

38/2002/287

CYRA GIBBON

**ERECTION OF PORCH AT 17 WHITEHALL, TAUNTON AS AMENDED BY PLANS RECEIVED 1ST AUGUST, 2002**

22620/25330

FULL PERMISSION

---

**PROPOSAL**

The application was reported to the last Planning Committee where it was resolved to grant permission provided the depth of the porch was reduced to 1.5 m. However, the applicant is unwilling to amend the scheme further. The proposal is for the erection of a porch to the front of this terraced property measuring 2 m deep x 1.5 m wide x 2 m to the eaves (3.7 m to the highest part). The porch is 0.6 m from the front boundary of the property. The materials are to be block and render and the roof is to match the existing dwelling. The plans submitted initially showed the porch to be 2.5 m deep x 1.5 m wide and within 0.1 m of the front boundary.

**CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS**

6 LETTERS OF OBJECTION raising the following points:- the frontage of Whitehall is characterised by cottage style terraced houses, a number of which have small porches or extensions; while several houses at the Station Road end of the street have porches which extend to the rear of the footway, these extensions are modest compared to the size of the house; the proposed extension is over twice the size of any other porch, out of keeping with the character of the street, and detrimental to the visual amenities of the residents of Whitehall; concerned that this extension will form an obstruction to visibility, and could increase both the fear of crime and likelihood of crime taking place unobserved; the street plan shows the porches that already exist but does not show our bay window and the roof that covers this window and our front door; the proposed porch will severely disrupt our light due to the fact that our house faces north; the proposed porch would be built directly on our boundary, as the plans are inaccurate; the porch does not meet the legal requirement of 2 m from the highway as it is 1.74 m and this does not include the overhang of the drainpipe etc.; the roof of the porch would allow people to stand on to break into first floor windows, the only difference with the new plan is that the porch has been shortened to 2 m, this is still not acceptable as demonstrated by the replica we built; the Committee are welcome to come and look at the proposed loss of amenity; the plans do not show our bay window which has existed for over 20 years and was built to increase light into the property; the proposal will block light and affect the character of Whitehall; the proposal is detrimental to street security as our house will not be seen properly; Whitehall has limited parking and we have to park at the bottom of the street, we will not be able to see our cars which will affect insurance; it will devalue our property by at least £15,000; the plans do not show how close our front door is to the proposal, only just over 1 m, therefore we would be stepping out into a dark void; the boundary lines on the plan are not accurate, our boundary resides on the

boundary of the porch, not through the middle of the passageway; the plans to not show the height of the extension; it is of interest that they intend using our drainage in order to channel rainwater from the porch, our deeds state that we are responsible for this as it resides on our property; is it an extension or a porch, its more like an extension or an aircraft hangar; the porch is far too large and out of character; the size of our porch is adequate (in projection).

## **POLICY CONTEXT**

In the assessment of this application, the following Taunton Deane Local Plan Revised Deposit (November 2000) policies are taken on board: - S1 (General requirements), S2 (Design) and H19 (Extensions to dwellings). These policies seek to ensure that extensions to dwellings do not harm the residential amenity of other dwellings, the amenities of the property to be extended and the form and character of the dwelling is not banned provided the extension is subservient to it in scale and design.

## **ASSESSMENT**

In light of these policies, I consider that the proposal, as it stands, does not have a detrimental effect upon the appearance or character of either the building itself or the street scene. It is considered to be a good design, reinforcing the local character and distinctiveness of the area. The proposal does not significantly harm the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings or the amenities of the existing property. The form and character of the dwelling are not compromised, as the extension is subservient to it in scale and design. Despite the unwillingness of the applicant to reduce the depth of the porch it is still considered to be acceptable.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Permission be GRANTED subject to conditions of materials as application forms. Note re building over a public sewer and drainage.

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

**CONTACT OFFICER: 356468 MR A GRAVES**

NOTES:

