

Supplementary Committee Agenda



**Epping Forest
District Council**

District Development Control Committee Wednesday, 27th March, 2013

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, High Street, Epping

Time: 7.30 pm

Democratic Services: Simon Hill, The Office of the Chief Executive
Tel: 01992 564249 Email:
democraticservices@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

7.a Planning Application EPF/2214/12 - Proposed two storey and single storey side extension at Roding View, Buckhurst Hill (Pages 3 - 8)

(Director of Planning and Economic Development) To consider a late report admitted by the Chairman which was referred to this committee after the agenda publication.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to District Development Control Committee

Date of meeting: 27 March 2013

Subject: Planning Application EPF/2214/12 Proposed two storey and single storey side extension at 5 Roding View, Buckhurst Hill

**Officer contact for further information: S Solon Ext 4018
Committee Secretary: S Hill Ext 4249**



**Epping Forest
District Council**

Recommendation(s):

- (1) That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

By reason of its bulk, proximity to the site boundary and rearward projection, the first floor element of the proposed two-storey extension would detract from the amenities of 3 Roding View to the extent that excessive harm would be caused to the living conditions of its occupants. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Local Plan and Alterations Policy DBE9, which is consistent with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Report Detail

1. (Director of Planning and Economic Development) This application was reported to the Area Plans South Sub-Committee on 13 March 2013 with a recommendation that planning permission be granted. Following discussion Members voted to refuse the application for the above reason. The vote was immediately followed by a decision to refer the application to the District Development Control Committee for a final decision.
2. The main issue for Members was the consequence of the proposal for the living conditions of the occupants of 3 Roding View. Their objection concerned the impact of the proposal on light received by and outlook from a first-floor flank bedroom window that overlooks the application site.
3. The original report to the Sub-Committee is reproduced below:

Report to Area Plans Sub-Committee South – 13 March 2013

APPLICATION No:	EPF/2214/12
SITE ADDRESS:	5 Roding View Buckhurst Hill Essex IG9 6AF
PARISH:	Buckhurst Hill
WARD:	Buckhurst Hill East
APPLICANT:	Mr Dean Taylor
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:	Two storey and single storey side extension.
RECOMMENDED DECISION:	Grant Permission (With Conditions)

Click on the link below to view related plans and documents for this case:

http://planpub.eppingforestdc.gov.uk/AniteIM.websearch/ExternalEntryPoint.aspx?SEARCH_TYPE=1&DOC_CLASS_CODE=PL&FOLDER1_REF=543381

CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this notice.
- 2 Materials to be used for the external finishes of the proposed development, shall match those of the existing building, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

This application is before this Committee since the recommendation is for approval contrary to an objection from a local council which is material to the planning merits of the proposal (Pursuant to The Constitution, Part Three: Planning Directorate – Delegation of Council function, Schedule 1, Appendix A.(g))

Description of Site:

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached house with detached garage separating the house from the southern site boundary. The detached garage projects approximately 2.5m rear of the rear elevation of the house and is sited on the site boundary. The application site is situated on the east side of Roding View, a short distance from its junction with Loughton Way. The locality is characterised by a mix of two-storey house types, predominantly with hipped roofs.

The neighbour to the south, 3 Roding View, is a detached house set at lower level. Unusually, it has no windows serving habitable rooms in the rear elevation. It has windows to habitable rooms in the north elevation facing the side boundary of the application site. The rooms at the rear of the house (a bedroom at first floor and a kitchen at ground floor) are only served by windows in the north elevation.

Description of Proposal:

It is proposed to demolish the existing detached garage and erect a part single-storey, part two-storey side extension.

The extension would be set 500mm rear of the front elevation of the house. At ground floor it would be set 1m from the site boundary with 3 Roding Road and align with the rear elevation of the existing house. At first floor the extension would be set 2m from the site boundary with 3 Roding Road and 1m forward of the rear elevation of the existing house. The extension would have a hipped roof to both the ground and first floor elements that would match the pitch of the existing main roof. The ridge of the first floor roof would be set below that of the existing main roof.

Relevant History:

EPF/0318/07 Two-storey side extension and basement garage. Refused on the basis of harm to the character and appearance of the locality and living conditions of 3 Roding View.

EPF/2481/07 Two-storey side extension (Revised application). Refused on the basis of harm to the living conditions of 3 Roding View.

Policies Applied:

CP2 Quality of Rural and Built Environment
DBE9 Loss of Amenity
DBE10 Residential Extensions

NPPF

Consultation Carried Out and Summary of Representations Received

Number of neighbours consulted. 11
Site notice posted: No, not required
Responses received:

3 RODING VIEW, BUCKHURST HILL – Strong objection.

“The impact of the proposed extensions with their close proximity to our property would be both intrusive and detrimental to our privacy.

The only window of the main bedroom on the first floor would be obscured by the brick walls of the two storey and single storey side extensions which will be as little as approx 2.5 metres away from the side of our house. This will seriously impact upon the amount of natural light that will enter the room, and also impair the view.

