
Case Number	20/03110/FUL (Formerly PP-09051445)
Application Type	Full Planning Application
Proposal	Demolition of side porch and detached garage, erection of single-storey side/rear extensions and provision of render and timber cladding to dwellinghouse
Location	8 Springfield Glen Sheffield S7 2HL
Date Received	09/09/2020
Team	South
Applicant/Agent	Brightman Clarke Architects
Recommendation	Grant Conditionally

Time limit for Commencement of Development

1. The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.

Reason: In order to comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act.

Approved/Refused Plan(s)

2. The development must be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved documents:

Amended Proposed Plans (Refs: 18-044-P00, Rev. A; 18-044-P01, Rev. A; 18-044-P02, Rev. A; 18-044-P04), Received 3rd November 2020.

Reason: In order to define the permission.

Pre Commencement Condition(s) – ('true conditions precedent' – see notes for definition)

Other Pre-Commencement, Pre-Occupancy and other Stage of Development Condition(s)

Other Compliance Conditions

Attention is Drawn to the Following Directives:

1. The Local Planning Authority has dealt with the planning application in a positive and proactive manner and sought solutions to problems where necessary in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Site Location



© Crown copyright and database rights 2016 Ordnance Survey 10018816

LOCATION AND PROPOSAL

The application relates to a detached single-storey dwellinghouse located on Springfield Glen, a cul-de-sac in the Ecclesall ward of the city. The site is in an allocated Housing Area as defined in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for Sheffield. The locality is residential in character, and Springfield Glen consists exclusively of detached single-storey properties, of mid-late Twentieth Century design.

Springfield Glen lies on a slope, with the dwellings at the western end, nearest to the junction with Springfield Road, at a higher land level than those at the eastern end – at the head of the cul-de-sac. This means that the topography of the application site specifically is such that there is a visible step up between no. 8 and no. 6, and a step down between no. 8 and no. 10.

The application proposes to demolish a detached garage and an attached canopy structure lying to the side and rear of the original dwellinghouse, alongside the shared boundary with no. 10 Springfield Glen. In its place, consent is sought to erect a single-storey side/rear extension, as well as a smaller single-storey rear extension situated close to the boundary with no. 6 Springfield Glen.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

77/01082/FUL - Extension to hall and to form WC – Granted: 25.05.1977.

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Councillor Barbara Masters has objected, raising concerns with the potential impact of the extension on neighbouring properties due to the proposals being out-of-character with the surrounding area in appearance and size. Councillor Masters also expressed that the proposals' proximity to no. 10 in particular would have a detrimental impact on this neighbouring dwelling's internal light levels, as well as on ease of access to the main entrance of the dwelling.

A total of 23 representations have been received during this application process, all of them in objection to the scheme.

Immediate neighbours were notified of the original application by letter (dated 24/09/2020), following which 11 objections were received; and notified again by letter with regards to the set of amended plans on 03/11/2020, following which another 12 objections were received. The vast majority of representations have been from other residents of Springfield Glen, except for two objections from persons with an interest in the property at no. 10 Springfield Glen.

Overall, the objections raise various issues and the material planning concerns that can be considered in this planning assessment are summarised below:

Design

- The side extension will reduce separation between nos. 8 and 10, altering the overall appearance of the Glen and harming the residential character of

the area.

- The extension will spoil the symmetry of the house, being too close and significantly higher than the house next door.
- The proposed materials (black wood cladding and white rendering) are out-of-keeping with the rest of the dwellings in the Glen, which have a similar appearance in type/colour of brickwork.
- Black cladding on white mortar will completely spoil the look of the neighbourhood.
- No matching of adjacent house materials is proposed or that of existing materials at no. 8.
- This application, if granted, will change the whole character and ambience of the Glen, due to its' physical appearance and size being out-of-keeping with the rest of the local area and destroying the uniformity that exists due to the considerate way in which all improvements/extensions have been made previously.
- Extensions should harmonise with other residential development in the vicinity, in terms of scale and design, spacing within the plot, and the prevailing architectural design. The current proposal does nothing to address these points.
- The scale, massing and materials of the proposed scheme is a dominant and visually intrusive form of development, constituting an incongruous addition to the host property.
- It will create a terracing effect which will harm the existing harmony of the bungalows and street scene and the character of space that exists on all other property boundaries here.
- Springfield Glen is characterised by bungalows set away from the highway with significant separation between them. The existing distance between no.8 and no.10 is approx. 3.34m. The garage at no.8 is set back from the front elevation by approx. 11.66m. The entrance to no.10 is located on its side elevation, adjacent to the boundary with no.8. The proposed extension would reduce the gap between the bungalows from the existing 3.34m to 1.07m and would be detrimental to the host dwelling's design.
- The extension is out-of-proportion with the host property and its height obscures the entire length of no.10. As such this is overdevelopment and the extension would compete with the host property.
- Natural surveillance of the area would be reduced. The design of the bungalows with significant gaps between them allow for unrestricted views of the street scene where there is gradual interplay between the public and private realms.
- The building line sits forward of no. 10. The view from the lower part of the street will be the sheer prominence of the overpowering gable end. This large blank gable end will be of detriment to the character of the street.
- The proposed plans are a modern interpretation of the current properties, and as such, will 'stick out like a sore thumb', being out of character with the rest of the street and may not stand the test of time.

