

Report To: The Planning Board

Date: 7th February 2018

Report By: Head of Regeneration and Planning

**Report No: 17/0338/IC
Plan 02/18**

**Local Application
Development**

Contact Officer: James McColl

Contact No: 01475 712462

**Subject: Proposed extension to rear of property at
42 Lilybank Road, Port Glasgow**



© Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Licence No 10023421, 2018

SUMMARY

- The proposal accords with the Inverclyde Development Plan.
- Seven objections have been received raising concerns over the impact on neighbours from intrusiveness, loss of daylight, sunlight, privacy, views and property value and from construction noise. Two letters of support consider that the proposal complies with policy and guidance and that there will be no impact from overlooking and on daylight and sunlight will be minimal.
- The recommendation is to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION.

Drawings may be viewed at:

https://planning.inverclyde.gov.uk/Online/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=OX_PILQIMMQE00

SITE DESCRIPTION

42 Lilybank Road is a split level dwellinghouse situated on a sloping site on the northern side of Lilybank Road, Port Glasgow. The building is two storey to the front and three storey to the rear. Externally, it is finished in sandstone to the front with render to the side. The rear is principally rendered, with painted stone at the lower ground floor level. The building roof is finished in slate. Similar dwellinghouses lie adjacent and the Port Glasgow to Wemyss Bay railway line is to the rear at a much lower level.

PROPOSAL

It is proposed to erect a single storey extension to the rear of the dwellinghouse. The extension will project approximately 4.5 metres from the rear wall of the house and have an external footprint of approximately 19 square metres. Due to the sloping garden, the extension will be approximately 3.6 metres in height adjacent to the rear wall of the house, with this height relative to the ground level increasing to approximately 4.7 metres. Externally, the extension will be finished in buff facing brick and render and with a grey tiled roof.

A balcony is also proposed to the rear of the extension. This is to be accessed via bi-folding doors and a raised patio to the side. The floor area of the balcony and patio combine to an area of around 11.5 square metres and will be enclosed by a glass balustrade. The floor of the balcony is around 1.5 metres above existing ground level at the highest point.

Finally, new concrete steps are proposed within the garden to replace those lost by the extension. These are to provide access to the lower level.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Policy RES1 - Safeguarding the Character and Amenity of Residential Areas

The character and amenity of residential areas, identified on the Proposals Map, will be safeguarded and where practicable, enhanced. Proposals for new residential development will be assessed against and have to satisfy the following criteria:

- (a) compatibility with the character and amenity of the area;
- (b) details of proposals for landscaping;
- (c) proposals for the retention of existing landscape or townscape features of value on the site;
- (d) accordance with the Council's adopted roads guidance and Designing Streets, the Scottish Government's policy statement;
- (e) provision of adequate services; and
- (f) having regard to Supplementary Guidance on Planning Application Advice Notes.

Policy RES5 - Proposals for Changes to Properties for Residential Use

Proposals for the change of use, sub-division or conversion to properties to create new additional dwelling units, and for the alteration or extension to residential properties, will be assessed against and have to satisfy where appropriate, the following criteria:

- (a) the character and amenity of neighbouring properties;
- (b) impact on the streetscape;
- (c) impact on the character of the existing property;
- (d) accordance with the Council's adopted roads guidance; and
- (e) having regard to Supplementary Guidance on Planning Application Advice Notes.

Planning Application Advice Note (PAAN) 4 on "House Extensions" applies.

Planning Application Advice Note (PAAN) 5 on "Balconies and Garden Decking" applies.

CONSULTATIONS

None required.

PUBLICITY

The nature of the proposal did not require advertisement.

SITE NOTICES

The nature of the proposal did not require a site notice.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Seven objections have been received in connection with the proposal.

The concerns raised can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal will lead to overlooking and loss of privacy.
- The extension will result in overshadowing and loss of daylight and sunlight.
- Loss of views from neighbouring properties will occur.
- The proposal is not in keeping with the existing properties within this residential area.
- Property values may be reduced.
- Noise disruption may occur during the construction of the extension.
- The proposal will be intrusive to neighbouring residents and be to the detriment of their amenity.

Two representations in support of the proposal have also been submitted. It is noted that the impact on daylight and sunlight would be minimal as would overlooking compared to the current situation. There is nothing within policy or guidance which suggests the extension should not be granted permission.

I will consider the points raised both in objection and support in my assessment.

