

Planning Committee Report – LA01/2016/0685/F Address: 42 Garvagh Road, Dungiven	26th October 2016
PLANNING COMMITTEE	FOR DECISION

Linkage to Council Strategy (2015-19)	
Strategic Theme	Protecting and Enhancing our Environment and Assets
Outcome	Pro-active decision making which protects the natural features, characteristics and integrity of the Borough
Lead Officer	Principal Planning Officer/Development Management Manager
Cost: (If applicable)	N/a

<u>No:</u>	LA01/2016/0685/F	<u>Ward:</u>	Dungiven
<u>App Type:</u>	Full Application		
<u>Address:</u>	42 Garvagh Road, Dungiven		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Two storey front and rear extensions to house and erection of single storey detached garden shed.		
<u>Officer:</u>	Heidi Clarke ext: 7095		
<u>Con Area:</u>	N/A	<u>Valid Date:</u>	9 th June 2016
<u>Listed Building Grade:</u>	N/A		
<u>Agent:</u>	O'Connor Burke Architecture, 1 College Terrace, Dungiven		
<u>Applicant:</u>	Mr and Mrs McLaughlin		
<u>Objections:</u>	0	<u>Petitions of Objection:</u>	0
<u>Support:</u>	2	<u>Petitions of Support:</u>	0

Drawings and additional information are available to view on the Planning Portal- www.planningni.gov.uk

1 RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in section 7 & 8 and resolves to **REFUSE** outline planning permission for the reasons in section 10.

2 SITE LOCATION & DESCRIPTION & CHARACTER OF AREA

- 2.1 The site is located within an established residential area within the settlement development limit of Dungiven as provided for by Northern Area Plan 2016.
- 2.2 The application site hosts a two storey dwelling which forms part of a terrace of four dwellings. The property is in the middle of the terrace with an alleyway running through the terrace to provide access to the rear gardens. The terrace is located on the western side of Garvagh Road in the northern part of Dungiven.

- 2.3 The property has a canopy roof over the front door which extends across and over the neighbour's front door. Both properties on either end of the terrace also have canopy roofs over the front door. The front garden has been paved to provide off street parking. The whole terrace is finished with render.
- 2.4 To the rear, the property has a small outhouse which is paired with an outhouse in the adjoining neighbour's garden at no. 44. The rear garden also houses a larger outbuilding which is positioned along the northern boundary. The property has a long garden stretching 22m from the rear wall of the dwelling to the rear boundary. The fence on the southern boundary follows a diagonal line towards the south west which means the garden widens further to the rear (west).

3 RELEVANT HISTORY

No planning history.

4 THE APPLICATION

- 4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for a two storey front extension, a two storey rear extension and the erection of a new outbuilding in the rear garden.
- 4.2 The southern side boundary of the rear garden runs diagonally away from the rear of the dwelling to the rear boundary (see map). The two storey rear extension as submitted on the original proposal followed the line of the southern boundary projecting diagonally away from the rear of the dwelling. During the processing of the application the Council raised concerns with the scheme. The proposal was amended to run the two storey rear extension perpendicular from the rear elevation of the main dwelling so as to step the southern side elevation of the rear extension off the diagonal boundary. The amended scheme is still considered to be contrary to the Addendum to PPS7.

5 PUBLICITY & CONSULTATIONS

External:

- 5.1 **Neighbours:** No objections

2 letters of support have been received from the adjoining properties.

No. 42 Garvagh Road have advised that the proposal does not obstruct light or views and advise that they have no objection.

No. 44 have advised that they have no objection to the proposal.

Internal:

5.2 Consultees – no relevant consultees

6 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 Section 45(1) of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 requires that all applications must have regard to the local development plan, so far as material to the application, and all other material considerations. Section 6(4) states that in making any determination where regard is to be had to the local development plan, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.2 The development plan is:
- Northern Area Plan 2016
- 6.3 The Regional Development Strategy (RDS) is a material consideration.
- 6.4 The Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland (SPPS) is a material consideration. As set out in the SPPS, until such times as a new local plan strategy is adopted, councils will apply specified retained operational policies.
- 6.5 Due weight should be given to the relevant policies in the development plan.
- 6.6 All material considerations and any policy conflicts are identified in the “Considerations and Assessment” section of the report.

7 RELEVANT POLICIES & GUIDANCE

Northern Area Plan 2016

Strategic Planning Policy Statement

Addendum to PPS 7 - Residential Extensions and Alterations

8 CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 The main considerations in the determination of this full application are the principle of development; design of front extension; dominance of rear extension; acceptability of outbuilding and precedent cases.
- 8.2 The main policy consideration is contained within the Northern Area Plan 2016, the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and the relevant Planning Policy Statements. This is a proposal for an extension to an existing dwelling and as such the main policy consideration is the Addendum to PPS7 – Residential Extensions and Alterations. The main policy consideration within this policy is Policy EXT1.

Principle of development

- 8.3 The Addendum to PPS7: Residential Extensions and Alterations (Adden PPS7) sets out the planning policy for achieving quality in relation to proposals for residential extensions and alterations. Policy EXT 1 states that planning permission will be granted to extend or alter a residential property where four criteria are met. The two criteria which the proposal fails to meet are:
- The scale, massing, design and external materials of the proposal are sympathetic with the built form and appearance of the existing property and would not detract from the character or appearance of that property or the surrounding area.
 - The proposal does not unduly affect the privacy or amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 8.4 The scale and design of the proposed front extension is not sympathetic with the built form and appearance of the existing property and would detract from the character of the surrounding area.
- 8.5 The rear extension by reason of its scale and position is not sympathetic to the host dwelling and would have a dominant effect on the residential amenity of the adjacent property to the

south. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policy EXT1 of the Addendum to PPS7.

