

KEY INFORMATION

Ward West Ferry

Proposal
Extension to KitchenAddress
10 Clinton Terrace
Broughty Ferry
Dundee DD5 1JZApplicant
Mr & Mrs William and Mary
Reilly
10 Clinton Terrace
Broughty Ferry
Dundee DD5 1JZ
AgentRegistered 27 August
2002Case Officer Charlie
Walker

Consent for kitchen extension sought

The extension to kitchen is **RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS**. Report by Director of Planning and Transportation

RECOMMENDATION

The proposed extension satisfies the requirements of Policy H4 of the adopted Local Plan and will not adversely impact on the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of neighbouring houses. The application is therefore recommended for **APPROVAL** with conditions.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

- Planning permission is sought to complete and retain an extension of some 18 sq. metres to the rear of this dwellinghouse. The extension accommodates a kitchen and is to the west of and continues the form of an existing extension at the rear of the house. This existing extension was constructed many years ago.
- Policy H4 of the adopted Dundee Local Plan 1998 sets out guidelines for alterations and extensions to houses.
- 2 letters of objection were received from the occupiers of houses to the west and south west of the site who are concerned about overdevelopment of the plot; overshadowing of their property; noise and cooking odours from the kitchen; the design of the roof of the extension and the fact that works have been carried out and continue to be carried out without planning permission.
- In terms of the overdevelopment of the plot, the total amount of development comes to some 40% of the rear garden which is well within the Policy H4 figure. The design of the extension is reasonable for this secluded location. It is considered that there will be no significant degree of overshadowing nor any unacceptable noise or smell from the kitchen. However it is considered that the colour of the tiles which have been used is unacceptable and a condition relative to this aspect of the development is recommended.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought to complete and retain an extension of some 18 sq. metres to the rear of this dwellinghouse. The extension accommodates a kitchen and is to the west of and continues the form of an existing extension at the rear of the house constructed many years ago. The roof ridge is slightly higher than the existing ridge. The proposed finishing material for the walls is roughcast to match the house. The roof has been covered in tiles with a similar profile but different colour to the existing roof tiles.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site comprises a detached bungalow on a large plot on the south side of Clinton Terrace. A large single storey extension of some 58 sq. metres has been erected to the rear of the house and is connected to it by a flat roofed link corridor. In addition a conservatory extension of some 16 sq metres has been erected to the south of that extension. There is also a garage along the eastern site boundary. When account is taken of the 18 sq. metres extension which it is now proposed to retain, the development to the rear of the existing dwelling is of a size and scale comparable to the existing house.

To the west and south west of the site are detached houses on Leamont Lane. These houses are separated from the application site by fencing and landscaping. To the south of the site is a row of lock up garages. To the east of the site are 2 detached houses on Grove Road. To the north of the site, on the opposite side of Clinton Terrace are detached and semi detached houses.

POLICY BACKGROUND

Policy H4 of the adopted Dundee Local Plan 1998 sets out guidelines for alterations and extensions to houses. It states that proposals will normally be approved provided the appearance of the house and surrounding area is not adversely affected. It also states that approval is unlikely to be granted where the siting and scale of the

extension significantly affects the degree of sunlight/daylight and/or privacy enjoyed by the occupants of adjoining property; where the materials, style and form are alien to the existing building; and where more than 50% of the original garden ground would be lost and off street parking provision reduced.

LOCAL AGENDA 21

The Council's Agenda 21 Policies are not directly relevant to the consideration of this application.

SITE HISTORY

There is no history of planning applications pertaining to this site. However the large extension to the rear of the house and the conservatory added to it both require planning permission but permission was neither



sought nor granted. As over 4 years has elapsed since the erection of these structures they are now immune from planning enforcement action.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Statutory neighbour notification was carried out and 2 letters of objection were received from the occupiers of houses to the west and south west of the site (copies available for inspection in the Members' Lounges). The objectors raise the following issues:

- 1 The site has already been overdeveloped so that it appears that 2 bungalows have been constructed on this plot. There is a concern that subdivision may take place. Further development will aggravate this situation.
- 2 The extension, being close to the boundary, will overshadow the objector's property and in addition residential amenity will be affected by cooking odours from the kitchen and noise from kitchen appliances.

