

BUDLEIGH SALTERTON
(Budleigh)

09/1231/FUL

Target Date: 20.07.2009

Applicant: Mr and Mrs G Maddaford

Location: 96A Granary Lane
Budleigh Salterton

Proposal: Proposed extensions and alterations

CONSULTATIONS

County Highway Authority

Does not wish to comment

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL

This Council supports the application

WARD MEMBER(S)

The initial comments of the Ward Members are;

Cllr. Malcom Florey,

"I have now had the opportunity to meet Mr Maddaford at 96A Granary Lane, a road and an area of Budleigh Salterton I know well. He has shared with me the proposed plans for the extensions to the house and I have carefully walked the entire area of the property and immediate surroundings. Taking into account the age of the property, its location, the proximity of neighbouring properties and the adjacent Otter Valley I can see no reason why approval should not be granted. I believe the scale and format of the extension enhances the existing property and will have very limited impact on the site and immediate surroundings. As far as I am aware, no objections have been lodged by his neighbour Mr Falby and importantly the Otter Valley Association. I therefore write to confirm my support for the application."

In the event that this application comes to Committee I would reserve my position until I am in full possession of all the relevant facts and arguments for and against.

Cllr. R Franklin,

"Although I failed to give my opinion on the previous app that was refused I am still of the opinion that this app can be approved - the design is acceptable and the nearest neighbours raise no objections."

In the event that this application comes to Committee I would reserve my position until I am in full possession of all the relevant facts and arguments for and against."

Cllr. S. Hall,

"I have viewed this proposed application from many aspects and cannot see how this extension would impact on the local street scene. The existing building at the rear has a higher and visible roof line, therefore 96A would not dominate in the context of the setting. I would be happy to recommend approval.

In the event that this application comes to Committee I would reserve my position until I am in full possession of all the relevant facts and arguments for and against.”

REPRESENTATIONS

Objections

No letters of support or objection have been received.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

App.No:	Proposal	Decision	Date
09/0023/FUL	Proposed extensions and alterations	Refused	18.02.09
09/0723/FUL	Proposed extensions and alterations	Refused	27.05.09

PLANNING POLICIES

Government Guidance

PPS 1 – Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development

PLANNING POLICIES

Devon Country Structure Plan (2001-2016)

Policy C03 - Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Policy CO6 – Quality of New Development

East Devon Local Plan (1995-2011)

Policy D1 – Design and Local Distinctiveness

Policy EN1 - Developments Affecting Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Policy H7 – Residential Extensions

SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The property known as 96 A Granary Lane, Budleigh Salterton is a detached dwelling fronting Granary Lane. The property is set back and slightly elevated above the level of the highway to the west. The surrounding area is residential in character with properties of varying size and form but predominantly of traditional design.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks to extend the dwelling to the north with a link extension incorporating the existing detached double garage. The garage sits forward of the property and the proposal would involve extension at first floor level above this and the raising of the roof of the existing off-shot extension on the front elevation of the main house, together with the conversion of the existing

hipped main roof to a gable end on the north side of the property. The proposal would also see a slight extension to the rear (east) over and above the existing footprint of the garage.

CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSESSMENT

Background

The current application is for the same proposal as recently refused under delegated powers (09/0723/FUL refers). The applicant has contested the method of dealing with the application under delegated powers and therefore has resubmitted the same proposals for further consideration. The current and most recent former applications represent revisions to a previously submitted scheme (09/0023/FUL). That scheme was refused on the basis of its discordant design and impact on the streetscene. The revisions made to the original scheme involve a slight reduction in the ridge height of the extension and adding a half hip to the north roof slope in lieu of the full gable formerly proposed. Aside from these changes the proposal is essentially the same as the original application.

The main issues concerning this application are the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the nearby neighbours and the design of the proposal and its impact on the streetscene.

Amenity

The proposal is not considered to impact on the amenity of the nearby neighbours due to the distances involved and the lack of windows which overlook. The boundary screening is sufficient to prevent overlooking. The roof lights created are of a sufficient height and would not create overlooking.

Design

The proposed two storey extension would be visible from the street scene and increase the mass of the building to a significant degree. It is noticeable that there is a mixture of design and style of development in the area. However, when viewed from the street the mass is particularly prominent and produces an awkward alignment. The resulting building is not considered to be subservient to the original dwelling in terms of mass and design. This is especially apparent with the linking section between the house and the garage, which projects forward of the host dwelling.

The increased roof mass and additional areas of roof slope created are considered inappropriate in comparison to the area of elevation walls. The roof slopes would dominate the property especially when viewed from the street scene.

The glazed roof over the garden room is acceptable in terms of impact on amenity and will not be visible from the surrounding area.

CONCLUSIONS

The proposal seeks to extend the existing property to provide additional living accommodation. Advice has been provided to the applicants prior to the submission of this application as to how this could be successfully achieved. The current scheme, however, is considered inappropriate and discordant in design terms. The proposal as submitted will have a harmful effect on the street scene and has not overcome the previous reason for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason:

1. The proposal, by virtue of the mass, dominating roof slope and discordant design is considered to impact detrimentally on the street scene and the original dwelling. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Policy CO6 (Quality of New Development) of the Devon Structure Plan 2001-2016 and Policies H7 (Residential Extensions) and D1 (Design and Local Distinctiveness) of the adopted East Devon Local Plan 1995-2011 and the Budleigh Salterton Design Statement.

Refused plans

CN05: 08-431 drawing nos.: T1, E1-E6 inc. & A1 – A6 inc.

List of Background Papers

Application file, consultations and policy documents referred to in the report.