

# COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL DELEGATED PLANNING DECISION

| 1.   | Reference No:  | 4/21/2159/0F1   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| 2.   | Proposed<br>Development:   | REMOVAL OF A CONSERVATORY, ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION<br>TO THE REAR |  |
| 3.   | Location:  | 19 BAY VIEW, MILLOM   |  |
| 4.   | Parish:  | Millom  |  |
| 5.   | Constraints: ASC;Adverts - ASC;Adverts,  |   |  |
|  |  | Coal - Off Coalfield - Data Subject To Change                                   |  |
| 6. <b>Publicity</b> Neighbour Notification Letter: Y |  | Neighbour Notification Letter: YES  |  |
|  | Representations<br>&Policy   | Site Notice: NO   |  |
|  |  | Press Notice: NO  |  |
|  |  | Consultation Responses: See report  |  |
|  |  | Relevant Planning Policies: See report  |  |
| 7.   |  |   |  |
|  | <b>LOCATION</b><br>This application relates to 19 Bay View, a terraced property located within Millom. The site benefit from an existing conservatory, a large rear garden and a detached garage.  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  | Planning Permission is sought for the removal of the existing conservatory and the erection of a replacement single-storey extension. The rear extension will project 4.32 metres and it will be 5.2 metres in width. It has been designed to include a mono-pitched roof, with an overall height of 4.2 metres and an eaves height of 2.6 metres. The design includes patio doors on the rear elevation and a window and access door on the side elevation. It will be finished with white K-render, grey cement roof tiles and white UPVC windows and doors to match the existing property. It will also be lit by two |   |  |

velux skylights.

# **RELEVANT PLANNING APPLICATION HISTORY**

There have been no previous planning applications at this property.

### **CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

<u>Consultees</u>

Millom Town Council – No objections.

# Public Representations

The application has been advertised by way of neighbour notification letters issued to 2 no. properties - No objections have been received as a result of this consultation process.

# PLANNING POLICIES

Planning law requires applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

# **Development Plan**

Copeland Local Plan 2013 – 2028 (Adopted December 2013)

Core Strategy

Policy ST1 – Strategic Development Principles

Policy ST2 – Spatial Development Strategy

Development Management Policies (DMP)

Policy DM10 – Achieving Quality of Place

Policy DM18 – Domestic Extensions and Alterations

# **Other Material Planning Considerations**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Emerging Copeland Local Plan (ELP):

The emerging Copeland Local Plan 2017-2035 has recently been the subject of a Preferred Options Consultation. The Preferred Options Consultation builds upon the completed Issues and Options Consultation, which finished in January 2020. Given the stage of preparation, the emerging Copeland Local Plan 2017-2035 has only limited weight in decision making, but provides an indication of the direction of travel of the emerging planning policies, which themselves have been developed in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### ASSESSMENT

The key issues raised by this proposed are the principle of development, its scale and design, the potential impacts on residential amenity.

#### Principle of Development

The proposed application relates to a residential dwelling within Millom and it will provide a replacement rear extension. Policy DM18 supports extensions to residential properties subject to detailed criteria, which are considered below.

On this basis, the principle of the development is therefore considered to be acceptable and the extension satisfies Policies ST2, DM18 and the NPPF guidance.

### Scale and Design

Policy ST1 and section 12 of the NPPF seek to promote high quality designs. Policy DM10 and DM18 seek to ensure domestic alterations are of an appropriate scale and design which is appropriate to their surroundings and do not adversely affect the amenities of adjacent dwellings.

The proposed replacement extension will be appropriately located within the rear garden and it will be modest in scale. It will be located behind the main element of the existing dwelling and this will ensure that the proposal appears subservient to the main dwelling. It will not be overbearing for the neighbouring properties and the design is considered to mirror the existing mono-pitched roof extensions along the terraced row. In addition, the choice of materials are considered to respect the existing character and appearance of the existing property.

On this basis, the proposal is considered to meet Policy DM18(A) and the NPPF guidance.

### **Residential Amenity**

Policy ST1, Policy DM18 and section 12 of the NPPF seek to safeguard good levels of residential amenity of both the parent property and adjacent dwellings.

Overlooking and overshadowing issues between the proposed extension and the neighbouring properties were considered, although the extension will be relatively modest in scale. The extension will replace an existing conservatory and the design is considered to reduce overlooking compared to the previous all glass conservatory.

In addition, under current permitted development rights, an extension could project 3 metres from the rear elevation, with an overall height of 4 metres without the requirement for formal planning permission. This fall-back position is a material consideration in the assessment of this application. As the projection and height is not significantly larger than what is possible under permitted development, this proposal is considered to be satisfactory and therefore the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring amenity.

On this basis, it was considered that the proposal will not have any adverse impacts on the neighbours and therefore the proposal is considered to meet Policy DM18 and the NPPF guidance.

|    | Planning Balance and Conclusion<br>The proposed replacement extension are of an appropriate design and will not have any detrimen<br>impact on the amenities of the adjoining properties. It represents an acceptable form of development<br>which accords with the policies set out within the adopted Local Plan and the guidance in the NPPF |  |  |  |
|----|---|--|--|--|
|    |   |  |  |  |
| 8. | Recommendation:<br>Approve (commence within 3 years)  |  |  |  |
| 9. | Condition(s):   |  |  |  |
|    | 1.  | The development hereby permitted must commence before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.  |  |  |
|    |   | Reason   |  |  |
|    |   | To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.   |  |  |
|    | 2.  | This permission relates to the following plans and documents as received on the respective dates and development must be carried out in accordance with them: -  |  |  |
|    |   | Site Plan, scale 1:1250, drawing no 1689, received 9 <sup>th</sup> April 2021;<br>Block Pan, scale 1:500, drawing no 1689, received 9 <sup>th</sup> April 2021;<br>Existing Floor Plan, scale 1:50, drawing no 1689, received 9 <sup>th</sup> April 2021;<br>Existing Elevations, scale 1:100, drawing no 1689, received 9 <sup>th</sup> April 2021;<br>Proposed Floor Plan, scale 1:50, drawing no 1689, received 9 <sup>th</sup> April 2021;<br>Proposed Elevations, scale 1:100, drawing no 1689, received 9 <sup>th</sup> April 2021;<br>Proposed Elevations, scale 1:100, drawing no 1689, received 9 <sup>th</sup> April 2021; |  |  |
|    |   | Reason   |  |  |
|    |   | To conform with the requirement of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.  |  |  |
|    | State   | ment   |  |  |
|    | asses<br>repre<br>perm  | local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by<br>sing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any<br>esentations that may have been received, and subsequently determining to grant planning<br>ission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in<br>lational Planning Policy Framework.   |  |  |

| Case Officer: C. Unsworth          | Date : 28/05/2021 |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Authorising Officer: N.J. Hayhurst | Date : 03/06/2021 |
| Dedicated responses to:- N/A       |                   |
|                                    |                   |