

9 GENEVA DRIVE, NEWCASTLE

MR S ROYALL

19/00031/FUL

The application is for full planning permission for a single storey side extension to form a new home office in addition to a two storey front and side extension.

The dwelling is located within the urban area of the Borough, as identified by the Local Development Proposal Framework Map.

The application has been called in to Committee by two Councillors due to residents' concerns about:

- Overbearing impact on the street scene in Geneva Drive.
- Loss of light and privacy to residents in Lugano Close.

The 8 week period for the determination of this application expired on the 11th March 2019.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason:

1. **The proposed two storey extension, by virtue of its size, form and appearance would result in a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the original dwelling as well as this part of the Geneva Drive street scene. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the character and visual amenity of the area and it does not represent a sustainable form of development. It would therefore be contrary to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policy H18 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan (2011), Policy CSP1 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy (2006-2026) and the advice found in the adopted Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2010).**

Reason for Recommendation

Due to the scale and design of the two storey front and side extension, the development does not represent a proportionate addition to No 9 Geneva Drive, and so as a result has a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling as well as the appearance of this part of the Geneva Drive street scene.

Statement as to how the Local Planning Authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner in dealing with this application

Whilst alterations to the layout of the openings on the front elevation and a reduction in height have been suggested it is not considered that this would overcome the principle objections to the scale and design of the proposed two storey extension. It is therefore considered that the proposals are unsustainable and do not conform to the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Key Issues

Full planning permission is sought for a single storey side extension to form a new home office in addition to a two storey front and side extension at No. 9 Geneva Drive. The dwelling is located within the urban area of the Borough, as identified by the Local Development Proposal Framework Map where the principle of the development is considered to be acceptable subject to the following key considerations;

- Acceptable design and impact upon the character of the area and street scene

- The impact on neighbouring residential amenity

Acceptable design and impact upon the character of the area and street scene

Section 12 of the NPPF sets out policy which aims to achieve well-designed places. Paragraph 124 states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Paragraph 127 goes on to detail that developments should be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

Policy H18 of the Local Plan is concerned with the design of residential extensions, and states that the form, size and location of extensions should be subordinate to the original dwelling, and that extensions should not detract from the character and appearance of the original dwelling, or from the character of the wider street scene.

The proposal includes a single storey side extension with the dimensions 2.6m width X 6.7m depth X 2.7m height. Whilst the flat roof proposed for the single storey side extension is not usually a design solution that would be encouraged, it is acknowledged that in this case flat roof side extensions are a dominant feature of the properties within this part of Geneva Drive and so it is not considered that this would be to the detriment of the character of the area.

The plans also include a two storey front and side extension to create an additional sitting room and bedroom with en-suite. The extension would project 1.8m beyond the existing principal elevation with a width of 3.4m and a maximum height of 6.5m

This part of Geneva Drive is characterised by dwellings of a modest scale and similar design. It is noted that a number of properties have undergone two storey alterations that are visible from the surrounding street.

Given the scale of the proposed extension, it is not considered that the development appears a proportionate addition to the host dwelling. The additional massing that is created as a result of its width and height would result in the character and form of the original dwelling being engulfed by the proposed extension. The applicant has noted that a reduction in the height of the side extension would be masked by the front extension and would also be difficult to construct, potentially leading to a more disjointed appearance. Whilst it is appreciated that a reduction in the ridgeline may allow the development to appear a more subordinate addition, it is not considered that this alteration alone would overcome the principle concerns with the development which stem from its overall scale and appearance when viewed in context with the host dwelling.

There is also a large expanse of plain brickwork across the two stories on the front elevation of the extension which presents an unbalanced appearance when viewed from Geneva Drive and draws further attention to the additional massing created as a result of the scale of the extension.