With regards to the kitchen, our back door will open out on to a parallel brick wall, again as little as approx 2.5 metres away from the side of our house. As a direct result all the windows and the back door within the kitchen will be denied any natural light that would otherwise be available in what is our main habitual room within the house. Additionally the view from all the windows and the back door will be severely diminished, if not entirely obscured.

Our garden will also be affected by the position of the proposed extension as the amount of natural light will be significantly reduced in what is the main communal area.”

BUCKHURST HILL PARISH COUNCIL: - Objection

Overdevelopment

Lack of light amenity and impact on No 3

Street scene is not in keeping with neighbouring property, the design would cause loss of symmetry.

Main Issues and Considerations:

The issues raised by the proposal are design and impact on the living conditions of neighbours. Existing off-street parking would be maintained in the front garden and the garage to be demolished is too small to accommodate a car therefore the proposal raises no parking issues.

Design:

By maintaining a short set-back from the front elevation and a lower ridge level the scale and bulk of the development would be subordinate to the existing house. It would also maintain the visual integrity of the existing pair of semi-detached houses. In terms of its detailing, the proposed extension would match that of the existing house. External finishes are proposed to match and it would be necessary to secure that by condition if planning permission is granted.

The subordinate design would assist in maintaining a smooth transition in roof heights between the existing house and the detached neighbour, 3 Roding View, since it allows for the fall in ground level between the two properties. The ridge of the two-storey part of the extension would be close to that of 3 Roding View.

The maintenance of a distance of 1m from the site boundary at ground floor together with a distance of 2m at first floor would ensure the proposal would not cause a terracing effect with 3 Roding View and is in excess of the distance sought in the supporting text to Policy DBE10. That is appropriate in this case where there is a difference in ground level between the two properties. The visual separation is further assisted by the following facts:

- The house at 3 Roding View is set a minimum of 1m from the site boundary, increasing to some 2m to the rear since it is set at an angle to the application site
- Due to their relative positions the front elevations of the houses at 3 and 5 Roding View are not in alignment
- Both 3 Roding View and the proposed extension have hipped roofs.

The proposal would therefore achieve a harmonious relationship between 3 and 5 Roding View and complement the design of the existing house. As a consequence the proposed extension would safeguard the character and appearance of the locality.

Living Conditions:

The ability to achieve an extension of the dimensions proposed and maintain specified distances to the site boundary has been verified on site.

The ground floor element of the proposal would not cause any excessive harm to the amenities of neighbours. The impact of the ground floor element of the proposal on

the amenities of 3 Roding View is not significantly greater than that of an existing 1.8m high fence on the site boundary and much less than that of the existing detached garage. Indeed, a single-storey side addition projecting the same distance from the existing flank as the ground floor element could be constructed as permitted development.

The only part of the proposal that could potentially cause harm to the living conditions of neighbours is the first floor component and its roof. That would be set a distance of 2m from the site boundary with 3 Roding View and 1m forward of the rear elevation of the existing house. As identified in the objections raised, the proposal would impact on outlook from the first floor bedroom window in the flank of 3 Roding View. However, the greater part of the affected window, some two-thirds of its width, is sited rear of the rear wall of the first floor element of the proposal. The third of the window directly opposite the flank of the first floor element would be separated from it by a distance of at least 3.5m. As a consequence of this relationship the proposal would maintain the clear views that window presently enjoys across the rear garden of the application site. It is therefore found that outlook from the affected window would not be excessively harmed and there would certainly be no loss of light to that window.

The first floor element of the proposal would not cause any excessive loss of light to the ground floor flank windows of 3 Roding View. The greater impact would be from the nearer ground floor element and, as discussed above, that impact would not be excessive. Moreover, it would not be appropriate to withhold consent for that reason in any event since, notwithstanding the neighbour's objection, the affected ground floor windows do not serve habitable rooms.

There would be no overlooking of 3 Roding View from the proposal since it would not contain any flank windows. A rear facing first floor window would increase existing overlooking of the rearmost part of the back garden of 1 Roding View, but the degree of additional overlooking would not be excessive.

Conclusion:

The proposal overcomes the reasons for refusing previous proposals for two-storey side extensions in 2007. The side extension is acceptable in design terms since it would complement the design of the existing house and safeguard the character and appearance of the locality. Furthermore, through careful design that limits the scale of the first floor element of the proposed extension the proposal would safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring properties. As a consequence it complies with relevant planning policy and it is recommended that planning permission be granted

Should you wish to discuss the contents of this report item please use the following contact details by 2pm on the day of the meeting at the latest:


***Planning Application Case Officer: Stephan Solon
Direct Line Telephone Number: 01992 564018***

***or if no direct contact can be made please email:
contactplanning@eppingforestdc.gov.uk***



Epping Forest District Council

Area Planning Sub-Committee South



The material contained in this plot has been reproduced from an Ordnance Survey map with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery. (c) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Agenda Item Number:	6
Application Number:	EPF/2214/12
Site Name:	5 Roding View, Buckhurst Hill IG9 6AF
Scale of Plot:	1/1250