

Item 10/00674/FUL

Case Officer Mr Matthew Banks

Ward Clayton-le-Woods And Whittle-le-Woods

Proposal Proposed single storey extension to front of house to provide disabled living facilities

Location 5 Hawthorne Close Clayton-Le-Woods Chorley PR6 7JL

Applicant Nigel Bunney

Consultation expiry: 9 September 2010

Application expiry: 27 September 2010

Proposal This application seeks permission to erect a single storey front extension to provide disabled living facilities for the applicant.

Recommendation It is recommended that this application is refused.

Main Issues The main issues for consideration in this application are as follows:

1. Need for the Development
2. Design and Impact on the Streetscene
3. Impact on Neighbour Amenity
4. Impact on Highways/Access

Representations To date, two neighbour objections have been received concerning this application, their comments can be summarised as follows:

4 Hawthorne Close:

- The proposed development is contrary to sections 2.9, 2.10, 5 and 6a of the Council's Adopted Householder Design Guidance SPG;
- The extension will stand focally from the close entrance and will appear claustrophobically dominant and destructive of the close's architectural integrity;
- The extension will overpower the front aspect of the house and dwarf the existing house;
- Question is raised into the need for a double garage of that size.

17 Bay Tree Road:

- The proposal will result in a detrimental effect on this property;
- The proposal will obliterate the existing view of trees, shrubs and hills from the rear window and garden of this property;
- The garage will tower above the garden of No. 17 at a height of 5m;
- A garage is not needed to provide disabled living facilities (this objector is also disabled).

Consultations Parish Council - None received

Assessment

1. Need for the Development

The proposed single storey front extension will include a double garage, bedroom, wet room, dining room and hallway to provide disabled living accommodation for the applicant who is suffering from

mitochondrial myopathy which is a disease that will result in the applicant becoming wheelchair bound.

The applicant has provided a supporting statement which outlines the nature of the disease as well as the need for each element of the proposed extension. This application is also accompanied by supporting letters from both an Occupational Therapist and Physician.

The applicant argues that the overall size of the extension has been dictated by the requirements for room sizes as set out in the Building Regulations Part M. As such, it is necessary to assess the need for each element of the proposal in relation to justifying the scale of the extension.

The appellant argues that the proposed bedroom is required as this will allow a special NHS bed and wheelchair access around the room. The letters from both the Community Occupational Therapist and Physician support this element of the proposal. In accordance with the information provided in support of the application, the need for this room is not disputed by the council.

The appellant argues that the wet room is needed as a shower room designed for wheelchair access. The letters that accompany the application also support this element of the proposal and therefore the council does not dispute the need for this element.

The applicant argues that the hallway is required at the proposed width to enable wheelchair access through the extension; that the existing WC has been converted to a utility room as this space can not function as a wash room for wheelchair access and that the existing dining room and kitchen will form a larger kitchen (although this is not shown on the submitted plans) and the proposed dining room will replace the existing.

The appellant argues that the double garage is required at the proposed size to enable ramp access from the house and enough room to enable the applicant to access one of the cars in privacy and under cover. However, the council does not consider that the garage is a necessity directly related to appellant's disease. This conclusion is drawn from the letters which accompany the application which support the need for a bedroom and wash room only.

The council considers that the garage could be omitted from the scheme and another option could be adopted which would allow the applicant to enter the property with minimal inconvenience in poor weather (ie. some form of cover to the front). The site is not particularly exposed to views from the surrounding area and adjacent properties.

The council acknowledges and certainly does not dispute that the applicant is in an unfortunate situation and that a certain level of disabled accommodation is required (ie. a bathroom and bedroom). However, in terms of need, it has been established (through the letters that accompany the application) that the only facilities which are medically required amount to a bedroom and showering facility. It has also been noted that an internal re-organisation of the property is also required to make the dwelling functional, however, it is also considered that this does not amount to the size of an extension as proposed.

As such, the council considers the applicant has failed to compromise given the difficult situation at the application site and the large size of the proposal. It is considered that the proposed facilities exceed what is reasonably necessary in line with the professional medical advice submitted with the application.

2. Design and Impact on the Streetscene

The Householder Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) states that extensions that project forward of the original building have a significant effect on the building itself and on the wider streetscape. Front extensions often upset building lines and architectural rhythms and appear unduly prominent in the streetscene.

The application dwelling is situated at the end of the cul-de-sac and forms the end property in a series of 5 that front the south side of Hawthorne Close. The proposed single storey extension would be situated to the front of the application dwelling in a relatively large expanse of front

garden. The proposed development will be prominent within the streetscene and be visible from numerous properties in the surrounding area. There are no distinct building lines on the cul-de-sac.

