

Application for Determination

Parish	Ditchingham		
Reference	BA/2013/0259/FUL	Target date	25 October 2013
Location	39 Ditchingham Dam, Ditchingham		
Proposal	Demolish existing single storey extension and replace with two storey extension		
Applicant	Mr Ben Ruddle		
Recommendation	Approve subject to conditions		
Reason for referral to Committee	Objection received from third party		

1 Description of Site and Proposals

- 1.1 The application site is a dwellinghouse at 39 Ditchingham Dam, Ditchingham. It is a two storey semi-detached dwelling which forms part of a group of three pairs of semi-detached dwellings sited parallel to and at the rear of a terrace which fronts the highway of Ditchingham Dam, just south of the A143 roundabout. These semi-detached dwellings sit on an approximate north-south axis, accessed from Ditchingham Dam by an unmade track from the south of the road-front terrace. The site forms the northern half of the middle pair of dwellings.
- 1.2 The site has an unusual layout as the boundary to the attached dwelling does not take a straight line through the dwelling or its rear curtilage. On the front (east) elevation, the site is one room wide, whereas it is two rooms wide at the rear, with the attached dwelling having the opposite arrangement. This dwelling also has a flat roofed single storey extension on the rear elevation which does not extend the full width of the main two storey part of the dwelling and the boundary fence to the curtilage follows this narrower line, resulting in the curtilage of the neighbouring dwelling abutting a 1.4 metre length of the rear wall of the two storey part of the dwelling. There are no window openings in this part of the rear elevation and the attached dwelling has not been extended. The curtilages of all six of these dwellings extend approximately 45 metres to the west and vary in width.
- 1.3 To the north there is a narrow passageway between the application site and the neighbouring non-attached dwelling. The pair of semi-detached

dwellings to the north have a two storey extension across the rear elevation.

- 1.4 The dwelling has blue painted brickwork, except the section which abuts the neighbours curtilage which is painted cream to match the rest of that dwelling. The hipped two storey roof has a covering of slates and the windows are in white uPVC, matching the materials of the neighbouring dwellings.
- 1.5 The application proposes the demolition of the existing flat roofed single storey rear extension and its replacement with a two storey extension. The existing extension measures 2.6 metres deep and 6.3 metres wide. However, the proposed two storey extension would align with the rear wall of the extended dwellings to the north, increasing the depth to 4.9 metres. The two storey extension would also be set in 0.1 metres from the north elevation of the original dwelling, providing a width of 6.2 metres and this would still abut the curtilage of the attached dwelling on the south elevation. A hipped roof would extend at the same eaves height as the existing dwelling, 4.8 metres above ground level, and the ridge would be approximately 0.5 metres lower than the ridge of the main dwelling, approximately 6.6 metres above ground level.
- 1.6 New windows are proposed in the north elevation of the existing dwelling; one to the ground floor and one to the first floor and the north elevation of the extension would also have one ground floor window. The rear elevation would have two first floor windows above two ground floor windows and double doors and there would be no openings to the south elevation. A roof light is also proposed to the roof of the existing dwelling on the rear elevation.
- 1.7 The extension is proposed to be rendered in a colour to match the existing dwelling under a natural slate roof. Replacement timber windows to be painted white are proposed to the existing dwelling, with matching windows in the extension.

2 Site History

None.

3 Consultation

Broads Society – No objections.

Parish Council - Consider the application should be approved. Weatherboard should not be used. Render should be used in common with existing and all other dwellings in vicinity.

District Member – No response.

4 Representations

- 4.1 One letter of objection from owner of attached dwelling to south. Objects on basis extension would have effect of blocking light from doors and windows of dwelling and proposed wood would not be in keeping with rest of buildings in the row. These objections would be overcome if extension moved three to four feet to north. Did object to first floor window on rear elevation, but amended plans have replaced this with a rooflight and this would not cause as much concern as the original proposal. Other matters which are not material planning considerations also raised.

5 Policies

- 5.1 The following Policies have been assessed for consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and have been found to be consistent and can therefore be afforded full weight in the consideration and determination of this application.