Design of front elevation

- 8.6 The front extension extends 2.6m out from the existing front elevation for the entirety of the ground floor and facilitates an extension to the living room and creates a large entrance hall. The front extension continues up to the first floor level on the left hand side of the dwelling and includes the installation of a 2m tall window to extend an existing bedroom.
- 8.7 As previously highlighted in paragraph 2.2 the dwelling is one of the central dwellings in a terrace of four. As the central property in a terrace, the extension cannot be considered in isolation but must be considered in terms of the impact on the host building and the wider context of the terrace. The site is located within an established residential area predominantly characterised by two storey residential properties of a similar design, size and scale. However, some of the properties display relatively minor individual details such as canopies over front doors, side extensions or design modifications.
- 8.8 The proposed front extension would appear out of keeping on the host dwelling, the terrace of four and in the wider street scene due to the level of projection, the scale over 2 floors and design detailing in particular the fenestration. The proposed front extension would be visible and dominant when viewed from the front window of the neighbouring property as it would extend 2.6m from the front elevation. The proposed front extension would compromise the appearance and architectural integrity of the terrace introducing a two storey front projection which would appear obvious as an add on to the property which would have an adverse impact on the character of the wider area. The detailing of windows in particular their size and style would not respect the character or appearance of the dwelling or the wider terrace. The proposal therefore fails to comply with EXT1 of the Addendum to PPS7.

Dominance of rear extension

- 8.9 The proposed two storey rear extension protrudes 5.1m from the existing rear building line over the ground and first floor and create an additional living room, allows for internal alterations to creates a larger kitchen and facilitates a new master bedroom and ensuite and bathroom extension at first floor level. The rear extension has a pitched roof with an overall height of 6.5m.
- 8.10 The proposed rear extension by reason of its size and projection would not respect the character of the host dwelling. Furthermore by reason of its position, scale and large blank side wall would dominate the neighbouring property to the south. The extension would be overbearing when neighbours are in their back room or using the amenity space immediately to the rear of the property. It is appreciated that the affected neighbour is situated south of the proposal and as such is unlikely to be overshadowed. In addition the residents of no. 40 and 42 have submitted letters of support advising that they have no objection to the proposal however the tenure of the properties may change during the lifespan of the extension. The proposed rear extension does not respect its wider setting and will impact in particular on the neighbouring property to the south. The rear extension fails to comply with Policy Ext1 of Addendum to PPS7.

Outbuilding

- 8.11 The proposed outbuilding which has been annotated as a shed on the plans would measure 6m x 4m with a pitch roof of 4.5m in height. The outbuilding would be positioned at the bottom of the garden along the boundary fence and replaces two existing outbuildings that would be demolished.
- 8.12 The position of the outbuilding on the rear boundary is an adequate distance from any neighbouring properties and the design ensures that it does not negatively impact on amenity. The outbuilding is an acceptable size and would retain sufficient amenity space for occupants. The proposed finishes would be sympathetic to the host dwelling and whilst the neighbouring properties do not have outbuildings of a similar scale, it is not considered to create any harm visually or to residential amenity. As such the proposed outbuilding is considered to comply with Policy EXT1 of PPS7 Addendum.

Precedent

- 8.13 During the processing of the application, other extensions in the vicinity were cited as precedent. The extensions to 30 and 36 Station Road, 46 Garvagh Road and 91, 92 and 94 Priory Road are not considered to be comparable as they all date prior to March 2008 and were therefore permitted prior to the publication of the Addendum to PPS7.
- 8.14 Front extension at 38 and 53 Garvagh were also raised as precedent. Both of which were also granted planning permission prior to the publication of the Addendum to PPS7 and are also not comparable. As both were for front extensions the Planning Authority have given them consideration and would highlight the following differences to the application site. No. 38 is an end of terrace and No. 53 is a semi-detached property. Each design has incorporated elements of the design of the host dwelling. The cited extensions continue the roof plane, have introduced dormers and have used windows which match the fenestration of the terrace. The cited extensions only extend part of the front elevation and not the whole footprint of the building, unlike the proposal which would step the whole building line forward.
- 8.15 The agent also cited an extension approved under B/2014/0033/F as precedent. The extension at 97 Priory Road, Dungiven did not propose a front extension and the rear extension is not comparable to that proposed because it was considerably smaller and being an end of terrace property, the extension was on the outer part of the rear elevation which would not impact on the adjacent property. This extension was therefore considered acceptable under the Addendum to PPS7.
- 8.16 Finally, with regards an extension granted permission under B/2011/0209/F, this extension was for a side and rear extension which was set back from and appeared as subordinate to the front elevation. The property is semi-detached and the rear extension is set back from the shared boundary by a metre which was considered acceptable under the Addendum to PPS7. This decision does not set a precedent for the current proposal.

9 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In conclusion, the proposal is not sympathetic to the host building and compromises the architectural integrity of the terrace and would have a dominant effect on the residential

amenity of neighbouring properties. The cases cited as precedent are not comparable and this proposal is considered to be contrary to policy EXT1 of the Addendum to PPS7.

10 REFUSAL REASONS

- 10.1 The front extension by reason of its scale and design would be out of keeping and would not be sympathetic with the built form and appearance of the existing property or the character of the area. As such it does not comply with Paragraph 4.27 of the SPPS and Policy EXT 1 – Residential Extensions and Alterations, of the Addendum to Planning Policy Statement 7 (PPS7).
- 10.2 The rear extension by reason of its scale and location is not considered to be sympathetic with the host dwelling and would have a dominating effect on the residential amenity of neighbours to the south. As such it does not comply with Paragraph 4.27 of the SPPS and Policy EXT 1 – Residential Extensions and Alterations, of the Addendum to Planning Policy Statement 7 (PPS7)

