

TWC/2021/0822

30 Highgrove Meadows, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9RJ

Erection of first floor front extension, installation of a second floor rear dormer and retrospective single storey ground floor rear extension***Amended Description and Plans***

APPLICANT

P S Baliana

RECEIVED

19/08/2021

PARISH

St. Georges and Priorslee

WARD

Priorslee

THIS APPLICATION HAS BEEN CALLED TO COMMITTEE AT THE REQUEST OF CLLR. VERONICA FLETCHER

<https://secure.telford.gov.uk/planning/pa-applicationssummary.aspx?Applicationnumber=TWC/2021/0822>

1.0 SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

1.1 It is recommended that **DELEGATED AUTHORITY** be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to **GRANT FULL PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to Condition(s) and Informative(s).

2.0 APPLICATION SITE

2.1 The site subject to this application is located on Highgrove Meadows within Priorslee. The property is located on a corner plot and comprises a detached 4-bedroom property, large front driveway and detached double garage.

2.2 The property contains bay windows and a single storey element projecting at ground floor level on the front elevation. This is an original feature which is typical of various properties in this area.

3.0 APPLICATION DETAILS

3.1 This application seeks full planning permission for a first floor front extension, installation of a second floor rear dormer and single storey ground floor rear extension. Retrospective planning permission is sought for the rear extension.

3.2 The proposal would result in the creation of an additional bedroom, resulting in a 5-bedroom property, as well as providing additional living space on the ground floor.

3.3 The application originally comprised of a first floor extension and second floor dormer. However, during the determination period the Local Planning Authority (LPA) identified that the completed ground floor rear extension did not benefit from Permitted Development and therefore planning permission is required. The applicant has re-submitted plans to include the rear extension as part of the planning application.

4.0 PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 No relevant history

5.0 RELEVANT POLICY DOCUMENTS

5.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

5.2 Telford and Wrekin Local Plan (2011-2031):

| | |
|-----|--|
| SP1 | Telford |
| SP4 | Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development |
| BE1 | Design Criteria |
| BE2 | Residential Alterations |
| C3 | Impact of Development on the Highway |

6.0 NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 The application has been publicised through direct neighbour notifications. Two stages of consultation have taken place with the second consultation including the rear single storey extension.

6.1 The Local Planning Authority received seven representations from local residents during the consultation period raising the following matters:

- Access issues to properties during construction due to insufficient space for construction vehicles and deliveries at the property;
- Construction materials and debris left on road;
- Duration of construction;
- Construction hours;
- Noise levels during construction;
- Inconsiderate contractors;
- Dust levels during construction;
- Overshadowing and loss of privacy;
- Loss of light.

7.0 STATUTORY REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 Councillor Veronica Fletcher: **Objection**:

- Residential Amenity (loss of light, overshadowing, loss of privacy);
- Highway Issues (during construction);
- Noise, disturbance, smells and fumes;
- Layout, density of design and visual appearance;
- Overdevelopment.

7.2 St Georges & Priorslee Parish Council: **No objection, subject to Condition(s)** (i) to ensure neighbours are protected from inconvenience during construction work; and (ii) a time limit on completion of the project.

7.3 Highways: **No objection**.

7.4 Drainage: **No comment**.

7.5 Shropshire Fire Service: **Comment** that consideration should be given to Shropshire Fire and Rescue Service's 'Fire Safety Guidance for Commercial and Domestic Planning Applications.'

8.0 APPRAISAL

8.1 Having regard to the development plan policy and other material considerations including comments received during the consultation process, the planning application raises the following main issues:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Design
- Highways impacts

8.2 Principle of Development

The site lies within Telford urban boundary, where Policy SP1 supports the principle of development. The application seeks planning permission for extensions to an existing residential dwelling, which is supported in principle by Policy BE2 subject to a number of criteria to ensure that the scale and design of extensions and alterations to dwellings respect their context and do not adversely affect the amenity of the host dwelling or that of neighbouring properties. These matters are assessed in further detail below.

8.3 Impact Upon Residential Amenity

Policy BE2 states that the Council will support alterations or extensions to residential buildings where (iv) the altered or extended building can be adequately accommodated within the curtilage of the existing property without adversely affecting its amenity or that of neighbouring properties/uses.

