

MEMBURY  
(Yarty)

07/1437/FUL

Target Date: 18.07.2007

Applicant:

Mrs S Dare

Location:

"Little Goslins"

Proposal:

Two Storey Extension to Dwelling

### **CONSULTATIONS**

#### **County Highway Authority**

No objections

### **TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL**

The Parish Council considers that this application answers our previous concerns and therefore supports it.

### **WARD MEMBER(S)**

The initial comments of the Ward Member (Councillor Diviani) are:

"I looked again at his semi detached house (previously referred to as terraced) and consider the revised application to be quite acceptable. I understand that concern has been expressed that the extension should be in stone but personally I feel that render would be more suitable as it would match the existing, the adjoining house and the extension to the neighbouring infil?large country house permitted as "Little? Haddons.

I also understand that there is concern that the rear of the extension would be dug into the hillside (back garden) whereas such build is quite common in the Blackdowns, usually without foundations (the building not the idea), as evidenced further along the road.

I don't have a problem with the size as it will be replacing a rather naff shed and will make a comfortable family home for the owners, a local young couple and I believe it should be approved."

In the event that this application should come to Development Control Committee I would reserve my position until further argument for and against has been presented.

### **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

<b>App no.</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
07/0160	Erection of two storey side extension	Refused	09.03.07

### **PLANNING POLICIES**

#### **Devon County Structure Plan (2001-2016)**

Policy CO3 - 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 - Development in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Policy H7 - Residential Extensions

Policy S4 - Development within Built-up Area Boundaries

Policy S3 - Built up Area Boundaries for villages

Policy EN26 - River and Coastal Flooding

Policy D5 - Trees on Development Sites

### **SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION**

The site refers to a semi detached two-storey dwelling located along the main street running through the village of Membury. The site is within the development boundary of Membury and within an AONB. The site also lies within flood risk zone 3 (1% risk of flooding per annum from rivers).

The dwelling is set back from the street by 13m and partially obscured by a large protected tree near to the front boundary and a series of established smaller trees along the front boundary. The dwelling is sunken from the streetscene but remains clearly visible.

The dwelling is stone, with a white rendered front elevation. There is a large rear gable, made from stone with some weatherboarding to the rear elevation. There is also an attached shed and detached garage store to the north.

The neighbouring dwelling to the north is currently undergoing building works including the erection of extensions. This dwelling is sited 20-26m to the north and partially screened by established hedges.

### **PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

The proposal seeks full planning permission for an extension to the dwelling. The proposed development seeks a two storey extension measuring 3.8m in width by 11.8m in depth with a pitched roof measuring 6.8m in height under a cedar shingle roof.

The walls would be stone faced to match the north elevation.

The windows would be constructed out of oak with double glazed small panes. These would be located at ground and first floor level on the front eastern elevation, the rear western elevation and the south side elevation. It is proposed that one window is in the northern elevation at ground level

The extension would form a kitchen and utility at ground level and bedroom and ensuite at first floor level.

## **CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSESSMENT**

This is a resubmission of a previously refused application which sought permission for an extension to the north elevation, including the erection of a car port to the front elevation. The proposed extension would have measured 6.8m in width x 6.1m in depth and project from ridge height. The extension would have projected from the north elevation of the rear gable and would therefore be set back from the front elevation by 3m. The car port would have been sited in front of the extension adjoining the north elevation of the original dwelling. There would have been a north facing first floor window to serve a bathroom. All new walls were to be rendered and painted under roof materials to match the existing.

It was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed extension to the north elevation, by virtue of its projection from ridge height, bulk, footprint, design and appearance, lacks architectural cohesion with the host dwelling and serves to dominate the host dwelling causing an erosion of the original character and appearance of the dwelling. The extension would also appear visually obtrusive from the streetscene to the east, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the rural character of the locale.
2. The proposed car port would be sited in a visually prominent location to the front elevation of the dwelling and appear as a suburban structure which would serve to erode the uncluttered and rural character of the dwelling frontage, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling and the rural streetscene to the east.

The car port has now been omitted.

The main issues with the application concern the impact that the proposed development would have on the character and design of the property, the streetscene, the landscape designated as an AONB and the amenity and privacy of the neighbouring dwelling. The proposal will also be judged on its impact upon the flood risk zone.

### **Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Dwelling**

The dwelling has a distinctive rural character, informed by its simplicity of architecture, form, materials and setting. The front elevation is especially important as it is visible from the street, contributes to the streetscene and is together with the adjoining dwellings a group of dwellings which appear uniform from the front.

The ridge height of the extension would be set down from the main dwelling by approximately 30cm which would offer some subservience. However it is considered that the proposal is particularly deep measuring around 11.8m, and would project around 5m beyond the rear gable it would adjoin. Although not particularly intrusive from the front, the extension would be a substantial addition to the dwelling in terms of its size and bulk. It is considered that this proposal in conjunction with the rear gable would add a large amount of bulk to the rear of the dwelling to the detriment of its character as part of a small semi detached dwelling.

The existing fenestration is relatively modern and lacking alignment and hierarchy. All walls would be stone faced to match the north elevation.

The proposed fenestration would be concentrated at the rear and is considered appropriate in this context.

### Impact on the AONB

The site is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, where landscape has the highest degree of protection. The dwelling lies in a village setting and although visible from the street to the front, would be set into the rising ground to the rear and well screened by the natural established vegetation to the side. However, the dwelling remains visible from many angles within the wider landscape and such a design, by virtue of its large depth would appear obtrusive into the landscape and fail to conserve or enhance its character and appearance.

### Impact on the Neighbouring Dwelling

The extension would be sited 25m from the neighbouring dwelling to the north and would not therefore be overbearing or cause overshadowing. No windows are proposed on the first floor level of the extension and would not therefore cause overlooking. The windows on the south elevation, which would project beyond the rear gable would be set relatively level with existing and would be set back some 6 metres. In summary, there are no significant impacts on neighbouring dwellings.

### Impact on Trees

The protected trees are located on the adjacent site and would not be directly affected by the proposed extension due to the distance between them of approximately 17m (edge of extension to trunk). The root protection area would also be likely to be outside of the proposed development zone so no remedial measures to protect the trees would be required.

### Impact on Flooding

The Flood Risk Assessment submitted would meet the criteria set out by the Environment Agency and is considered acceptable.

### Plans

There appears to be some discrepancy between the design of the roof on the north and west elevation. The north and east elevation appear to show plain gables whilst the (rear west elevation) shows an inverted gable to mirror that adjacent.

### Conclusion/Summary

It is recognised that one of the reasons for the previously refused scheme, the car port, has been overcome. The applicants have attempted to overcome an additional reason for refusal, "being visually intrusive", by setting the extension back from the façade. However the attempts to overcome the previous reasons for refusal have resulted in a substantially deep extension which in conjunction with the rear gable would cause an overall erosion of the character of the dwelling.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposed extension by virtue of its substantial depth in conjunction with the adjoining gable would dominate the host dwelling causing an erosion of the original

character and appearance of the dwelling to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the rural character of the locale. The proposed development is considered contrary to Policy CO6 (Quality of New Development) and C03 (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) of the Devon Structure Plan 2001 to 2016 and Policies H7 (Residential Extensions), Policy EN1 (Development in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and Policy D1 (Design and Local Distinctiveness) of the Adopted East Devon Local Plan 1995 – 2011.

2. The applicant has not supplied accurate details of the proposed development to enable the Local Planning Authority to give full and thorough consideration to the potential impact the proposed development may have on the dwelling and surrounding Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

#### List of Background Papers

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