

31/13/0008

MR P BULL

**ERECTION OF TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO THE REAR AND A DOUBLE DETACHED GARAGE AT ROSEDALE, ILMINSTER ROAD, HENLADE (RESUBMISSION OF 31/12/0015)**

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 C Proposed Plans, Elevations and Section  
(A4) DrNo 2512\_03 Location Plan  
(A4) DrNo 2512\_04 Site Plan  
(A1) DrNo 2512\_05 Rev B 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 and has imposed planning conditions 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.

Last year planning permission was granted 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 was proposed of render and tile, with an external staircase to the rear to access the first floor and two rooflights 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 was extended to run alongside the full staircase. The application also included a two storey rear extension to form a garden room with additional en-suite bedroom above, of brick and tile to match the existing bungalow.

This application now seeks planning permission to revise the materials of the garage from render, to brick to match the existing dwelling.

This application comes before planning committee as the agent is related to a member of staff.

## **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 comment*

## **Representations**

Two letters received from the occupier of Highcroft querying that double detached garage has already been built and appears to be nearing completion. Concerns that detached double garage now built is two storey and queries misdescription of the application, garage constructed to same standard as house with cavity wall, insulation, windows and doors to both floors and same height as Rosedale. Within a few feet of boundary and grossly overpowering. If described as two storey, would have investigated planning application more thoroughly and oppose it in strongest possible terms. Equivalent to having another house built in garden of Rosedale within a few feet of boundary. Concerns that application form stated works had not already been started. Queries whether turning was considered as distance from garage to new extension is somewhat limited. Queries how use of new building will be monitored, construction is not consistent with use for garage/storage.

## **PLANNING POLICIES**

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

## **DETERMINING ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS**

Planning permission has already been granted for a two storey rear extension and garage of these dimensions. As such, the principle has already been established. The matter for consideration is whether the use of brick in place of render on the garage is acceptable.

Under the previous application, the case officer took the view that 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. As such, the use of render was considered acceptable on this basis.

The revised design to erect the garage in brick to match, would appear more in keeping with the existing dwelling and would not lead to any increased impact upon the appearance of the surrounding area or the amenities of neighbouring properties and the conditions attached to the previous permission would be re-imposed.

In terms of the concerns raised regarding the description of the garage, the garage was stated to be a detached double garage, which is a standard description whether or not the loft space within the roof is being used for accommodation. It is then up to the occupier of nearby properties to decide if they wish to look at the plans and elevations to ascertain whether they consider the proposal would have an impact upon them. The height, windows, doors, etc was all shown on the previous

application, as it is on the current application.

The objector raises concerns that the garage is grossly overpowering. As stated under the previous application, 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 is not considered to result in any loss of light or overbearing impact. 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. As such, whilst it is acknowledged that the garage would lie in close proximity to the boundary with the adjacent properties, it is not deemed to result in material harm to the residential amenities of those dwellings.

The objector also queried whether consideration was given to the turning for the garage. It is important to note that the County Highways Authority were consulted on the scheme and were of the opinion that the site would retain ample space for vehicle turning. In terms of the use of the building, a condition has been attached to ensure that it's use would remain ancillary to the 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**