacent to Millfield House) that was refused by the planning committee this is an analogous situation. It is felt that the current application 20/2005/023 would still constitute a separate dwelling outside of the agreed settlement limits for the Kingston St Mary Parish Plan ( Ref. 16A ).

ONE LETTER OF OBJECTION has been received raising the following issues:- object on the same grounds as application 20/2005/007 (Erection of dwelling at land adjacent to Millfield House) that was refused; the site is outside the settlement area of Kingston St Mary, we do not understand the need for such a construction, it surely cannot be for family members who already own a property; the application is blatantly an attempt to get round that refusal; with so much land being freed up by the relocation of the owner's business there must surely be better sites available; the original nuisance caused by the erection of Millfield House, the loss of enjoyment of views for residents of Davestones, Mill Cross Cottages, Green Meadows and the Mill and subsequent increase in noise will only be exacerbated by the erection of this apparently unnecessary annexe.

ONE FURTHER LETTER OF REPRESENTATION has been received raising no objection but makes reference to signs that have since been removed.

## **POLICY CONTEXT**

Taunton Deane Local Plan the following policies are considered especially relevant:- Policy S1 requires that proposals for development should ensure that (D) the appearance and character of any affected landscape, settlement, building or street scene would not be harmed as a result of the development. Policy S2 requires development to be of a good design. Policy S7 requires that outside development limits new buildings will only be allowed, amongst other criteria, that they accord with a specific Development Plan Policy. Policy H18 requires that ancillary accommodation, amongst other criteria, should be close enough to the main dwelling to maintain a functional relationship. Policy EN6 requires the protection of trees and hedgerows and adequate provision to compensate for any loss.

## **ASSESSMENT**

The site is located outside any defined settlement boundary and therefore for the proposal to be acceptable in principle, it should accord with Policy S7 (development outside development limits) of the Taunton Deane Local Plan. Policy S7 states that development outside development limits is acceptable if it accords with a specific Development Plan Policy. The specific policy relating to annexes is Policy H18 that states that ancillary accommodation should be close enough to the main dwelling to maintain a functional relationship. This means that the resulting building could not be separated off as a separate dwelling due to its relationship in proximity to the existing dwelling. Considering the location of the annexe it would be difficult to separate it from the existing dwelling to create a separate dwelling. The occupiers of the annexe have to either gain access through the existing house itself internally or pass by its habitable windows and through private amenity areas/gardens externally. Furthermore this functional dependency is increased by the glazed link/conservatory with a new door provided in the gable end of the existing house. It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in principle as it accords with Policy S7 due to its compliance with a specific Development Plan Policy, namely Policy H18.

In detail, the design of the annexe is simple in form that resembles existing additions to the property and is proposed to utilize matching materials to those used on the existing dwelling. The size of the annexe is also considered acceptable as it is only big enough to provide basic accommodation. Due to the single storey nature of the annexe, proposed and existing screening and distance from neighbouring properties, the proposal would not result in any overlooking, loss of light or overbearing relationship. The visual and residential amenity of the area would not therefore appear to be detrimentally affected.

The previous refusal of application 20/2005/007 related to a separate dwelling in the garden of Millfield House. This proposal appears to relate to a genuine annexe that is considered to comply with the relevant planning policy. The planning circumstances of this proposal are therefore considered acceptable whereas application 20/2005/007 was considered to be contrary to planning policy.

There is no planning policy requirement for there to be a need for such a development. For example, it would seem prudent to obtain permission prior to there being a need to

look after relatives etc and having permission in place to implement as and when required. It is proposed to place a condition tying the annexe to Millfield House.

Although the proposal results in the loss of 2 trees and a hedge, subject to the replacement hedge and tree planting, it should be possible to integrate the proposals into the local landscape.

It should be noted that permitted development rights have already been removed at Millfield House and this would equally apply to the proposed annexe, so it could not be extended without further consent being required.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Permission be GRANTED subject to conditions of time limit, materials, landscaping, link built before occupation and annexe tied to Millfield House.

REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION:- The site is adequately screened and the proposal is not considered to be harmful to the landscape and has good access to the highway network, the visual and residential amenity of the area would not be detrimentally affected and the character and appearance of the adjacent Conservation Area would be maintained/enhanced and therefore is compliant with Taunton Deane Local Plan Policies S1, S2, S7, H18 and EN6.

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

**CONTACT OFFICER: 356586 MR R UPTON**

NOTES: