



DELEGATED REPORT

Item Number:

Application Number: S/HOU/22/0511

Ward: Haydon Wick

Parish:

Haydon Wick

Proposal: Erection of a two storey side extension.

Location: 32 Holliday Close, Abbey Meads, Swindon

Agent:

Mr Craig Eccleston
101 Victoria Road
Swindon
SN1 3BD

Applicant:

Mr Joseph Dorey
32 Holliday Close
Abbey Meads
Swindon
SN25 4YQ

Officer Report

Summary of Recommendation

That planning permission be GRANTED with Conditions

The Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for a two storey side extension. The ground floor would include a garage and family room, whilst the first floor would provide an additional bedroom and en-suite bathroom.

The Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises an end terraced dwelling, located within a cul-de-sac in Abbey Meads. It is primarily constructed from brick with concrete tiles. The host dwelling shares part of a double width driveway with No. 33 Holliday Close.

Representations

Neighbours: One objection was received to the original submission of the planning application which raised concerns about the lack of parking provision, particularly due to the size of the garage and that the design of the proposed extension is not in accordance with the adopted SPD.

Local Highway Authority: Objected to the original submission, however this concern was overcome by the revised plans. No objection to the revised scheme.

Parish Council/Community Council Comments: Objection on the grounds that this does not adhere with SBC's planning guidelines with regards to the height of the roofline and the front building boundary line.

Planning Considerations

- ☐ Adopted Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026
- ☐ Policy SD1 (Sustainable development Principles)
- ☐ Policy DE1 (High Quality Design)
- ☐ Policy TR2 (Transport and Development)
- ☐ Adopted SPD Residential Extensions and Alterations (2011) ('REA SPD')
- ☐ Adopted DCGN Technical Guidance on Parking Standards (2007)
- ☐ National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The main issues to be considered are the design and appearance of the proposal in relation to the host dwelling and surrounding area, the impact upon the neighbour's amenity and sufficient parking provision.

The existing dwelling is gable fronted, and forms the end terrace of a row of four dwellings, of which the other three have a perpendicular roof ridge. The proposed two storey side extension would be above the existing driveway, and would measure approximately 2.4m wide and be set in by 0.1m from the shared boundary. There would be no guttering on the side elevation. The extension would be level with the existing front elevation, with a pitched roof, akin to the rest of the row of terraces. Whilst the REA SPD states that the first floor element of the side extension should be set back by 900mm from the principal elevation and should have a lower ridge height, in this particular instance, it is considered preferable in design terms to replicate the existing terrace in terms of design and appearance. An extension with a setback on this particular property is likely to result in the host dwelling and row looking visually imbalanced. The proposed extension would have the same architectural features as the host dwelling, such as brick heads and detailing. In this particular instance the design, siting and relationship of the proposed dwellings, in addition to character of the wider streetscene is such that the development is of a design and appearance that would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or the area in which it is situated. Whilst not in compliance with all elements of the REA SPD, the design of the proposed development in this particular instance is considered acceptable and satisfies the requirements of Policy DE1 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

In terms of amenity, the proposed extension would be set away from No. 31, such that the 45-degree rule would not be impacted. The side elevation of the proposed extension is also set away from the private amenity areas and buildings of Nos. 34 and 35 and positioned to the north, such that it is unlikely to have an adverse impact in terms of adverse overbearing, outlook or loss of light effects on the occupants. There are proposed windows on the first floor in the front and back, although these would not alter the existing relationship with other dwellings to the existing first floor windows. Whilst there is a window in the side elevation, this serves a bathroom and will be conditioned to have obscure glazing. The proposal would maintain the amenity of adjoining neighbours and would not result in overlooking/loss of

privacy/loss of light/visual dominance to a degree that would be contrary to the above policies. The proposal therefore satisfies Policy DE1 of the Local Plan.

The proposed extension would increase the number of bedrooms at the host dwelling from 3no. to 4no., and in accordance with the adopted parking standards and due to its location within close proximity to local amenities, must demonstrate that 2no. off-road parking spaces can be accommodated on site. The original plans showed the existing driveway to the front of the extension and the proposed garage. The garage however did not achieve the minimum internal dimensions outlined within the adopted parking standards for it to be considered sufficient for a parking space, as raised by the neighbour and LHA. The amended plans illustrate that parking could be achieved on the drive and the front garden would be converted to parking, and whilst this would result in the loss of the front garden to parking, on balance, in this particular instance the scheme is considered acceptable. A condition will require that these parking spaces are brought in to use prior to the use of the additional bedroom.

The proposed extension would be on the applicants side of an existing driveway, and as such consideration needs to be given to whether there is sufficient space for the occupiers of the neighbouring property (No. 33) to use their part of the driveway, in accordance with the adopted parking standards. The driveway for the neighbouring property contains a wider space from the highway, and leads to the narrower space adjacent to the extension now measuring 2.7 m wide (the proposed extension has been set 0.1m away from the central boundary of the driveway). The wider part of the driveway could then allow a passenger to egress the vehicle while the driver parks in the rear space. On balance and in this particular instance, due to the small scale of the proposal and the fact that the space does allow the driver to access and egress the vehicle, in accordance with the Parking Standards, the scheme is considered acceptable in highways terms.

The Council Adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL Charging Schedule) on the 26th March 2015 and became effective on the 6th April 2015. All relevant planning applications determined on or after this date will be subject to the consideration of CIL. The proposed extensions would not exceed 100 sq. m in area, and would therefore be exempt from CIL liability.

Concluding Comments

The development is not considered to be in conflict with the relevant policies identified above or the NPPF, and is considered acceptable.

Recommendation

That planning permission be GRANTED with Conditions

Conditions/Reasons

3 years

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 (1) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

Matching materials

2. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed using external facing materials that match and correspond with those of the main dwellinghouse. Such facing materials shall be retained thereafter in their approved form

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory.

Parking spaces

3. The additional rooms within the development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the vehicular parking facilities for 2no. vehicles have been provided in accordance with the submitted Proposed Site Plan (Rev A - March 22), and those facilities shall be maintained available for those purposes thereafter.

Reason: To reduce potential highway impact by ensuring that adequate parking and manoeuvring facilities are available within the site.

Obscure Glazing

4. No glass other than obscure glass manufactured to a privacy level of 4 or above shall be used in the glazing on the windows proposed at first floor level in the south facing side elevation.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

No First Floor Windows

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order, no windows other than those hereby approved shall be formed in the first floor side elevation (south facing).

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

Plans

6. This approval shall be in respect of the application form, Location Plan, Existing Site Plan, Existing Floor Plans and Elevations, Proposed Site Plan (Rev A), Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations (Rev A) all received by the Local Planning Authority on the 13th June 2022.

Reason: To define the scope of the development hereby permitted, in accordance with section 72 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Informatives

1. CIL - Reg. 42 Exemption for Minor development: Whilst the development generates a net gain in floor space and is Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liable, it is exempt from CIL liability under CIL Regulation 42, as it constitutes minor development for the purposes of calculating CIL liability because the proposed extensions floorspace is below 100 sqm GIA.

2. The granting of planning permission does not authorise you to carry out any works on, over or under your neighbour's land or property without first obtaining their consent.

Case officer: Edward Snook	Authorising Officer: Janet Busby
	Date Authorised: 1st August 2022