

TWC/2019/0047

10 Quarry Lane, Red Lake, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 5EE

Erection of a rear conservatory (Retrospective) ***Amended plans received***

APPLICANT

Christopher Benn

RECEIVED

21/01/2019

PARISH

Ketley

WARD

Ketley and Overdale

KETLEY PARISH COUNCIL HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS APPLICATION BE DETERMINED BY MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

1.0 SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

1.1 Grant Full Planning Permission subject to Condition(s) and Informative(s).

2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The application property is set within a large plot, located within the residential area of Quarry Lane which is a residential street in the Red Lake area of Telford.

2.2 The application property is technically an end of terrace property but more resembles a detached property from certain views. No.10 Quarry Lane is attached to No.9 and used to be one detached property but has previously been subdivided. The majority of No.9 is at the rear of No.10 however there has been a single-storey extension on the side, set back from the front, which connects onto No.11 Quarry Lane.

3.0 APPLICATION DETAILS

3.1 This application seeks Full Planning Permission for the erection of conservatory on the rear elevation of the property. The application is retrospective as the conservatory has already been erected.

3.2 The conservatory is 3.8 metres in width and comes out 3.6 metres from the rear of the property. The conservatory is 2.1 metres in height to the eaves and 3.2 metres to the ridge.

4.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

4.1 TWC/2017/0632 - Application for prior approval for the erection of a single storey rear extension measuring 3.6 metres in length, 2.5 metres in height and 2.15 metres to eaves - Householder Determination Prior Approval not required

4.2 TWC/2018/0428 - Erection of a rear conservatory (Retrospective) - Withdrawn

5.0 RELEVANT POLICY DOCUMENTS

5.1 National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

5.2 Local Development Plan

Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031

6.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

6.1 Local Member & Parish Council Responses

6.1.1 Ketley Parish Council: Object:

- The proposal is not in Keeping with the character of the property or the local area;
- The proposal is disproportionate in size to the property which does not enhance the area and impacts negatively on neighbouring properties;
- The build quality is poor using substandard materials which have been badly stored.

6.2 Standard Consultation Responses

6.2.1 Arboricultural: Comment:

There is a protected Sycamore tree on site. A Root Protection Area (RPA) for a tree is capped at 15 metres from the trunk of a tree and this tree stands 22 metres from the conservatory. It is considered that the development would not have caused harm to the tree.

6.2.2 Shropshire Fire Service: Comment:

Consideration to be given to advice provided in Shropshire Fire and Rescue Service's 'Fire Safety Guidance'

7.0 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC RESPONSE

7.1 Three objections have been received from local residents, which are available in full on the planning file, but key points have been summarised as follows:

- Very intrusive to neighbouring properties;
- The roof is higher than the 2.5 metres shown on the original plans;
- Not been built to building standards;
- Out of character with the area.

8.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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
- Scale, Design and Impact on the Character of the Area
- Impact on Neighbours

8.2 Principle of Development

8.2.1 The property is in a residential area and has its Permitted Development (PD) Rights in-tact. This conservatory is only 0.6 metres deeper than what could be built under permitted development.

8.2.2 The property previously had the benefit of a prior approval for a larger extension. This was 3.6 metres in depth, 2.5 metres in height and 2.15 metres to eaves. No objections were received on this prior approval and therefore as per the regulations, the application did not need to be assessed and therefore consent was granted. During construction works, it was noted that the conservatory was not being built in accordance with the plans which was subsequently confirmed by Planning Enforcement Officers. A Prior Approval application cannot be amended, hence the requirement for a Full Planning.

8.2.3 A Full Planning Application was subsequently submitted under reference TWC/2018/0428. However, this was withdrawn following an Officer site visit when it was noted that the plans submitted did not marry up with what had been built. The conservatory that has been erected had been taken down from another property and was erected on the application site. When the work was initially completed, the conservatory was in poor state of disrepair, noting that there were elements of flaking paint, damaged wood and the breeze block wall had not been rendered.

8.2.4 The plans initially submitted with this current application were also inaccurate as both the property and conservatory had been drawn incorrectly. Officers have subsequently sought a series of Amended Plans requesting amended and accurate plans which have now been submitted and consultees have been re-consulted.

8.2.5 The plans submitted now accurately show what has been built on-site and what has been applied for.

8.3 Scale, Design and Impact on the Character of the Area

8.3.1 The conservatory is to the rear of the property and whilst it can be seen from certain vantage points, it is not highly visible within the street scene and therefore is not considered to have any significant impact on the street scene.

- 8.3.2 The footprint of the application property is reasonably large, set within a large plot. The conservatory is modest in floor area, being less than 14 sq. metres and measuring 2.1 metres to the eaves and 3.2 metres to the ridge. It is considered that due to the modest nature of the development, it is not an overdevelopment of the property.
- 8.3.3 It has been stated that the conservatory is not in keeping with the property. It is acknowledged that the pitch of the roof on the conservatory does not match the existing property however this is not an uncommon feature of a conservatory. Whilst it is considered that altering the pitch would improve the appearance of the conservatory, it is not considered that the proposal detracts from the property and therefore, the scale is considered acceptable.
- 8.3.4 Whilst there were initial concerns with the external appearance of the conservatory, since the initial site visit, work has progressed and the remedial works to improve the appearance of the conservatory have been undertaken and therefore, it is not considered necessary to attach a condition regarding this.

8.4 Impact on Neighbours

- 8.4.1 The conservatory is on the rear of the property and therefore is only really visible to No.7 and No.9 Quarry Lane. Due to the position of the conservatory and the distance to the boundary, it is considered that there is no impact on the residential amenity of No.7. The conservatory is set away from the boundary with No.9. The plans submitted helpfully show the rear of No. 9. A site visit has been undertaken and whilst it is acknowledged that there is an existing conservatory to No.9, due to the distances involved, it is considered that there will not be any detrimental impact caused.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 This retrospective conservatory is on the rear of the property. The Local Planning Authority considers that the scale and design of the proposal is acceptable, is in keeping with and does not harm the character of the existing house design and respects and responds positively to its context and the surrounding area. The conservatory does not cause any detrimental harm upon the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties by way of nearness, loss of light or privacy. As such, the conservatory is considered to be compliant with the Development Plan and national planning policy guidance.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 10.1 Based on the conclusions above, the recommendation to the Planning Committee on this application is that **DELEGATED AUTHORITY** be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the following:

- a) The following Condition(s) and Informative(s) (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager):

Condition(s):

C38 Approved Plans