Adopted Core Strategy (2007)

[Core Strategy \(Adopted Sept 2007\).pdf](#)

CS1 – Landscape Protection and Enhancement

Adopted Development Management Policies (2011)

[DMP DPD - Adoption version.pdf](#)

DP4 - Design

- 5.2 The following Policies have been assessed for consistency with the NPPF and have found to lack full consistency with the NPPF and therefore those aspects of the NPPF may need to be given some weight in the consideration and determination of this application. [NPPF](#)

Adopted Development Management Policies (2011)

DP28 – Amenity

6 Assessment

- 6.1 The application proposes an extension to an existing dwelling and this is acceptable in principle. The key considerations are the scale, form, design and materials and the impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.
- 6.2 In terms of scale, the proposed extension is large, however the pair of dwellings to the north have been extended in a similar way, albeit as a unified extension across the full width of the rear elevation of both dwellings. The proposed extension would not extend any further to the west than this. In relation to the scale of the existing dwelling, its curtilage and neighbouring dwellings, the proposed scale is not considered inappropriate. The form of the extension, with a lower hipped roof is

considered appropriate to the existing dwelling and the detailed design also complements the existing dwelling.

- 6.3 The proposed new and replacement timber windows are welcomed. The Parish Council and neighbour both raised concern about the initial proposal to clad the extension in timber and this has been amended to a render finish instead, which is considered appropriate to the local area. Natural slates are proposed to the roof and the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of materials. Overall, the design is considered appropriate to its local context and acceptable in accordance with Development Management Policy DP4.
- 6.4 With regard to amenity, the new openings on the north elevation would face the south elevation of the neighbouring dwelling which is the width of the passageway, approximately 1.1 metres, away. There are two existing openings to the neighbouring dwelling and the new openings would not directly face these. These windows are overshadowed by the existing dwelling and it is not considered that the proposal would result in any significant additional overshadowing of these openings. There are two first floor windows in the existing west elevation and these would be replicated in the extension, however it is not considered that extending these 4.9 metres further out would result in any significant additional overlooking or loss of privacy. It is not therefore considered that the proposal would result in any unacceptable impacts on the amenities of the adjoining occupiers to the north.
- 6.5 No windows are proposed in the south elevation and the application has been amended to remove one proposed first floor window in the west elevation and replace it with a roof light which the objector has acknowledged causes less concern. Due to the orientation of the extension to the north of the attached dwelling, it is not considered that the extension would block out light to doors and windows of this dwelling. Any overshadowing from the extension would be to the west (within the application site) and north (mitigated by the existing extension to the neighbouring dwelling). It is noted that the objectors concerns may be overcome if the extension were sited further north, however it is not considered that this would significantly reduce any impact.
- 6.6 Whilst it is acknowledged that the scale of the extension is large and would extend up to the boundary of the curtilage of the neighbouring dwelling, due to the position of openings and orientation relative to the sun, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any unacceptable impacts on the amenities of the adjoining occupiers to the south and the proposal is considered acceptable in accordance with Development Management Policy DP28. Although this policy is not wholly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, it can be given weight in the determination of this application.

7 Conclusion

- 7.1 The application proposes the replacement of a single storey extension that does not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the dwelling with a two storey extension on a larger footprint. Whilst this extension would be large, the form, design and materials are appropriate to the existing and neighbouring dwellings and the scale would not be out of character. Although this group of dwellings enjoys a close relationship, it is not considered that the extension would result in any unacceptable impacts on the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

8 Recommendation

- 8.1 Approve subject to conditions:
- (i) Standard time limit
 - (ii) In accordance with submitted plans
 - (iii) Remove permitted development rights for extensions and alterations to dwelling

9 Reason for recommendation

- 9.1 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies DP4 and DP28 of the adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2011) and Policy CS1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007). It is also considered to be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) which is a material consideration in the determination of this application.

Background papers: Application File BA/2013/0259/FUL

Author: Maria Hammond
Date of Report: 26 September 2013

List of Appendices: APPENDIX 1 Location Plan

APPENDIX 1

BA/2013/0259/FUL - 39 Ditchingham Dam, Ditchingham
Demolish existing single storey extension and replace with two storey extension