Amenity

- Over-bearing impact of the front elevation on the street scene.
- Over-bearing impact of the side extension on no. 10.
- Over-shadowing impact of the side extension on no. 10 - the extension will

be only 920mm from no. 10's dining room, bathroom windows and main entrance, and will reduce natural light by breaching the 45-degree rule on the vertical plane.

- The proposed side extension will be higher than no. 10, on land that is already higher than the land level at no. 10.
- It will create a sense of enclosure to the occupiers of no. 10.
- The existing gap of 0.95m between no. 8's garage and no.10 is limited to the rear part of no. 10 (due to the garage being set back) and does not affect the amenity of no.10. The proposed extension is approx. 17.73m deep, maximum height 5.37m, and with the gap between the properties reduced this would be detrimental to no.10 in terms of loss of daylight/sunlight.
- It is acknowledged the revised plans show the proposed scheme set only slightly further from the boundary with no.10. This does not overcome the impact of the development on the host property, street scene and adjoining property at no.10.

Highway Safety

- No provision has been made for adequate off-street parking. The garage and majority of the main driveway will be removed, and what remains will be of insufficient width to provide the necessary off-street parking spaces, in accordance with current Council planning guidelines.
- For dwellings with 3 bedrooms, the guidelines state that 2 car parking spaces will be required.
- Loss of a significant amount of off-road parking space is likely to result in increased on-street parking in this narrow cul-de-sac.

Other issues

- The proposed side extension will cause safety and security issues for no. 10, as the main entrance will no longer be visible from the road making it easier for undesirables to break in.
- The proposals will have a huge impact on the environment as no. 10 will have to use more energy for lighting, increasing the carbon footprint, which must be avoided as much as possible.
- An extension up to the boundary with no. 10 will make it difficult for Emergency Services to access the property if required. This would also be true for anyone accessing no. 10 in a wheelchair or using mobility aids.
- The amended plans indicate the scale as 1:50 and 1:100, however no scale bar is provided so accuracy cannot be checked, preventing the Council from making accurate decisions.
- All previous approved schemes on Springfield Glen are modest extensions to the rear or small front porches, no permission has been granted for extensions of this magnitude.
- The proposals will impact upon no. 10's right to safe and secure accommodation as prescribed by Article 8 of the Human Rights Act (2000).

Non-planning issues

- The development would result in significant highway disruption due to numerous heavy vehicles. It is unlikely there would be adequate storage space 'on-site', potentially meaning more impact on the road with skips etc.

