

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMUNITY WELLBEING AND DEVELOPMENT –
27 July 2015

APPLICATION NO:
P/2015 /0286

LOCATION:
16 SUNNYRIDGE AVENUE
MARFORD WREXHAM
LL12 8TE

DATE RECEIVED:
17/04/2015

COMMUNITY:
Gresford

DESCRIPTION:
ERECTION OF DETACHED GARAGE
AND ERECTION OF GROUND AND
FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION

CASE OFFICER:
KH

WARD:
Marford & Hoseley

APPLICANT(S) NAME:
MR ADAM PEILL

AGENT NAME:
WDP ARCHITECTS
MS ALLISON POWELL

THE SITE



Located off the north east side of Sunnyridge Avenue.

PROPOSAL

Erection of detached garage and ground and first floor extensions.

HISTORY

No recent history.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Within settlement limit with policies PS1, PS2 and GDP1 of the Unitary Development Plan applicable.

CONSULTATIONS

Community Council:	Consulted 21.04.2015
Local Member:	Notified 21.04.2015
Neighbours:	2 letters of objection on the grounds of: - Two-storey element will be visually over-bearing, intrusive and dominant affecting privacy and sunlight with an existing ground level 6-7m higher than the property to the north east - Should be a distinctive break in the ridgeline between existing and proposed extension - Historically only bungalows in this area - Should comply with requirements of Local Planning Guidance No 20 - Over development - Design not acceptable - Loss of privacy – with any windows facing south, north west or north east should not present overlooking problems and use obscuring glazing
Site Notice:	Expired 14.05.15

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Proposal: Involves ground floor extensions to provide a new entrance, kitchen, dining and family room and modest front porch. Works are to the front and rear of the property and extension to be north west side elevation. It also involves a two-storey element on the south east elevation and provision of a new garage to the front of the property.

Design: The design is generally acceptable but I do have some reservations regarding the two-storey extension on the south side of the property with provision of two dormers facing south west and north west. A proposed garage to the front will have a minimal impact with an existing hedge to the boundary which will largely conceal the garage and the property to the south east also having a garage to the front of their property.

Amenity: Objections have been raised in regard to overlooking and loss of privacy. Loss of light and the over-bearing nature of the development.

The closest properties are Bank House to the north west, Randles Rise to the north east and Woodlea to the south east.

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMUNITY WELLBEING AND DEVELOPMENT –
27 July 2015

With regard to Bank House the single storey extension will project to within 1m of the boundary and whilst there is a substantial hedge on the boundary the height of the ridge will be 5m. However, the closest windows on Bank House will be approximately 19m away and with substantial screening of the side elevation and no windows here will have a significant loss of amenity.

Concerns have also been raised with regard to windows on the side/north west elevation which face towards Bank House. Part of a dormer window would be visible but would be at a distance of 30m from the closest windows and two rooflights (providing light to a landing) would be approximately 35m to existing windows. I would not anticipate any significant loss of amenity.

Randles Rise is located to the north east of the site and approximately 6-7m lower. Some existing tree planting within the garden of Randles Rise close to the boundary does help provide privacy. The two-storey element is located on the southern side of the application property and approximately 40m to any windows on Randles Rise. With existing screening and the distance and orientation of windows I would not anticipate any significant loss of privacy or it being overbearing. However, I am discussing this element of the two-storey extension with the agent given it is difficult to fully access the impact given the differences in levels.

Woodlea to the immediate south has a kitchen window close to the boundary but whilst the proposed two-storey projects forward of the window applying the BRE guidelines I would not anticipate any significant loss of light.

CONCLUSION

I am satisfied generally with the proposal but I am still in discussions with the applicant regarding elements of the two-storey extension, privacy and design. Subject to these elements being fully resolved, I am satisfied the scheme will be acceptable. My recommendation is in two parts to reflect on ground discussions.

RECOMMENDATION A

Should amended plans/proposals be submitted to overcome my concerns I am requesting that the Head of Community Wellbeing and Development be given delegated powers to determine the application and GRANT permission subject to appropriate conditions.

CONDITION(S)

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiry of five years from the date of this permission.
2. No part of the development shall commence until samples of all external facing and roofing materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in strict accordance with such details as are approved.

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMUNITY WELLBEING AND DEVELOPMENT –
27 July 2015

3. With the exception of those shown on the approved plan and notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking, re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no windows or other openings shall be inserted in any elevation of the building facing north west, north east and south east.

REASON(S)

1. To comply with Section 91(3) of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990.
2. To ensure a satisfactory standard of appearance of the development in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.
3. To protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties.

RECOMMENDATION B

If acceptable plans/proposals are not submitted to overcome my concerns I am requesting delegated powers to REFUSE the application for the following reason:

- 01 The proposal is considered unacceptable by virtue of its scale and mass and would be to the detriment of nearby residential amenity in regards f loss of privacy and the overbearing nature of the proposal. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy GDP1 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan.
-