
Delegated report Officer: Teresa Turner

Application ref. DMPA/2020/1247

The erection of an extension and external raised decking at 43 Askew Grove, Repton, Derby, DE65 6GR

Valid date: 02/12/2020

Consults expired: 15/01/2021

EIA development? No

Section 106 agreement? Not required

This decision is delegated to officers under the terms of the current Scheme of Delegation.

Relevant planning history

33/313 and 9/0872/0026 – Detached garage – approved 8th November 1972.

Responses to consultations and publicity

The Conservation Officer has raised concerns regarding the design inconsistencies within the originally submitted plans mainly the statement regarding its subservient nature. The reduced use of timber cladding, so as to better allow the extensions to be differentiated from the existing building, would be advocated.

It is difficult to determine what would be doors due to how the plans have been drawn. All openings are shown as windows on the floorplan and the front door is not shown at all on the proposed plans (annotated as an open gap between the marginal glazing panes on either side) and no internal doors or room labels are shown. On the existing plans, external doors are shown as vacant openings too, therefore some clarity on what is a door and what is a window would be helpful.

No detail of the proposed decking is provided however it is assumed that the brown shaded areas of the 3D models represent proposed decking which is shown outside of what appear as proposed bi-fold doors which are shown significantly above existing ground level on the proposed elevation drawings. Decking more than 300mm above existing ground level would represent a raised platform for which planning permission is required.

A new flue, presumably for a solid fuel appliance, is shown on elevations near an internal chimney breast. No details of its materials are provided – it is suspected that it would be black powder-coated or stove enamelled given how it is drawn on the elevations but this is never mentioned either in the Design and Access Statement or the materials section of the application form and the plans themselves have no annotation.

Relevant policy, guidance and/or legislation

The relevant Development Plan policies are:

- 2016 Local Plan Part 1 (LP1): Policy S2 (Presumption In Favour of Sustainable Development), Policy SD1 (Amenity & Environmental Quality), Policy BNE1 (Design Excellence)
- 2017 Local Plan Part 2 (LP2): H27 (Residential extensions and other householder development)
- Repton Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020 (NDP): H1 (The Limits of Development), H2 (Development within Settlement Confines), H4 (Design of New Developments)

The relevant local guidance is:

- South Derbyshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The relevant national policy and guidance is:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

Planning considerations

Taking into account the application made, the documents submitted (and supplemented and/or amended where relevant) and the site and its environs; the main issue(s) central to the determination of this application is/are:

- The design of the proposed extension as originally submitted;
- The impact on the setting of the adjacent conservation area; and
- The impact [of the revised plans of 13/01/2021] on the living conditions of the adjoining properties and the general character and appearance of the area.

Planning assessment

The design of the proposed extension as originally submitted

The proposal seeks planning permission for an extension that would effectively replicate the existing scale of the host dwelling on site. The proposed eaves and ridge heights would be the same as the existing building whilst the width and length of the proposed extension would be directly comparable to the existing building (in both respects just marginally smaller than the existing). As such it would be difficult to see in what way the proposal has taken account of adopted guidance on design of domestic extensions which advocates a subservient relationship of extensions to existing buildings, an extension which is itself the same size and scale as the existing could not be called subservient. The incorporation of a front facing entrance door into the proposed extension would effectively leave the visual focus on the proposed extension and the use of matching materials would seem to promote harmony and consistency across the extended property as a whole rather than promoting the character of a building which has been extended.

In essence the originally submitted plans are confusing and contradictory as well as showing a proposal which in no way addresses the claim in the Design and Access Statement that the proposal would achieve the goals set out in the Council's Adopted SPD which does not advocate extending a building in a way which makes the result appear as a building which has simply always been of the proposed scale.

Amended plans were received on 13th January 2021 in response to the above comments regarding the design and the discrepancies with the original plans. The addendum to the originally submitted Design and Statement which was received at the same time states that the ridge height of the proposed extension would be a little lower and that this revision has been represented on amended drawing no. PPE1D. However, the revised plans have the exact same error as the originals – two elevations show a slightly lower ridge while a third elevation and the roof plan/block plan shows a ridge the same height as the existing. The text in the addendum does not confirm how much lower the ridge would be although there is additional information on the extension width which would indicate that a slightly lower ridge would be achieved and is proposed.

The amended plans and addendum also confirm the extent of the proposed external decking and that it would be flush with the proposed finished floor level of the proposed extension.

The discrepancies within the amended drawings and statement would not be sufficient to warrant or to sustain a refusal of the proposal given that its design is in keeping with the character of the existing host and given the minimal impact that a flush ridge or a slightly lowered one would have on the character of the immediate street scene and area.

