

Email from Planning officer – Mr Ross Neal. 15/03/2018

Dear Brian,

Thank you for your email and the attached.

I note that your client is now limiting the proposal to single storey 'lean-to' at the side with a set-back of 1m from the front corner of the adjoining dwelling and approximately the same amount from the main front wall of no.52. No first floor extension is proposed. The separation from the adjoining would be 0.85m. The rear extension proposal will remain, this replaces an existing rear conservatory of a similar size, including depth.

I am of the view that this revised proposal has a substantially reduced impact on the adjoining dwelling and would not result in unacceptably harmful impacts on either no.54 or no.50. In particular, the already limited light into the rear garden of no.54 would be for the most part still available.

I note that the side to side separation will be not be 1m but will be 0.85m. This is an increase from the previous 0.65m. The required 1m separation set out in policy DEV19 (iv) applies to the 1st-floor of 2-storey extensions where streets are characterised by relatively small gaps (in order to prevent a terracing impact visually).

If a first floor extension were to be subsequently proposed above the ground floor as shown in your revised proposal, then as previously discussed this must:

1. Substantially reduce the front eaves level and the ridge level of the extension. This would result in a 'cat slide' type roof at the front, which would still allow some first floor accommodation. The reduced ridge level which can be achieved ought to be significantly lower than the existing ridge level of the dwelling, so as to allow greater penetration of sunlight into the rear garden of no.54.
2. Provide a modest rear dormer with gable and ridged roof. This would allow for space in the first floor bedroom.

On this above basis and subject to seeing the final detailed design of any first floor extension, I would consider that the separation at 0.85m (0.15m less than the policy) would, taken with the other revision (1 & 2 above), be acceptable and that there would not be sufficient grounds to refuse such an application.

I have spoken to our Technical Support regarding the fee. It is possible that a fee may not be required. As you know, the further application must be for the same applicant and site area and for the same character and description of development. This will have to be considered when any further application has been submitted. I would suggest that you include a letter explaining the situation, with a copy of this email.

I hope that this email assists.

Regards,

Ross
(Leal)