DARLINGTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE DATE: 12 December 201	2 Page
APPLICATION REF. NO:	12/00669/FUL
STATUTORY DECISION DATE:	17 December 2012
WARD/PARISH:	MIDDLETON ST GEORGE

The Granary, Thorntree Farm, Neasham Road, Middleton St George

Erection of a single storey rear extension.

Mr S Hill

APPLICATION AND SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is situated within a group of former agricultural buildings (including a former farm house) near the western edge of the development limits of the village of Middleton St George. The application dwelling is part two storey and part single storey.

The proposal involves the erection of a single storey extension to the rear of the property. It would be of a traditional gabled roof design, measuring some 5.1m in depth by 4.1m in width. It would have a height of 2.6m at eaves level and 4.4m at ridge level.

PLANNING HISTORY

LOCATION:

DESCRIPTION:

APPLICANT:

92/84 – Planning permission was granted in April 1992 for the change of use of agricultural buildings to form two separate dwellings (The application property and attached dwelling).

99/328 – Planning permission was granted in July 1999 for the erection of a sun lounge.

12/152 – Planning permission was refused in April 2012 for the erection of a two storey rear extension.

PLANNING POLICY BACKGROUND

Darlington Core Strategy Development Plan Document policies: -

CS2 – Achieving High Quality, Sustainable Design CS14 – Promoting Local Character and Distinctiveness

Borough of Darlington Local Plan 1997 policies:-

H7 – Areas of Housing Development Restraint

H12 - Alterations and Extensions to Existing Dwellings

The Council's Planning Guidance Note 7- Alterations and Extensions to Dwellings is also applicable.

RESULTS OF CONSULTATION AND PUBLICITY

Two letters of objection have been received from adjoining occupiers and the following comments made: -

- The proposed extension is very large and out of character with adjoining barn conversions.
- It would result in a loss of privacy.
- Loss of light.

.

• There is a restrictive covenant on the land which prevents the erection of any structure.

Low Dinsdale Parish Council has objected to the proposal on the following grounds: -

- It represents creeping development.
- It would result in the increased use of the existing access track (construction traffic) between Thorntree Gardens and the Thorntree Farm development, endangering young children, albeit for a limited period.

The Council's Highways Engineer has no highway objection to the proposal.

PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues to be considered in the determination of this application are: -

- Visual Amenity
- Residential Amenity; and
- Highway Implications

Visual Amenity

Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy expects new development to reflect/enhance the built and historic characteristics that positively contribute to the character of the local area and its sense of place.

Policy CS14 States that the distinctive character of the Borough's built, historic, natural and environmental townscapes, landscapes and strong sense of place will be protected.

Criterion 4 of Policy H7 of the Local Plan states that in the Countryside outside the development limits residential development will be permitted where it extends an existing residential building without materially detracting from its character or that of its setting. The supporting text of Policy H7 refers to large extensions (for example by 50% or more of the existing floor space of the original dwelling) often having an unacceptable impact on the landscape.

Policy H12 states that alterations and extensions to existing dwellings will be permitted provided that they are in keeping with the character, design and external appearance of the property.

The proposed extension in terms of its scale and design is considered acceptable and reflects the traditional style of the existing dwelling. As such it would not have any detrimental effects on the overall character or appearance of the locality.

Residential Amenity

Residential properties lie to the rear and either side. A separation distance of some 35m is provided between the proposed extension and the dwellings to the rear, consequently the amenities of the occupiers of these properties are unlikely to be affected.

In terms of the attached dwelling to the east, the extension would be sited approximately 7m from the common boundary between the respective properties which is delineated by a timber fence approximately 1.6m in height. The proposed extension would also sit partially behind an existing single storey offshoot at the rear of the dwelling which masks it from the adjoining dwelling to some degree. In view of this overall context the extension would not result in any material harm to this neighbouring property either by way of loss of light or privacy.

Turning to the dwelling on the opposite side the proposed extension would be situated some 5.5m from the low timber boundary fence which separates the properties and approximately 7m from the nearest part of the gable end of the neighbouring dwelling. Only a small element of the proposed extension would directly face the gable end of this dwelling (approximately 1m), with the remainder facing the neighbouring garage and the small yard which sits between this and the dwelling. Two small windows within the flank wall of the proposed extension would face the yard area and the back portion of the adjoining dwelling which contains an obscure glazed window providing light to a utility room. There are a number of other windows within the facing gabled elements of the neighbouring property but these are positioned forward of the proposed extension and overlook the side of the existing dwelling. In view of the location of the proposed extension and its physical relationship with the adjoining dwelling on the western boundary it is considered that there would be no adverse effects to the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

Highway Implications

The proposal raises no issues in respect or car parking provision or highway safety.

SECTION 17 OF THE CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998

The proposed development has been considered in the context of the requirements placed on the Council by Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, namely, the duty on the Council to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area. The proposed development does not give rise to crime and disorder issues.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development is considered acceptable in this location and will not cause any material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside. Neither would it give rise to conditions prejudicial to residential amenity or highway safety. The application does not raise any issues in relation to highway safety or crime prevention.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. A3 Implementation Limit (3 years)
- 2. B4 Details of materials (Samples)
- 3. B5 Detailed application (Accordance with Plans)

SUGGESTED SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANTING PLANNING PERMISSION

The proposed development is considered acceptable in this location and will not cause any material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside. Neither would it give rise to conditions prejudicial to residential amenity or highway safety. The application does not raise any issues in relation to highway safety or crime prevention. The proposed development accords with the relevant policy in the adopted development plan set out below;

Darlington Core Strategy Development Plan Document policies: -

CS2 – Achieving High Quality, Sustainable Design CS14 – Promoting Local Character and Distinctiveness

Borough of Darlington Local Plan 1997 policies:-

H7 - Areas of Housing Development Restraint

H12 - Alterations and Extensions to Existing Dwellings