

Planning Report

Application No: C/2021/0209	App Type: Full
Applicant: Mr Liam Jenkins 53, Larch Lane Bedwellty Gardens Tredegar NP22 4FA	Agent: George and Co Mr Steven George 1st Floor Woodfired Studios 62 High Street, Merthyr Tydfil United Kingdom CF47 8DE
Site Address: 53 Larch Lane, Bedwellty Gardens, Tredegar	
Development: Proposed two storey rear extension.	
Case Officer: Jane Engel	



1. Background, Development and Site Context

- 1.1 This application seeks planning permission for a two storey extension to the rear of 53 Larch Lane, Bedwellty Gardens, Tredegar.
- 1.2 The property is an end of link two storey house situated within the Bedwellty Gardens development site. It is located on a corner, which fronts onto the estate road which extends around the side boundary. The rear garden backs onto the side garden of no 35 Larch Lane.



- 1.3 The proposed extension projects 4.2m from the main back wall of the house and extends across the full width of the garden projecting 0.67m beyond the side elevation of the house. It will have a pitched roof and have a set of French doors at ground floor level and two windows at first floor serving the two bedrooms.
- 1.4 The extension would be finished in materials to match the main house.
- 1.5 Concerns were raised with the agent over the design of the proposed extension and he was requested to amend the development. He advised that he wished the application to proceed on the plans as submitted.

2. Site History

	Ref No	Details	Decision
2.1	C/2007/0400	Erection of 147 no. dwellings including garages, roads and associated works	Approved 04/08/2009
3. Consultation and Other Relevant Information			
3.1	<u>Internal BG Responses</u>		
3.2	<u>Team Leader Building Control:</u> Building Regulations required		
	<u>External Consultation Responses</u>		
3.3	<u>Town / Community Council:</u> No objections		
3.4	<u>Welsh Water</u> The applicant is advised that the proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer. No development will be permitted within the safety zone which is measured either side of the centre line.		
3.5	<u>Public Consultation:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 letters to nearby houses • site notice(s) • press notice • website public register of applications • ward members by letter • all members via weekly list of applications received • other <p><u>Response:</u> No responses have been received as a result of the neighbour notifications. Ward Members have requested that the application be presented to Planning Committee as they consider that there are a mix of housing types, sizes and designs in the immediate area.</p>		
4. Planning Policy			
4.1	<u>Team Manager Development Plans:</u> <p><u>LDP Policies:</u> DM1 New development DM2 Design and Placemaking</p>		

Supplementary Planning Guidance: Householder Design Guidance Note 1

5. Planning Assessment

- 5.1 The proposal has been assessed against policies DM1 and DM2 of the adopted Local Development Plan (LDP) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance for Householder Development Note 1: Extensions and Conservatories (SPG).
- 5.2 The proposed extension meets the requirements of the SPG in relation to its size, finishes and roof design and remaining amenity space.
- 5.3 The positioning of the extension is such that it will inevitably have some impact upon the immediate neighbouring property in terms of loss of light. However, I do not consider that any overshadowing would be significant enough to justify refusal of the application. I am also satisfied that the proposal would not have an overbearing impact upon the amenities of the occupiers. No windows are proposed in the side elevation therefore there are no concerns regarding loss of privacy.
- 5.4 The proposal will result in the windows on the first floor being brought closer to the garden of the property to the rear. However, this garden area is already overlooked and as such I do not consider the impact to be significant enough to justify refusal of the application. I also consider that the extension will be sited far enough away such that it will not have an overbearing or overshadowing impact upon this property. I therefore consider the proposal to be compliant with policy DM1 2c.
- 5.5 However, policy DM2 d specifies that extensions should “*reflect, complement, or enhance the form, siting of the original building, its curtilage and the wider area*”. Policy DM1 2b requires proposals to have no “unacceptable adverse visual impact on the townscape”. The SPG also advises that extensions on corner plots need to respect the streetscene.



5.6

The proposed projection beyond the side elevation is considered poor design which fails to respect the main building and the design of dwellings in the wider area. The disruption of the building line would result in an incongruous feature as viewed from the surrounding area and as such consider contrary to both DM2 d and DM1 2b and the SPG.

5.7

Whilst the principle of a two storey extension is acceptable in principle, the projection beyond the side building line is not considered an acceptable form of development for the reasons outlined above.

5.8

Approval of the development would in my view set an unacceptable precedent for other such development within the estate.

6. Legislative Obligations

6.1

The Council is required to decide planning applications in accord with the Local Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The planning function must also be exercised in accordance with the principles of sustainable development as set out in the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 to ensure that the development and use of land contributes to improving the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales.

6.2

The Council also has obligations under other legislation including (but not limited to) the Crime and Disorder Act, Equality Act and Human Rights Act. In presenting this report, I have had regard to relevant legislation and sought

	to present a balanced and reasoned recommendation.
7. Conclusion and Recommendation	
7.1	<p>In conclusion, I consider the proposed extension would have a detrimental impact upon the visual amenity of the area. The development is therefore contrary to LDP Policy DM1 2b and DM2 d and Supplementary Planning Guidance for Householders: Note 1</p> <p>Planning permission be <u>REFUSED</u> for the following reason(s):</p> <p>By virtue of its design the proposed extension would have an unacceptable impact upon the visual amenity of the area. The disruption of the building line results in an incongruous feature which will have an unacceptable impact upon the streetscene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DM1 2d and DM1 2b and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance "Householder Design Guidance", Note 1 Extensions and Conservatories.</p>
8. Risk Implications	
8.1	None