The impact on the setting of the adjacent conservation area

The application site is well outside of the conservation area and the proposed extension would not harm its setting or views into and out of it. The property does sit within a group of other bungalows to the west, these all appear to be based on the same basic footprint. The 4 furthest to the west appear to have been built with attached garages and front porches, the next 3 with no porches but with attached garages and then this property which, despite being in the largest plot, appears to have been built without either of the attached porches or garages as seen on examples to the west. The result is that the row of bungalows are not read as a group of matching properties and they derive little architectural character from their position as part of a group of similar properties. As such there would be no significant objection from the Conservation Officer with regard to the proposal in terms of design and the impact on the setting of the conservation area.

It should be noted that the conservation area boundary runs along the rear (south) boundary of the application site which also forms the boundary of a very long private garden space for a house that fronts High Street which is within the conservation area. There are no public views into or out of the conservation area from this location and it would appear that the conservation area boundary specifically excludes the more modern bungalows and detached houses along this section of Askew Road. As such, the location of the application site could not be said to affect the setting of the adjacent conservation area sufficiently to warrant the need to advertise the proposal with a site notice.

The proposal, as amended on 13/01/2021, would therefore be considered to conform to the requirements of the NPPF and the objectives of Policy BNE2 of the LP1 and BNE10 of the LP2 in that the significance of the adjacent heritage asset would not be affected by the proposed works.

The impact [of the revised plans of 13/01/2021] on the living conditions of the adjoining properties and the general character and appearance of the area

Ground levels along the section of Askew Grove where the application site is located are relatively flat with the road descending gradually from the junction of the main thoroughfare through the village (High Street) to the west – the application site and the surroundings properties are in a slight hollow before Askew Grove takes a gradual upward turn to the east. The ground level to the east side of the application site where the proposed extension would be located gradually descends towards the watercourse to the extent that the proposed raised decking (additional details received on 13/01/2021) would be required to allow level access from the extension onto the outdoor amenity space as the proposed floor level of the extension would match that of the existing house. The proposed raised deck would no higher, or only marginally higher, than the existing ground level that currently surrounds the host to its rear, front and west side and as such it would have no increased impact on the amenities of the immediate neighbours.

The immediate neighbour to the west (No. 45) is a single storey bungalow of the same style as the host and the proposed single storey extension would be located to the east side of the host building such that it would not impact on this neighbour's amenities and the existing privacy levels between them would be maintained in accordance with the Council's SPD.

The closest neighbour to the east (No. 41) is a 2-storey detached house, side on to the application building and separated from the site by a watercourse. There would be adequate separation and screening between the side of the proposed extension and the side elevation of No. 41 to comply with the Council's SPD with regard to preserving privacy.

There are no residential neighbours to the north side of Askew Grove that would be affected as the land opposite is the site of Repton Village Hall (a new village hall is currently being built - planning and relevant demolition approved under 9/2017/1257 and 9/2017/1376). The land to the south side of the application site comprises the end of a very long garden area for a property that fronts High Street (No. 29) and the proposed extension would not be considered to adversely impact on this neighbour's outdoor amenity space.

The proposed single storey extension would be attached to the east side of the host and set back slightly from its rear elevation and at a right angle. As such, the proposed addition would not interfere with the current building line which the host shares with the 2 other properties of similar design to the west (45 and 47 Askew Grove) as well as No. 41 to the east. The character of the original host and the current building line would be maintained and the intervening built form and the vegetation around the watercourse would limit views of the proposed extension when travelling along the highway in both directions such that there would be a negligible impact on the character of the existing street scene and the general character of the area.

The proposal, as amended on 13/01/2021, would therefore be considered to be in accordance with the requirements of NPPF and with the objectives of Policy BNE1 of the LP1 and Policy H27 of the LP2 in that the proposed development, although not notably subservient, would be of a scale and character in keeping with the existing host and would not be unduly detrimental to the living conditions of adjoining properties or the general character of the area.

The proposal, as amended on 13/01/2021, would conform to the requirements of Policies H1, H2 and H4 of the Repton NDP in that the application site is within the settlement boundary of Repton and the proposed development would not adversely affect neighbouring properties and would have no impact on the historic context of the adjacent conservation area.

The proposal, as amended, would conform to Policy SD1 of the LP1 in that it would not lead to adverse impacts on the environment or amenity of existing and futures occupiers within and around the proposed development.

The proposal, as amended, would conform to the requirements of the NPPF and the NPPG and with Policy S2 of the LP1 in that planning applications received by the Council that accord with the policies in the Local Plan Part 1 (and where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be dealt with positively and without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Recommendation

Approve with Conditions

None of the other matters raised through the publicity and consultation process amount to material considerations outweighing the assessment of the main issues set out above, noting that conditions or obligations have been attached where meeting the tests for their imposition. Where relevant, regard has been had to the public sector equality duty, as required by section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 and to local finance considerations (as far as it is material), as required by section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), as well as climate change, human rights and other international legislation.

Recommendation made:	26/01/2021
Report agreed:	27/01/2021
Authorised officer:	Steffan Saunders
