

Planning Statement in support of planning application

February 2013

Introduction

1. This Statement accompanies a planning application three storey side extension to 1 Meadowbank, to create additional living accommodation for that dwelling. The submission follows the withdrawal in April 2011 of a previously proposed three storey side extension (ref. 2011/1083/P) and the refusal of permission in July 2011 for a three storey side extension (ref. 2011/2320/P) This formal submission also follows a pre-application enquiry made in October 2012 (ref. 2012/ENQ/08351) and a response received in February 2013.
2. Close regard has been paid to the previous submission refused in 2011 and the contents of the decision notice and the Delegated Report to that application. Regard has also been paid to the response made to the recent pre-application enquiry. These established a number of matters relating to the property and any future proposal for an extension:
 - The Council found no 'in principle' objection to a side extension in the location proposed.
 - A design approach of 'harmonious contrast' to the existing building was considered acceptable. However, the 2011 submission was found to be unacceptable due to a lack of detailing and lack of set-back. The side elevation of the extension proposed in 2011 was felt to be 'dull'.
 - The 2012 scheme showed a set-back and this was considered to be subordinate to the main terrace of dwellings, and so was considered by the Council to be acceptable. The elevations to the extension were enlivened by modern window designs and form, but the pre-application response commented that the windows should be of a more horizontal design.
 - The 2011 extension was felt to lead to the need for pruning of two street trees, which might be unsympathetic and lead to unbalanced crowns. This was successfully rectified by the 2012 scheme, which showed a lower extension.
 - There might be an impact on roots to the street trees arising from the 2011 scheme; this was on the basis of the submitted arboricultural report suggesting further investigation was required prior to work starting, whilst the Council wished such survey work to be undertaken prior to determination of the application.
 - On the basis of the submitted information for the 2011 scheme, the Council were not satisfied that construction work could be carried out whilst providing adequate protection to the retained trees.

- The extension proposed in 2011 would not cause any harm to residential amenity for neighbours. It was also considered that the extension would provide satisfactory living accommodation and access for the occupants of the house itself.
3. This further revised scheme therefore incorporates certain aspects of the previous schemes, but also includes changes to the extension to take account of comments made with the 2012 scheme.

Proposed development

4. This revised submission has therefore been drawn up to address the specific concerns of the Council relating to the design of the extension and its effect upon the street trees.

The extension still adopts an harmonious contrast to the design. It shows a brick extension, which is set back from the existing main front elevation to ensure the desired set-back and degree of subservience to the main house.

- The detailing of the extension would distinguish it clearly from the host property. The window pattern and proportions have been modified from the previous scheme to incorporate more horizontal emphasis in the windows. A degree of contemporary design is retained within the window placement, size and design in order to avoid the ‘dull’ criticism that was levelled at the 2011 scheme.
 - The reduced height of the extension ensures the subordinate scale of the extension in relation to the host property and to the wider area, given the property’s location on a corner site.
 - The siting and scale of the proposed extension is located such as to cause no impact upon outlook or levels of light to neighbouring residential properties. There would not be any material change to privacy for adjoining occupiers, as the extension is simply at the end of an existing row of terraced housing.
 - The reduced height of the extension retains the positive benefits for the retention of the street trees. There would be less interference with the canopy of the trees, which was a concern expressed previously. There have also been changes in circumstances in relation to the nearby street trees since the date of the 2011 planning application. These matters are dealt with in more detail in the accompanying arboricultural statement.
 - Similarly, the detailed accompanying arboricultural statement addresses matters relating to the construction of the extension and how the health of the street trees would be maintained.
5. This planning application is therefore assessed against the relevant policies of the development plan and the relevant supplementary guidance.

Planning policy

6. The general objectives of Policies CS5 and CS14 of the Core Strategy and Policy DP24 of the Development Policies are to seek a high standard of design in new development. More detailed guidance is contained in the Design Planning Guidance 2011 CPG1. The specific criteria relating to side extensions (in Section 4) are examined below:
 - The extension would be set-back from the elevation to the adjoining terrace of properties.
 - There would not be any infilling of a gap, or impact upon a significant view in the area. Whilst the 2011 scheme was found to be intrusive and highly visible in the street scene, no 'in principle' objection was raised. Rather, it was the scale and design of that scheme, which have now been addressed in this smaller proposal, which is set-back and of a different design. Comments made with the 2012 pre-application submission have also been addressed through a redesign to the fenestration of the extension.
 - The front building line of the property and others along the road would not be compromised.
 - There is not an architectural symmetry to be impaired in the building. The property is on a corner site with changes in levels and a garden set at an angle to the road. The form of the proposed extension would relate well to this context, and so address comments made in relation to the previous scheme. The changes to the fenestration now proposed would provide the 'harmonious contrast' to the terrace, whilst avoiding any impression of a 'dull' extension.
 - There are not any architectural features on the side wall to be obscured.
 - Access to the property is retained.
7. The objectives of Policies CS14 and CS 15 of the Core Strategy and Policy DP24 of the Development Policies include protection of the landscape quality of the Borough and trees. The accompanying arboricultural statement explains how this revised scheme now overcomes the Council's previous concerns on this matter. This contains details on the retention of the health to adjoining street trees, both during construction and in the longer term.
8. The 2011 application was found to not be harmful to the amenities of neighbouring residents. The response made to the 2012 submission referred to the need to have regard to neighbouring amenity. This current scheme too would not impact upon privacy, outlook or levels of light to neighbours. The requirements of Policy DP26 of the Development Policies would therefore be satisfied.

Conclusions

9. The 2011 application and the 2012 pre-application enquiry for the site established a number of clear principles to guide a formal planning application for a side extension. The drawings now submitted, along with the accompanying arboricultural statement, clearly demonstrate how the Council's previous concerns have been addressed.
10. The extension of the property is to create additional space for the existing dwelling; it is not for a new dwelling. The extension to the side in a subdued contemporary fashion is acceptable in principle. In essence, the Council considered the refused scheme to be too high, set too far forward and of an inappropriate design. The 2012 pre-application scheme addressed many of these concerns. All the outstanding matters have now been overcome in the current formal planning submission.
11. The scheme accords with the development plan and the supporting supplementary planning guidance. It is trusted it is now an extension that can be granted permission by the Council, and support of the Planning Officers.