- General disruption to neighbours as a result of building operations.
- The base of the garage will need to be raised by at least 1m to be extended and joined to the main house, because of the lie of the land. This will affect no. 10's legal right to uninterrupted light.
- Insufficient space between nos. 8 and 10 for eavesdrop. The applicant has no legal right of eavesdrop along the whole of the boundary with no. 10, and no right would be granted if the application succeeds.
- A side extension will effectively block access and egress to no. 10 as any contractors, equipment and scaffolding would block the entrance.
- Digging down under no. 10 would be necessary to lay foundations for the extension. The applicant has no legal right to enter for this purpose, and no such right of access would be granted.
- Maintenance and repair to nos. 8 and 10 would be almost impossible and dangerous as there would be insufficient space between.
- There is no provision for storage of refuse bins. There will be no access to the rear of no. 8 which means the bins will be on view and if placed on the two driveways it will further reduce off-street parking space.
- Loss of value of neighbouring property.
- Loss of daylight/sunlight and lack of sufficient air flow between properties due to the height and mass of the extension would cause structural dampness.
- No.10's drainage is located along the boundary with no. 8. Excavation for foundations near the drainage would negatively affect the structural integrity of the drainage system at no.10.
- Disturbance of the ground to lay foundations risks disturbing the natural drainage. No. 10 is most at risk from any disturbance because it is at a lower level. There is no indication that this has been explored. Neither is there any indication of how the void between the existing ground level and the new ground floor level is to be filled to prevent it acting as a reservoir allowing water to seep onto no. 10.
- No environmental assessment has been requested – this is regrettable. This is an area affected by numerous streams. Several building alterations in the general area over the years have caused streams to be diverted from their natural course, causing a range of problems affecting structures. It has not been possible to rectify some of these.
- The resident at no. 6 will not give permission to the neighbour at no. 8 to attach a gate, for security purposes, to no. 6.
- Lack of communication and cooperation with the neighbours at no.10.
- The submitted application form contains inaccuracies in the answers to questions 6 (Trees and Hedges), 8 (Parking) and 11 (Authority Employee/Member).

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Planning Policy Context

UDP policies BE5 ('Building Design and Siting') and H14 ('Conditions on Development in Housing Areas'), and Core Strategy policy CS74 ('Design Principles'), expect good quality design in keeping with the scale and character of the surrounding area. Also relevant is the Council's Supplementary Planning

Guidance (SPG) on 'Designing House Extensions' which sets out design and privacy standards.

These policies are in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and in particular paragraph 127 which states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and result in a high standard of amenity.

Design

The existing dwelling at no. 8 Springfield Glen has a relatively linear form with a pitched roof and a front porch featuring a gable facing the highway. Whilst all the dwellings on Springfield Glen are similar to each other and all have pitched roofs, there are two distinct types – those with a pitched roof slope facing the highway, like the application site and its neighbour at no. 6; and those whose roofs are orientated through 90 degrees from the former type, such that the front elevations are represented as a gable feature, often with a central stone chimney, including no. 10. There is roughly an equal split between the two types on this road.

The proposed side/rear extension will extend the linear form of the original dwelling towards its side boundary with no. 10. The front elevation of the dwelling at no. 10 is positioned approximately 2 metres further back from the front boundary than that of the application site, no. 8. This may serve to emphasise the differences in size and appearance between these two properties, but given that they differ in their original design, and there are similar variations between adjacent dwellings throughout Springfield Glen, it is not considered that the form and mass of the proposed side extension will have a significant impact on the appearance of the host dwelling, or the wider street scene.

The front elevation of the dwelling as existing is faced mainly in reconstituted stone blockwork, with some small areas of light-coloured brickwork, both of which materials are common across nearby dwellings. Viewing the street scene of Springfield Glen, the palette of materials besides stone blocks and light brick includes areas of cream or white render and dark brown-/red-stained timber cladding (to nos. 10 and 12).

The proposals in this application will result in changes to the appearance of the facing materials, in that it is proposed to apply off-white render to bottom half of the front elevation and the entirety of the front porch feature, and to use black timber cladding for the area above the render, up to the eaves of the roof. The small areas of existing light-coloured brick will also be painted black (below the rendered areas). Whilst there is no precedent in the street scene for black facing materials, the contrast between this and the off-white render will have an appearance that is similar in character to the dark brown/red timber cladding at the neighbouring property. Overall, the impact of the proposed facing materials will be to afford the host dwelling a more contemporary appearance. It is considered that although the proposals will result in the dwelling having a more contemporary appearance than others in the Glen, the differences that make it appear contemporary do not represent a stark departure from the existing palette of materials. It is often preferable to utilise contemporary facing materials, as opposed to trying to source

materials that match those from an earlier time, which can result in a dwelling with a pastiche appearance.

The height of the ridge of the roof of the application site will not be raised as a result of the proposals. Due to the slope in Springfield Glen being readily perceived, the difference in overall height between the application site and its neighbours – the ‘steps’ between roof ridge heights – that exists presently will remain following the proposed development. The reduction in separation distance between nos. 8 and 10 will, however, be reduced. There is enough differentiation in the design of the two properties to ensure that they will continue to be perceived as individual detached dwellings, and no terracing effect will occur.