Reference has been drawn by the applicant to other properties within the area that are of the same original design as No. 9 and have successfully implemented a variety of extensions and alterations. Some of the specific properties referred were No's 2 and 84 Geneva Drive, both of which have implemented two storey front/side extensions; however the planning history for the properties only provides details of extensions from the late 60s/early 70s, and so the decisions made on these sites pre-dates current policy. An extension at No. 1 Como Place was also referenced, however the design of this extension is not comparable to that proposed at No 9. Whilst it is noted that the direct neighbour has implemented a two storey front/side extension, your officer considered this to be a much more proportionate and sympathetic addition to the property than the proposed extension that is subject to this application. Also, each case should be determined on its own merits, and so it is not considered that the presence of these alterations would outweigh the harmful impact that the proposed extension would have on the host dwelling and the appearance of the Geneva Drive street scene.

Therefore for the reasons outlined above, the proposed two storey side and front extension would be contrary to Policy H18 of the Local Plan, Policy CSP1 of the Core Spatial Strategy as well as the provisions within the NPPF.

Impact upon residential amenity:

Criterion f) within Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should create places that are safe, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

SPG (Space Around Dwelling) provides guidance on privacy, daylight standards and environmental considerations.

The above SPG notes at SD4 that where a two-storey dwelling faces a single storey dwelling, at least 21m should be maintained where the facing walls contain principal windows.

The rear elevation of No. 10 Lugano Close contains a principal window and large patio doors that serve the living room.

The two storey side extension would create an additional principal bedroom on the first floor which would be served by a window on the rear elevation of the dwelling. There would be a distance of approximately 18m between the first floor new principal bedroom window and the window serving the living room.

It is noted that the proposal would fall short of the guidance within the SPG by two meters; however this shortfall is not considered to amount to a significant loss of residential amenity that would warrant the refusal of the application. The extension does not project any closer to the rear elevation of No.10 Lugano Close than the existing rear elevation, which contains principal windows. In addition it is noted that although some views of the patio doors of No. 10 Lugano Close would be possible from the principal window as proposed it would not be directly opposite the patio doors. Taking such factors into consideration it is not considered that this window would achieve any further significant views than that already offered by the existing principle bedroom with a window on the same elevation.

Objections have detailed that the proposed extension would result in a loss of light to No. 10 Lugano Close. As a result of the orientation of the two dwellings, there may be some additional overshadowing towards the later hours of the afternoon on the northern corner of the curtilage of No. 10 Lugano Close; however it is not considered that this would have a serve impact on the light offered to the property and the amenities of the occupants.

Therefore on this occasion the development is considered to be acceptable.

APPENDIX

Policies and Proposals in the approved Development Plan relevant to this decision:-

[Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy \(CSS\) 2006-2026](#)

Strategic Aim 16: To eliminate poor quality development;

Policy SP1: Spatial Principles of Targeted Regeneration
Policy ASP5: Newcastle and Kidsgrove Urban Neighbourhoods Area Spatial Policy
Policy CSP1: Design Quality
Policy CSP3: Sustainability and Climate Change
Policy CSP10: Planning Obligations

[Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan \(NLP\) 2011](#)

Policy T16: Development – General Parking Requirements
Policy IM1: Provision of Essential supporting Infrastructure

Other material considerations include:

[National Planning Policy Framework](#) (February 2019)

[Planning Practice Guidance](#) (March 2014, as updated)

[Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations](#) (2010) as amended and related statutory guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

[Developer contributions SPD](#) (September 2007)

[Space Around Dwellings SPG](#) (SAD) (July 2004)

[Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document](#) (2010)

Relevant Planning History

09/00532/FUL - Single storey side and rear extensions – Approved

View of Consultees

None.

Representations

Objections have been received from one neighbouring address raising the following concerns:

- Overlooking of No. 10 Lugano Close
- Loss of daylight
- Harm to enjoyment of private rear garden space and living space on the rear of No. 10 Lugano Close
- The applicant should consider a single storey rear extension to reduce impact on neighbouring properties

Applicant/Agent's submission

All of the application documents submitted for consideration can be viewed using the following link;

<https://publicaccess.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk/online-applications/PLAN/19/00031/FUL>

Background Papers

Planning File
Development Plan

Date report prepared

7th March 2019