

REPORT TO: Development Control Committee

DATE: 16 May 2016

REPORTING OFFICER: Strategic Director, Community & Resources

SUBJECT: Planning Applications to be determined by the Committee – AB Update List

WARD(S): Boroughwide

PAGE NO.	LIST A	LIST B	Updated Information
17		15/00549/FULEIA	
77	16/00024/FUL		
97		16/00069/FUL	<p>Representations</p> <p>Two additional representations have been received via a Ward Councillor. The representations raise the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns regarding scale, the look of the building and the level of intrusion. • The proposal does not meet the Council's guidelines with regard to privacy, nor does it offer any ingenious design to demonstrate how privacy will be achieved. • The guidelines state that where minimum distances are not met, a 25 degree rule applies. • Why was the 45 degree rule not applied in this case as the proposed extension appears contrary to it? <p>In respect of scale, Victoria House is a large building which is three storey in height and the proposed extension whilst being large, it would respect the scale of the existing building and form an acceptable relationship with surrounding buildings.</p>

			<p>The proposed elevations show that buildings would have some variety in materials to add interest to the overall external appearance and is considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>In relation to privacy, the judgement which needs to be made in this case is whether an unacceptable loss of amenity to occupiers or users of adjacent land or buildings would result contrary to the provisions of Policy BE1 of the Halton Unitary Development Plan. The Design of Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document exists to assist decision making in this regard.</p> <p>As set out in the report, The relationship with the nearest residential property (no.14 Burland Close) is considered acceptable as this property would face the corner of the proposed extension with the adjacent habitable room windows not directly facing the property in question. The direct relationship with the particular habitable room windows in question is with no.11 Burland Close (taken by drawing a line at 90 degrees from the centre of the habitable room window) to which there is sufficient separation to meet the guidelines.</p> <p>Based on the relationships involved, the Officer view taken and the recommendations to the Development Control Committee is that the proposed relationship would not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity through overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing appearance nor could a 28m separation distance (24m (three storey to two storey) + 4m (based on 2m difference in land levels) as if there were direct relationship be insisted on in this case for the reasons set out and a refusal defended at a subsequent appeal.</p> <p>There is no direct conflict with the guidelines in this case nor is the relationship considered to be unacceptable. If a development does not satisfy the minimum separation distances, it would be at this point that a 25 degree assessment would be undertaken. This is the reason why this has not been requested from the</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>applicant in this instance.</p> <p>The 45 degree rule referred to is guidance which is contained in the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document opposed to the Design of Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document. This is used to help assess impact upon the amenities of the neighbouring properties and to protect from overshadowing or obstruction, caused by large extensions on or close to the boundary. The code is principally applied to single storey rear extensions and side extensions where building lines are staggered.</p> <p>It can be used as a tool to consider staggers between houses within a residential layout, however does not apply to relationships where habitable room windows face each other with the privacy distances being the consideration in this case. The 45 degree rule works on close relationships, however if you continue the line, it will inevitably cut the line at some point which does not automatically make a relationship unacceptable.</p> <p>Electric Vehicle Charging Points</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 35 which states that to further enhance the opportunities for sustainable development any future developments should be located and designed where practical to incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.</p> <p>This has been put to the applicant and they would be happy to accept a condition requiring the provision of future charging points for ultra-low emission vehicles.</p> <p>Additional Condition suggested:</p> <p>24. Submission of a scheme for the provision of future charging points of ultra-low emission vehicles – (Policy CS19).</p>
--	--	--	--

120	16/00120/FUL		<p>United Utilities Observations</p> <p>United Utilities provided comments on 29th April 2016 and stated they have no objection to the proposed development provided that the following 3 conditions are attached to any approval:</p> <p><i>Condition 1</i></p> <p><i>Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems.</i></p> <p><i>Condition 2</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the commencement of any development, a surface water drainage scheme, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority</i></p> <p><i>Condition 3</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the commencement of the development a sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development shall be submitted to the Local Planning authority and agreed in writing.</i></p> <p><u>General comments</u></p> <p>It is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate the exact relationship between any United Utilities' assets and the proposed development. United Utilities offers a fully supported mapping service and we recommend the applicant contact our Property Searches Team on 03707 510101 to obtain maps of the site.</p>
-----	--------------	--	---