The side gable of the host dwelling will be positioned closer to no. 10 as a result of the proposals. However, as there will be no raising of the roof height, or extension forward of the original front elevation, it is not considered that the side gable will be any more visible or imposing when viewed from further along Springfield Glen, i.e. at the head of the cul-de-sac. In fact, from certain angles a lower proportion of it may be visible than at present, due to being obscured by the view of no. 10.

In terms of the impact of the reduction of the separation distance between facing side elevations within the street scene as a whole, this is considered to be minimal, as it will reflect similar separation distances between nos. 8 and 6, and between nos. 10 and 12. As these are close to the application site, it is considered that the impact of the design of the side extension and its projection towards no. 10 will not have a negative effect on the appearance of the dwelling or the street scene in general, and therefore is acceptable. In summary, the proposals raise no conflict with the relevant policies – BE5 and H14 of the UDP, CS74 of the Core Strategy, guidelines 1, 2 and 3 of the SPG, and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Amenity

UDP Policy H14 states that new development in Housing Areas should not cause harm to the amenities of existing residents, and Core Strategy Policy CS74 requires that development contributes to the creation of successful neighbourhoods. As stated above, these policies are in conformity with paragraph 127 of the NPPF which requires the creation of places with high standards of amenity.

The proposals in this application can be divided into three elements: the side/rear extension close to the boundary with no. 10, the cladding and rendering of the front elevation, and the small rear extension close to the boundary with no. 6. Whilst the former two elements were discussed in the previous section due to their design being visible from within the public realm, the latter has not been discussed thus far as it will only be visible from the rear of the application site and adjacent rear gardens, to a lesser degree.

Over-shadowing and over-dominance

The third element of the proposals – the smaller rear extension – will project approximately 4 metres (measured along its longest side elevation) from the rear

elevation of the original dwelling, and approximately 2m beyond the rear elevation of no. 6. It will also be separated from the boundary with this neighbour by approximately 1m. Sheffield's Supplementary Planning Guidance, 'Designing House Extensions', states under Guideline 5 that: "a single storey extension built adjacent to another dwelling may not extend more than 3m beyond that other dwelling". This element of the proposals will not exceed this, and so is found to be acceptable.

The curtilage of the dwellinghouse as existing includes a detached garage situated to the rear of the dwelling, lying along the side boundary with no. 10. The element of the proposed development that constitutes a side/rear extension will replace the garage with extended habitable accommodation for the dwelling. The rear elevation of the existing garage is approximately aligned with the rear elevation of a small rear extension that exists adjacent at no. 10. The proposed side/rear extension at no. 8 will project approximately 9.5m from the rear elevation of the original dwelling, and its rear elevation will not project beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling at no. 10. In this way, it will not cause any over-shadowing of windows in the rear elevation at no. 10.

This element of the proposals will also project from the side elevation of the original dwelling in the direction of the boundary with no. 10 but will leave a separation of approximately 0.2m from this boundary. This will result in approximately 1m of separation between the facing side elevations of the host dwelling as proposed and no. 10, inclusive of the neighbouring dwelling's side passage.

Due to the front elevations of properties on Springfield Road being situated at differing distances from the highway, the proposed side/rear extension will also project forward of the front elevation of no. 10, as the existing host dwelling also does. The closest feature of the front elevation of no. 10 to the side/rear extension would be the garage door, with the closest habitable room window being approximately 5m from the furthest extent of the proposed side/rear extension. This corner of the development would make an angle of approximately 30 degrees from the closest edge of the living room window at the front of no. 10. This angle and separation distance is considered adequate to ensure there will be no unreasonable over-shadowing of the front elevation of this neighbouring dwelling.

The increase in proximity of the side elevation of the host dwelling as a result of the proposed side/rear extension will cause some loss of light to the side passage and side-facing glazing at no. 10. The level of over-shadowing or over-dominance must be assessed for its impact upon neighbouring amenity levels in order to determine the acceptability of the proposal.

At present, no. 8's existing detached garage lies on the shared boundary between the properties at a length of approx. 6m. Projecting from the front of this, also on the boundary, is a canopy structure constructed from timber and plastic, with timber fence panels (permitted development) measuring approx. 4m in length. It is considered that these existing features already provide a sense of enclosure to a certain degree for the residents of no. 10 as they enter or exit the dwelling from the main entrance in the side elevation, which directly faces the timber fence panels.