ASSESSMENT

The material considerations in the determination of this application are the Inverclyde Local Development Plan, Planning Application Advice Notes (PAAN) 4 and 5 on "House Extensions" and "Balconies and Garden Decking", the impact on the existing building and on the wider streetscape, the impact on residential amenity and the representations received.

Policy RES1 seeks to protect residential amenity and Policy RES5 advises on alterations to existing residential properties. PAAN4, which applies to house extensions, provides guidance in achieving a balance between those wishing to extend their property whilst protecting the amenity of neighbouring residents. Considering PAAN4, this seeks to limit extensions to either projecting not more than 4.5 metres or crossing the 45 degree line from the mid-point of the nearest neighbouring ground floor window, whichever is greater. This is to ensure that daylight and sunlight to neighbouring property is not unacceptably affected by an extension. The extension, which projects 4.5 metres from the rear wall of the house, complies with this guidance. The large rear garden ensures that the extension does not encroach within 5.5 metres of the rear boundary nor does it result in more than 25% of the rear curtilage being developed. This also is in accordance with the advice within PAAN4. I am therefore satisfied that over development does not occur.

With regard to design, the extension is located to the rear. Whilst distant views to the rear are possible, a variety of rear porches, outbuildings and large elevated timber decks are evident at the rear of buildings on the northern side of Lilybank Road and Shankland Road beyond. I do not consider a single storey rear extension to be unacceptable in this context. The pitched roof design and the use of a combination of render and buff facing brick are considered acceptable in the context of the building design and overall I am satisfied that the appearance of the proposed extension is appropriate. In further considering residential amenity, whilst it is acknowledged that the bi-folding doors to the side of the extension face towards the neighbouring property at no.44, the existing timber boundary fence ensures that clear views towards neighbouring windows will not occur and the position of these doors therefore does not lead to any unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy beyond the established position.



PAAN5 offers advice on how to assess the balcony. I am also satisfied that the balcony is visually acceptable in the context of the proposed extension. The floor area of the balcony to the rear and the elevated patio to the side of the extension combine to create an area of around 11.5 square metres. I am satisfied that this would afford seating to enjoy the views across the river but is not of an excessive size. Notwithstanding a small privacy screen proposed to the eastern side of the balcony which is adjacent to the garden boundary, it is acknowledged that clear views across neighbouring gardens will be possible. However, due to the steep slope on the north-east side of Lilybank Road and Shankland Road beyond, there is presently intervisibility between gardens and from existing rear windows. There are also other instances of elevated terraces and decks, with similar open views, including an elevated decking within a neighbouring garden which offers unobstructed views across the lower part of the application site's garden. Overall, there is a recognition that this arrangement allows residents to benefit from open views of the River Clyde at the cost of intervisibility between gardens. PAAN5 informs that screening may not be required where decking does not increase or intensify the intervisibility and overlooking between neighbours; overall, I am satisfied that despite clear views from the proposed balcony across neighbouring gardens and the absence of any screening, the deck does not lead to any additional overlooking, intervisibility or loss of privacy to neighbouring gardens beyond the established position requiring additional screening.

Finally, the new external stair within the garden to provide access to the lower level will have a neutral impact both visually and in terms of wider residential amenity.

Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal complies with the Inverclyde Local Development Plan Policy RES1 in that it is compatible with the character and amenity of the area and Policy RES5 (a) the character and amenity of neighbouring properties; (b) impact on the streetscape; (c) impact on the character of the existing property; and (d) having regard to Supplementary Guidance on Planning Application Advice Notes.

It remains to consider if there any material considerations that determine planning permission should be considered contrary to the Development Plan. In this regard, it is appropriate to address representations not considered in the assessment of planning policy. Loss of view and any perceived effect on property values are not material planning considerations. Whilst it is acknowledged that a degree of noise and disturbance would occur during the construction phase, noise from building sites is controlled by the Head of Safer and Inclusive Communities via separate legislation.



In conclusion, I am satisfied that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the existing building and wider streetscape. The proposed extension together with balcony and associated works within the garden will have an acceptable impact on residential amenity. The proposal presents no conflict with Policies RES1 and RES5 of the Inverclyde Local Development Plan and meets the guidance in PAANs 4 and 5. I am mindful of the objections received, however, there are no material planning considerations which warrant the refusal of the application.

RECOMMENDATION

That the application be granted.

Stuart Jamieson
Head of Regeneration and Planning

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 – Background Papers. For further information please contact James McColl on 01475 712462.