

<b>DECISION DATE</b> 12 January 2007	<b>APPLICATION NO.</b> 06/01348/FUL A9	<b>PLANNING COMMITTEE:</b> 22 January 2007
<b>DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED</b>  <b>ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY FRONT EXTENSION</b>		<b>SITE ADDRESS</b>  44 SUNNYBANK ROAD BOLTON LE SANDS CARNFORTH LANCASHIRE LA5 8HG
<b>APPLICANT:</b>  Mr And Mrs Scott Wilcock 44 Sunnybank Road Bolton Le Sands Carnforth Lancashire LA5 8HG		<b>AGENT:</b>  Robert Crabtree

#### **REASON FOR DELAY**

Amended plans and the applicant is an employee of the local authority

#### **PARISH NOTIFICATION**

No comments to date, any comment will be reported directly to the Committee.

#### **LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE**

Lancaster District Local Plan - No specific proposals

#### **STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS**

**Highways** - No observations.

#### **OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED**

One written and one verbal objection have been received from neighbouring residents in connection with the originally submitted scheme. The nature of the objections relate to the height and massing of the side extension, the change in nature of the appearance of the pair of semi detached houses to terraced and the loss of light from the close relationship of the development to the neighbouring garden area.

3 letters of support have been received over the revised design for a front extension to the dwelling. The revised design is considered not to effect neighbouring dwellings and the design is such that it would not look out of place within the street. The development would be a more acceptable way of gaining the additional accommodation should it have to go ahead.

## **REPORT**

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the scheme of delegation. However, it was discovered during discussion over the application that the applicant is an employee of the local authority. The application has therefore been brought before the Planning Committee for determination.

### **Site and its Surroundings**

The application site is located within the more urbanised area of Bolton-le-Sands close to the main west coast rail line. The site is located in an area of mixed residential properties, one side of the road comprising almost wholly of two storey semi-detached houses and the other of a predominantly semi-detached bungalows set at a slightly higher level to the application site.

The application site is located on a corner location with Shelley Close and is the last of approximately 14 pairs of semi detached houses all built to a similar design and building line which forms the western end of Sunnybank Road. Most of the houses remain as original on the public street elevations, however, some have the addition of small single storey porches to the front elevation and a small number of properties have two storey side extensions set back from the front wall of the dwelling. The plot differs from the other dwellings of this form as it lies in a corner position in a triangular plot with a wide street frontage to the plot but only a small triangular rear garden.

### **The Proposal**

As originally submitted, the application sought consent to develop a two-storey side extension comprising of a ground floor garage and dining room and an upper floor en-suite bedroom. This proposal resulted in objections being raised by neighbouring residents, making representations to both the local planning authority as part of the consultation process and directly to the applicants.

In response to the concerns raised by neighbours the applicant has revised the proposal seeking to develop a small two-storey extension to the front of the semi-detached property rather than the original side extension. The applicant considers that this revised arrangement will minimise impact on nearby dwellings and result in a much smaller development which will still suit their need to increase the size of the third bedroom. The development consists of a ground floor entrance hall and WC with the upper floor expanding the 'box' room to the original dwelling. The overall footprint of the extension is 2.4m wide and projects 1.7m from the front wall of the existing dwelling.

### **Planning History**

The application site has no planning history.

### **Planning Policy**

Policy H7 seeks to ensure that new development within the rural areas is appropriate in design and harmonises with its surrounding. Development should not have an adverse effect upon character of the settlement or neighbouring residents. Furthermore, SPG 12 Residential Design Guide acknowledges the presence of modern development surrounding the main village but still seeks to ensure that development is appropriate to its surroundings.

### **Comments**

The approach to the design of the extension is a laudable one as it seeks to minimise its impact upon the neighbouring residents. However, the application site forms half of a pair of semi-detached properties of which the street contains a large number of dwellings, built to an identical design. The pairs of dwellings sit at a slight angle to the road but all have a strong building line and limited set back from the rear of the footway.

It is considered that the proposed development will be detrimental in design terms, as it will unbalance the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties and a two storey projection forward of the main dwelling and the building line will be to the detriment of the appearance of the street scene. Furthermore, the development, if approved, will develop a precedent for further similar development on the neighbouring houses again to the detriment of the street scene. The development is contrary to the aims and objectives of policy H7 and guidance contained within SPG 12 and as such should be resisted.

## **HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS**

It is recognised that a recommendation of refusal may result in an interference with the applicant's right to develop their land in accordance with the Human Rights Act. However, on the facts of this case it is considered both necessary and proportionate to control development in the public interest in light of the concerns set out in this report and for the stated reasons.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

That **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reasons: -

1. Detrimental to the character and appearance of the semi detached properties and the wider street scene.
2. Precedent.