The existing detached garage has a flat roof and the structure sits on a lower land level than the main dwelling. As previously discussed, the proposed side/rear extension will extend the ridge of the original dwelling's pitched roof to the side, and the ridge of the extension will also extend to the rear (turned through 90 degrees from the original dwelling's roof ridge), such that when viewed from the rear garden, the rear elevation of the extension will represent a gable end.

Although land levels slope away across the application site towards no. 10, and the roof ridge height will be maintained at one level, the proposed side elevation of the extension will be built up from an area of relatively flat ground, currently designated as no. 8's and no. 10's driveways. As a result, the height to the eaves of the side/rear extension from adjacent ground level will be no greater than the existing. However, it will be situated closer to the side elevation of no. 10 and will have increased in its overall length alongside no. 10.

As well as the main entrance to this neighbouring dwelling, the facing side elevation at no. 10 contains obscure-glazed windows serving a bathroom, adjacent to the main entrance, and windows serving the dining room in the existing rear extension, facing the boundary with no. 8. It should be noted that side windows in no. 10's rear extension are not the only source of light to this room, as the extension is similar to a conservatory – with roughly half of each elevation being glazed (with a brick plinth below) and having a glazed roof. As a result of this room having several aspects, it is not considered imperative that light levels reaching the side elevation that faces the proposed extension at no. 8 is protected.

Guideline 5 of the SPG encourages the protection of 'main windows' from over-shadowing or loss of light. Bathrooms and WCs are not considered to be the main habitable rooms of dwellings and so neither would the windows serving them be considered to be 'main windows'. Similarly, a door serving a main entrance, whether it is glazed or not, would not be considered in this category of 'main windows' requiring protection in the planning process, due to its transitory purpose, and the likelihood that a minimal amount of time is spent in these areas of a dwelling by inhabitants.

One of the representations received suggested that the height of the proposed side/rear extension at no. 8 would make an angle greater than 45 degrees when measured on a vertical plane from the openings in no. 10's facing side elevation. This relationship has not been considered as part of this planning assessment as within Sheffield's SPG for house extensions the '45 degree rule' is only applied horizontally and only to 2-storey extensions.

Any potential loss of direct sunlight is also a consideration. The orientation of the application site and its adjacent neighbours are such that they have south-facing rear gardens and rear elevations. The side elevation of no. 10 facing the proposed side/rear extension is orientated to the west. Consequently, the roof of the proposed extension is anticipated to have a somewhat obscuring impact on light reaching no. 10 from the setting sun. However, in considering the impact of this on the amenity and living conditions of occupiers of no. 10, particularly when using the room(s) at the rear of the dwelling, it should be noted that no. 10 is situated at a lower land level than the application site, such that some of the sun's light would

already be obscured during its descent by surrounding development and mature trees. Therefore, it is not considered that the loss of light from the setting sun as a result of the proposals represents a significant detrimental impact on light levels at no. 10.

In summary of the over-shadowing and over-dominance impacts that would arise from the proposed extensions at no. 8, it is accepted that the reduction in the separation distance between facing side elevations, and the increase in the overall height and length of development on the shared boundary, will cause some over-shadowing of windows and openings in the side elevation of no. 10, but it is not considered that this will represent such an unreasonable decrease in amenity levels for this neighbouring dwelling as a whole, or of its main living rooms in particular, as to warrant a refusal of planning permission on these grounds.

Privacy

Guideline 6 of the SPG states that “extensions should protect and maintain minimum levels of privacy” and provides guidance on appropriate distances between new elevations containing windows or other openings and existing dwellings. There are no side-facing windows proposed for the external side elevations of the extensions in this application, and the proposed front- and rear-facing windows are to be placed at a sufficient distance from neighbouring dwellings so as to maintain the existing privacy levels, both for occupiers of the application site and for neighbours.