The proposed extension is not considered to be particularly well related to the design of the original house which has a distinctive style. This style is replicated throughout the immediate and surrounding property types. The proposal is not considered subordinate to the original house and will have a footprint larger than that of the original dwelling.

From views into Hawthorne Close the proposed development would not be overly prominent due to trees and shrubbery coverage that forms the front boundary treatment for many of the properties leading up to the application site. The only element of the proposal that would be visible from the entrance to the Close would be the attached garage. However, only part of garage would be visible from this viewpoint and it would not appear inappropriate in the context of other development on the site. It is not until you pass No. 4 Hawthorne Close that the true size of the extension would be visible, hence its impact on the surrounding area in terms of appearance would be localised.

Although the proposed extension is not considered to particularly enhance or positively contribute to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It is not considered that the proposed extension would result in a form of development which would be significantly detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and as such, could not be refused on these grounds.

3. Impact on Neighbour Amenity

As discussed above, the visual impact of the proposed extension will be particularly localised to properties on Hawthorne Close and to the rear of the properties which front Bay Tree Road.

Although the proposed development would be visible from the properties on Hawthorne Close, it is not considered that it would result in any significant detrimental harm in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy to these properties. The proposal will have no windows serving a habitable room facing the adjacent property No. 4 Hawthorne Close and would be positioned as such that it would not have a significantly detrimental overbearing impact.

With regards to the properties situated to the immediate west of the application site which comprise Nos. 15, 17 and 19 Bay Tree Road, the impact will be significantly different.

The applicant has argued that the erection of the extension will not have an overbearing impact on these properties primarily because of the existing boundary treatment and the existence of the existing electricity sub-station which is positioned to the north of the application site. However, the council considers that the proposed development will have a significantly different impact on the amenity of these properties (particularly No. 17 Bay Tree Road) than the existing boundary treatment.

The properties Nos. 15, 17 and 19 all currently enjoy a relatively modest rear sized garden and have a rear boundary treatment separating them from the application site that comprises a 1.8m high wood boarded fence and in parts, trees and shrubbery that reach a height of over 3m.

The proposal seeks to remove much of the existing tree/shrubbery cover and retain the 1.8m high wooden fence. The proposal would extend approximately 17.3m from the front elevation of the application dwelling, at a distance of approximately 1m from the existing western boundary treatment. It would reach a maximum height of 5m at the highest point and as such, the properties Nos. 15, 17 and 19 Bay Tree Road would view the full extent of the proposal.

It is the combination of height, proximity and extent of the proposed extension that causes particular concern to the council. An extension of such a height, in such close proximity to the site boundary and of such an mass will have an unacceptable overbearing impact on the amenity space of Nos. 15, 17 and 19 Bay Tree Road.

The element of the proposal that is of particular concern is the garage which would be situated directly to the rear of No. 17 Bay Tree Road. The proposed extension would therefore result in an

overbearing form of development which would create an uncomfortable and unacceptable sense of enclosure to the occupiers of the adjacent properties, (particularly No. 17 Bay Tree Road) and would therefore be contrary to policy HS9 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review 2003.

It must be noted at this point that the applicant did submit a scheme to lower the ridge of the proposed garage and alter the ridge so that it would run concurrent with that of the remainder of the extension. However, this is not considered to significantly reduce the overbearing impact and massing of the extension and will not materially alter the consequential impact on the neighbouring properties. The amended scheme offers no break in the massing of the extension and as such, the applicant has confirmed that they would like to pursue the original scheme.

4. Impact Highways/Access

The proposed development would result in an increase in demand for off-road parking at the site, however, the property has sufficient off-road parking provision to ensure that no significant harm would come to highways/access.

Overall Conclusion

It is considered that the proposed extension will result in an overbearing form of development which would create an uncomfortable and unacceptable sense of enclosure to the occupiers of the adjacent properties and is therefore contrary to policy HS9 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review 2003.

It is also considered that the agent has failed to present a scheme that meets the medical needs of the applicant (in accordance with the letters that accompany the application) whilst maintaining an acceptable relationship between the proposal and the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

Planning Policies

Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review

Policies: GN1, GN5 and HS9

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

- Householder Design Guidance SPG

Planning History

The site history of the property is as follows:

Ref: 03/00965/FUL Decision: PERFPP Decision Date: 21 October 2003

Description: Erection of conservatory to rear and dormer to front,

Recommendation: Refuse Full Planning Permission

Reasons

1. It is considered that a combination of height, proximity to the boundary and extent of the proposed development will have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring properties (with particular regard to No. 17 Bay Tree Road) and will dominate views of these dwellings and their associated private amenity space. The proposed development will result in an uncomfortable and unacceptable sense of enclosure to the occupiers of the adjacent properties and is therefore contrary to policy HS9 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review 2003.