- 3 The roof of the extension is unsightly because it is higher than the existing roof and the finishing material don't match.
- 4 Works have been carried out and continue to be carried out without planning permission.

These matters are considered in the Observations Section of this Report.

CONSULTATIONS

No adverse comment on the development was received from Statutory Consultees.

OBSERVATIONS

The determining issue for the Committee is whether the design, scale and siting of the proposed extension are satisfactory taking into account the guidelines set out in Policy H4 of the Plan and the comments of the objectors

It is clear that a significant amount of development has taken place on this site with out the benefit of planning permission. Neighbours are understandably concerned about this but this development is now immune from planning enforcement action. The current proposals seek to retain and complete an 18 sq. metres extension to the rear of this dwellinghouse and it is only this matter that can be considered in the context of this planning application.

Normally a single storey extension of this size would be acceptable and would be unlikely to lead to residential amenity problems. However in this case the extension has the cumulative effect of adding to a very large extension on this site.

In terms of the overdevelopment of the plot, all the rear extensions to the original house (including the current proposals) come to a total floor area of some 100 sq. metres. Even if the garage is added to this, the total amount of development to the rear of the house is some 152 sq. metres whereas the overall size of the original rear garden is some 380 sq. metres. The total amount of development comes to some 40% of the rear garden which is well within the Policy H4 figure and leaves a total of some 230 sq. metres of useable private garden

ground to the rear of the house. In addition the extension has no impact on the existing off street parking provision at this site.

In terms of the design of the extension, it follows the design, shape and form of the original house and extension.

Although the roof is slightly higher (by some 10 centimetres) than the roof of the existing extension this difference is barely perceptible. However, the colour of the tiles is green and does not match the colour of the existing roofs, albeit that the size and profile of the tiles do match. Whilst it would have been ideal if the roof heights had matched exactly, the difference in height is considered not to be sufficiently different to justify the removal and replacement of the entire roof. However, the colour of the tiles which have been used for the extension presently under construction are so radically different that it is not considered that they would ever weather to match the existing. Although the roof extension is most visible to residents to the rear, it is considered that this aspect is likely to adversely affect their amenities. It is therefore appropriate for a suitable condition to be applied to any permission requiring the replacement of the tiles. In conclusion, with the exception of the colour of the roof tiles, it is not considered that the design of the extension is so unacceptable that it adversely affects the amenity of the area, thereby contravening Policy H4 of the Plan.

In terms of overlooking and overshadowing, it is considered that there will be no unacceptable impact. The extension is single storey only and due to the height of the screening on the western site boundary, it will not overlook any adjoining property. Furthermore the extension is some 3 metres from this boundary and there will be no significant degree of overshadowing.

In terms of noise and smell from the kitchen, there is no reason why this should be different from any domestic kitchen and the closest window is some 3 metres from the boundary. It is not considered that there will be any unacceptable impact on residential amenity due to noise or smell from the proposed extension.

Finally fears about any subdivision of the plot cannot be taken into account

and the approval of this application would not sanction anything other than the use of the house and extensions as a single dwelling. Furthermore the fact that the applicants have developed their plot with scant regard to planning legislation is to be condemned but cannot influence the decision on the current application.

Design

The design of this rear extension follows the scale and form of the existing extension to the rear of the house. The fact that the ridge is slightly higher than the existing roof is not considered to be sufficiently unacceptable to warrant reconstruction or refusal of the application. However, it is considered that the colour of the roof tiles is inappropriate and it is recommended that this issue be dealt with by means of condition.

CONCLUSION

The proposed extension satisfies the requirements of Policy H4 of the adopted Local Plan, will not adversely impact on the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of neighbouring houses. The application is therefore recommended for APPROVAL.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

- 1 the development hereby permitted shall be commenced within five years from the date of this permission
- 2 The roofing tiles to be used on the proposed extension, the subject of this permission shall, to the satisfaction of the Council, match those of the existing property in terms of size, profile, texture and colour.

Reason

- 1 To comply with Section 58 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997
- 2 In the interests of the visual amenities of neighbours