

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

ADDENDUM 16 November 2021

Item

1. AMEND Condition 2 to read:

2. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plans contained in the following schedule:

| Plan Description | Plan No. | Date Received |
|------------------------------------|----------|---------------|
| Location Plan 1:1250 | | 29/06/2021 |
| Existing plan and elevations | 1 | 04/10/2021 |
| Proposed Ground Floor Plan | 2 | 04/10/2021 |
| Proposed First Floor Plan | 3 | 04/10/2021 |
| Proposed front and rear elevations | 4 | 04/10/2021 |
| Proposed left and right elevations | 5 | 04/10/2021 |
| Annex Plan and Elevations | 6 | 29/06/2021 |
| Site Plan 1:500 | | 15/11/2021 |

2. ADD to representations:

Comments by Marcus Jones MP who stated he was objecting on behalf of his constituents and the following points were raised:

1. Acknowledges the need for the improved coverage and capacity and supports the company and campaign to improve the coverage and capacity in the area.
2. Local residents oppose the proposal for the reasons of visual intrusion and believes that with consultation between residents and the applicants a compromise can be found that would satisfy their issues and objections.

3. Please amend this section of support in the neighbour response's part to read:

There have been 7 letters of support from 6 addresses.

There have also been letters of support received from Councillors Walsh and Brown. The comments are summarised below;

1. Need for housing in the area
1. Increase visual amenity of the area
2. Good use of the land

4. ADD to neighbour responses.

- After further consultation an additional letter of objection was received raising the following concerns: that the proposal would remove the existing parking to the property, that the property is unique and is one of 4 which has garage parking as well on street parking. The complainant also raised that the lack of parking would prevent the bus which travels down this road from continuing this journey. Finally, the complainant was concerned that any extension to the 4 houses numbers 10 to 16 would not be in keeping with the surrounding area.
- A further objection and second signed petition was received from 24 Joseph Luckman Road, signed by 34 and 30, 26, 20, 22, Joseph Luckman

Road, following re-consultation, raising concerns regarding the same concerns as previously raised, including that there would be an invasion of privacy to these properties and concerns of overlooking.

- A third petition following the second consultation period has also been received although only included signatures of 2 Catherine Ward Hall, and 1 and 7 Mill Terrace. The petition is likely to be an extension of the petition previously signed and discussed above.

ADD to end of Other Considerations

Following on from the second consultation, several concerns and objections were raised regarding the proposal in terms of impact on residential amenity and privacy to the properties at the rear boundary of the property at 10 Wood Street. As the new amended plans show a single storey extension, it is unlikely that the new extension is going to impact privacy as the extension is single storey, and there are standard boundary treatments including a fence separation these properties.

Therefore, there would be no concerns of overlooking into these rear dwellings. Further to this, traffic and bus congestion concerns are not valid reasons for refusal as highways were consulted and provided a statement of no objection to the proposal. In terms of concerns raised that the extension would not be in keeping with the character of the area, the proposed single storey extension occupies the place of the side garage, therefore there is a very minor material change compared to what was there previously, meaning on balance there is no net detrimental impact on visual amenity to street scene as a result of this extension.

AMEND:

Please amend neighbours notified section to read:

50 Hill Street, 24, 26 and 28 Joseph Luckman Road and 12 and 14 Wood Street

Amend Neighbour Responses section to read:

To the initial proposal for a two storey side extension and sub-division into two flats, two petitions were received. One with 10 signatures from 9 addresses and one with 8 signatures from 7 addresses. Another three objections were received from two addresses.

The comments are summarised below:

- Concerns that the development is out of character with the surrounding area, and concerns of the impact of the proposal on traffic in the area.
- Adverse effect of the proposal on the property to the rear, 24 Joseph Luckman Road, and loss of light to habitable room windows, and loss of privacy because of the proposal
- Concerns that Question 10 of the application has been answered incorrectly in that it says there are no current parking spaces, however objector has identified there is currently one-off street parking space in the garage.
- Concerns that the increase in density would cause parking and highway issues.
- Concerns as to whether Highways have been consulted as part of the application.
- Concerns that the proposal to turn the two-bedroom semidetached house into 2 flats with an upper and lower flat will mean a kitchen and a lounge being immediately adjacent to two first floor bedrooms of 12 Wood Street.

- Request from the objector that a condition be placed upon the developer to include suitable sound / acoustic insulation on the upper party wall in recognition of there being kitchen appliances (tumble dryers/ washing machine) adjacent to the bedroom wall of 12 Wood Street.

To the revised description for a single storey side extension two petitions were received. One with 10 signatures from 9 addresses and one with 4 signatures from 4 addresses. Another two objections were received from one address. The comments are summarised below:

- Extension would be out of keeping
- Detract from the aesthetics of the properties
- Remove existing parking space and increase in on-street parking
- Impact on highway safety
- Impact on privacy and overlooking

After the introduction, please add the following:

BACKGROUND:

Notwithstanding the number of objections received, this application was also called in to the Planning Applications Committee by Councillor Kyle Evans.

Amend Impact on 24 and 26 Joseph Luckman Road, and 50 Hill Street section to read:

Impact on 24 and 26 Joseph Luckman Road, and 50 Hill Street 24 and 26 Joseph Luckman Road

The rear elevation of the proposed extension would feature a ground floor lounge window and this would be opposite the rear elevations of 24 and 26 Joseph Luckman Road. In order to protect privacy, section 11.4 of the SDC states that a minimum of 20m is required in between existing and proposed habitable room windows. The distance between the proposed extension and the rear of 24 and 26 Joseph Luckman Road is approximately 13 metres, however the boundary treatments (2m wooden fence) and developments close to the boundary (multiple outbuildings) that separate these properties would block this view and therefore the impact to privacy is considered to be acceptable.

A side extension in this location with a rear facing habitable room window could also potentially be built under permitted development and this is considered to be a material consideration within this assessment.

In regards to the impact on light, section 11.7 of the SDC states that the blank wall of an extension directly facing the window of a habitable room of the same height shall be a minimum 12 metres apart. The scheme is compliant with this distance recommendation and therefore the impact to light is considered to be acceptable.

As the development is to be single storey, it is considered that there is no risk of overlooking and loss of privacy to the rear gardens of these dwellings.

50 Hill Street

The side boundary of 10 Hill Street's rear garden partially adjoins the side of the application site. Section 11.9 of the SDC states that near the boundary of an adjoining private amenity space, a proposed single storey extension shall be less than 4 metres long. The extension is shown to feature a length of 7.4m which is in

excess of this guidance. However, as the extension is to be set back from the boundary, the level of impact is considered to be minimal and acceptable. Also, 10 Hill Street features an outbuilding/garage so the extension would partially project alongside this rather than fully open garden space.

AMEND Introduction:

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached house. References to it, or its neighbour at 12 Wood Street, being terraced properties are incorrect.