The proposed openings in the internally-facing side elevations of the rear extensions will direct views predominantly towards other parts of the application site and will not represent a significant increase in views of the rear of no. 6 (which the longest element of the proposals will face towards) in comparison to those already available as a result of no. 6 being at a higher land level than the application site. Therefore, any impact upon the privacy of neighbouring gardens or dwellings from these proposals will be very limited and not unreasonable. Overall, the proposed extensions will not have significant impacts upon neighbouring amenity levels and the plans are found to comply with policies BE5 and H14 of the UDP, CS74 of the Core Strategy, guidelines 4, 5 and 6 of the SPG, and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Highways Safety

The proposed development will result in the loss of an off-road parking space, and the addition of a bedroom to the host dwelling. This is a regrettable situation, albeit one which does not present cause for refusal of the planning application, as Springfield Glen is a quiet cul-de-sac subject to limited traffic. Therefore, it is considered that if the proposals result in more frequent parking on the highway by the occupants of no. 8, it will not have a significantly negative impact on the ability of other vehicles or pedestrians to pass by, or on the overall safety of the highway.

Other Issues

Natural surveillance of this residential area, specifically of no. 10's main entrance

and particularly from dwellings opposite on Springfield Glen, will not be so significantly reduced as to warrant a refusal on security grounds.

Issues relating to the climate, environment and energy consumption are valid and are recognised by officers, but in this instance are also not considered to be so significant as to bring the planning process to a halt, and indeed, to make conditional demands of the applicants in relation to environmental benefits would be disproportionate and unreasonable of the planning authority.

In response to representations asserting that the reduction in the width of space between nos. 8 and 10 could obstruct wheelchair or emergency services' access to the dwelling at no. 10, it should be noted that the proposals for no. 8 do not encroach upon no. 10's property. Any access to no. 10 via land belonging to no. 8 at present should be considered to be 'borrowing' from, or utilising, land beyond the boundary of no. 10. Therefore, it would be unreasonable to resist these proposals on the basis that they will result in a loss of a potential to utilise the neighbouring property for access to no. 10.

In response to the concern raised that insufficient scale information had been provided on the submitted drawings to enable the planning authority's officers to make accurate decisions, it is confirmed that the software available to officers in their assessment has not encountered any problems examining the drawings and the information provided was sufficient to make reliable measurements in line with our expectations for applications.

It has been highlighted that no other dwellings on Springfield Glen have been subject to any extensions or development of a similar design or scale to these. Each planning application must be assessed on its own merits. The absence of similar previous applications or development is not automatically a hindrance to the success of a planning proposal. If this application were to achieve consent and be developed, it would not set a precedent and it would still remain that any future applications for similar development in this area should be considered on their individual merits.

One of the representations received has also requested that consideration be given to the responsibilities of the Council under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act (2000). The proposals set out in the above planning assessment are considered to be compatible with Human Rights. Planning proposals may interfere with an individual's rights under Article 1, Protocol 1, and Article 8, which provide that everyone has the right to peaceful enjoyment of his possessions and respect for their private and family life, home and correspondence. Interference with these rights can only be justified if it is in the public interest, in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society. In planning decisions, there is a need to balance the competing interests and rights of the landowners, other individuals, and wider public issues.

The potential interference here has been fully considered within the report, in particular the impacts on the amenities of existing and future residents and on balance, is justified and proportionate in relation to the provisions of the policies of the development plan and national planning policy.

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS

The majority of issues raised through representations are discussed in the above report. Those which are not, are addressed in the section below:

- The agent has been invited to comment on the perceived inaccuracies on the application form but all related matters have been considered in this assessment;
- Issues relating to residential waste drainage and ground water drainage (for a development of this scale), subsidence, noise, devaluation of neighbouring properties, and provision of bin storage are not planning considerations.
- Issues concerning building works or disruption at this scale of development fall outside of the planning process, as it is a domestic extension. Hours of work and noise nuisance are covered by separate legislation (Environmental Protection Act).
- Statements regarding the legal rights of neighbours to withhold from the applicant access to neighbouring property for the purposes of development or future maintenance and repairs are also not planning considerations.
- No environmental assessment has been requested for this application as it is not a requirement for a householder development of this scale.
- Consultation of neighbours by applicants prior to the application process is also not a requirement. Responsibility for this aspect lies with the Local Planning Authority and separately with the applicant prior to construction under the Party Wall Act.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

The proposed single-storey side/rear extensions and provision of render and timber cladding to the front elevation of the dwellinghouse is considered acceptable from both design and amenity perspectives and would not detrimentally affect the character and appearance of the dwelling nor significantly harm neighbouring living conditions.

In summary, the proposal is considered to accord with the provisions of the Unitary Development Plan, adopted SPG guidance, the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. It is recommended that planning permission is granted conditionally.