- 8.4 The neighbouring property (No. 28 Highgrove Meadows) has a window on the gable wall facing 30 Highgrove Meadows, which serves their bathroom. The proposal would result in the creation of a first floor dormer over the existing single storey structure. Whilst the first floor dormer extension would reduce the amount of light to this window, bathrooms are not considered to be habitable rooms that are given daylight protection and therefore limited weight can be given to the impact upon them.
- 8.5 In terms of privacy, the first floor extension/dormer would face the road so there would be no significant loss of privacy to neighbouring properties given existing acceptable separation distances.
- 8.6 The property has a garden at the rear which is contained by a timber fence. The garden directly bounds the rear garden of No. 28 to the north and the estate road to the south. The garage and gable of No. 32 Highgrove Meadows is located at the rear of the garden, directly to the west of the application site. No. 32 Highgrove Meadow does not contain windows on the first floor of the gable facing the application site and as such, the second floor dormer would not result in loss of privacy to this property.
- 8.7 The single storey rear extension has been built in similar brick to the existing property and measures 4.05 metres in depth. Whilst this extension reduces the size of the amenity area for the property, the remaining garden still measures circa 130 sq. metres and is over 8 metres in depth at its narrowest point. As such, the proposal is considered to be compliant with Policy BE2(iv) in that it does not compromise the existing levels of amenity enjoyed by the host property.
- 8.8 The LPA has received seven representations from local residents in respect of noise and vehicle disturbance caused to local residents during the construction of the rear single storey extension (which is being applied for retrospectively as outlined earlier in this report).
- 8.9 The LPA has discussed these concerns with the Agent, who has confirmed that the applicant is willing to accept a Condition requiring the submission of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to protect public amenity for the proposed works.

8.10 Design

Policy BE2 states that the Council will support alterations or extensions to residential buildings where:

- i. The alteration or extension is not disproportionate in size in relation to the existing building/plot and does not substantially alter the character of the dwelling;
- ii. The altered or extended building respects the character of the area;
- iii. The design remains in keeping with the existing building.

8.11 The LPA has requested amendments during the determination period to reduce the scale of the first floor extension to ensure its design is subservient to the main property. The revised proposal has resulted in the creation of a first floor dormer above the existing ground floor projecting element, with materials used to match the existing property.

8.12 The LPA has also requested amendments to the second floor dormer on the rear roof plane during the determination period to reduce the proportions of the proposed windows and amend the materials so that they were more in keeping with the existing property. The revised proposals replaced the full height windows to more proportionate windows, whilst identifying the bathroom window as obscure glazing. In terms of materials, the revised proposal includes red tiles on the roof and sides to match the existing property, white uPVC window frames to match existing and stained timber vertical cladding between the windows.

8.13 When considering this application, the LPA takes into consideration the generous Permitted Development Rights covering extensions to dwellings under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015). The proportions of the second floor dormer extension are in line with what could be constructed under Permitted Development and as such, the applicant does not require planning permission for a dormer extension of this proportion. However, as the Applicant is proposing stained timber cladding, a material not used in the construction of the existing property, planning permission is required.

8.14 The property is constructed in a buff/yellow facing brick with red brick window head details and red brick floor line detailing around the property. Whilst the proposed dormer windows and the roof tiles would match the existing, timber cladding is not a characteristic material of the property or the area. Nonetheless, the timber cladding will be stained in order to represent a more congruous addition to the streetscene. As such, the proposal is considered compliant with Policy BE2.

8.15 When assessing the cumulative impact of the proposals, the LPA consider that the extensions do not constitute the overdevelopment of the site as they can be adequately accommodated within the site boundary and that the development is in accordance with the principles of Policy BE1.

8.16 Highway Impacts

The property contains a double bay garage and a large block paved driveway, providing space for at least 3no. vehicles. As such, the LPA is satisfied that there is sufficient parking on site in line with the Local Plan.

8.17 The Local Highway Authority have reviewed the proposals and offer no objection to the proposal.

8.18 As outlined earlier in the report, the parking of construction vehicles will be reasonably managed through the submission of a construction management plan to cover the temporary construction period.

8.19 Other Considerations

The impact of noise, dust and odour was also raised in the representations. Whilst the LPA acknowledge that the development of the proposals will result in some level of noise during the construction period, this will be temporary and controlled through the construction hours stipulated within the Construction Management Plan. The LPA consider that the impact of dust and odours caused by the development will be limited and temporary.

8.20 It should be noted that the duration of construction is not a material planning consideration and that the LPA do not have any powers to control the duration of construction.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 On balance, it is considered that the proposal is compliant with Policy BE1 and Policy BE2 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031. The proposed extensions do not harm the character of the area and do not adversely affect the amenity of the host property or that of neighbouring properties. The proposal has been considered in terms of its scale and siting and its impact to surrounding neighbouring properties and the LPA conclude that the cumulative impact of the extensions do not constitute in the overdevelopment of the site. The Local Highway Authority has reviewed the proposals and there would be no adverse impacts in terms of highway safety.

9.2 The proposal is therefore deemed to be compliant with the Telford & Wrekin

Local Plan 2011-2031 and the guidance contained within the NPPF.

10.0 DETAILED RECOMMENDATION

10.1 Based on the conclusions above, it is recommended that **Delegated Authority** be granted to the Service Delivery Manager to **GRANT FULL PLANNING PERMISSION** (with the authority to finalise any matter including conditions) subject to:

A) The following Condition(s):

1. Time Limit – Full
2. Construction Management Plan
3. Materials Details
4. Development in Accordance with Plans