

Report To: The Planning Board

Date: 2 September 2020

Report By: Head of Regeneration and Planning

Report No: 20/0022/IC
09/20

Local Application
Development

Contact Officer: David Sinclair

Contact No: 01475 712436

Subject: Proposed alterations and enlargement of house at
Haiglea, Florence Drive, Kilmacolm.



SUMMARY

- The proposal complies with the Inverclyde Local Development Plan.
- Twenty objections have been received raising concerns over scale and size, access, and impacts on public realm, the environment, public realm and amenity and wellbeing.
- Consultations received present no impediment to development.
- The recommendation is to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to conditions.

Drawings may be viewed at:

<https://planning.inverclyde.gov.uk/Online/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=Q5HD46IMGHI00>

SITE DESCRIPTION

Haiglea is a detached bungalow located on the north-west side of Florence Drive, Kilmacolm. It is designed with a hipped roof containing a single roof light on the principal and rear elevations and finished with red rosemary tiles; it also has two stone chimneys, one on each side roof; white render walls; white uPVC windows with two bay windows on the principal elevation either side of a green timber storm door; and a small single stained glass window set in a white and green timber frame on the side elevation facing Aysgarth. The house is bound by a mixture of detached single storey dwellinghouses with roof dormers and two storey dwellinghouses, all set in similar sized garden areas.

The site is on a gentle south-west slope, with a gradient of approximately 1 in 50, and within the rear garden adjacent to the boundary with Aysgarth is a timber outbuilding. The site boundary has a low stone wall along Florence Drive, with all other boundaries delineated by a variety of planting, including in the main high hedging.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the enlargement of the house into a two storey villa, the construction of a two storey rear extension and a single storey side extension on the south-west side of the building. The additional floor will increase the overall height of the house from approximately 6 metres to approximately 8.2 metres.

On the front elevation it is proposed to install two double windows above the existing bay windows and a smaller double window above the door. On the side elevation to Sunart it is proposed to enlarge a ground floor window to an office (previously a bedroom) and to install a matching window to a library/study directly above on the upper floor. On the side elevation to Aysgarth it is proposed to remove the existing kitchen windows towards the rear of the building and install a smaller window forward of the garage. It is proposed to maintain a hipped roof on top of the house.

The two storey rear extension is proposed to extend outwards by approximately 6.4 metres across the entire rear elevation and is proposed to incorporate a large sliding door in the centre of the ground floor, measuring approximately 4 metres across, with double windows either side. On the upper floor are three double windows, all measuring approximately 1.8 metres across. All new windows are proposed to be in Edwardian style design to match the existing bay windows.

The proposed garage, which is affixed to the side of the house adjacent to Aysgarth, will measure approximately 6.5 metres in length by 3.2 metres and is to be set back from the principal elevation by approximately 5.5 metres. The garage is proposed to have a pitched roof, measuring approximately 4.4 metres in height.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Policy 1 – Creating Successful Places

Inverclyde Council requires all development to have regard to the six qualities of successful places. In preparing development proposals, consideration must be given to the factors set out in Figure 3. Where relevant, applications will also be assessed against the Planning Application Advice Notes Supplementary Guidance.

Draft Planning Application Advice Note (PAAN) 4 on “House Extensions” applies.

CONSULTATIONS

Head of Service – Roads and Transportation

- Parking should be provided in accordance with the National Roads Development Guidelines. The parking requirement for the existing dwelling which has 3 bedrooms is 2 spaces, and the proposed dwelling which has 5 bedrooms is 3 spaces.
- Applicant to show they can meet these requirements within the site.
- Parking spaces should be 3.0m x 5.0m each.
- For the garage to be counted as a parking space, it must be a minimum of 3.0m by 7.0m.
- The surface water flow from the site should be limited to that of greenfield flow off.

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

The application was the subject of neighbour notification. 20 representations were received. Concerns were raised as follows:

Size and Scale

- This is overdevelopment and with the loss of garden ground due to car parking and garage modifications, and the size and scale of the house, both the size of the footprint and the 2 storey nature of the plans.
- The proposal is not a modification but a rebuild and not in line with the current environment.
- The proposal is not sensitive to the design of the house or its neighbours.
- There are concerns over whether the strength and construction of Haiglea as it currently exists will be able to sustain the proposed development.
- The proposal deprives the housing market in the area of a valuable and increasingly scarce asset, a bungalow.
- The proposed plans show a substantial increase in size infringing in proximity to the boundary of both properties.
- The garage is too high and the roof is too steep.
- The garage shown has a higher pitch than neighbouring garages.
- There is a lack of a gap between the boundary hedge and the side of the garage.
- The garage may not be large enough to accommodate a car.

Public Realm

- The plot that the house sits on is narrower than the neighbouring properties and so the scale of the building proposed will look cramped and will negatively impact the spacious and harmonious streetscape which is one of the main attractions of the street.
- The development will be totally out of context with the houses adjacent to and across from it.
- The visual impact of the development will be the opposite of what is current and could not be deemed to be a “sympathetic” conversion or enhancement.
- The plans indicate the destruction of the Austin Laird designed house presently occupying the site.
- The proposal is not in keeping with either its original design or of the character of the adjacent houses.

- The visual impact of the proposed development will result in the house towering over neighbour properties and appearing only as a brick edifice along the line of gardens in Florence Drive.

Access

- Construction traffic and subsequently the occupiers of a large property will need to use Florence Drive.
- A 5 bedroom house could potentially result in 4-5 cars requiring off road parking, especially as the plans show accommodation for 2 generations of adults and lead to the possibility of on street parking.
- There are concerns over an increase in traffic flow as the driveway converges with neighbouring driveways.
- The proposal will result in on-street parking, resulting in concerns over public safety with there only being a pavement on one side of Florence Drive.

Environmental Impact

- The proposed development will create a negative impact on the environment given the smells, dust and vibrations created throughout.
- Development will result in the removal of established trees and bushes on wildlife including squirrels, birds, bats and hedgehogs.
- There are concerns over impact on the watercourses, water retention and drainage.
- The requirement for car parking would result in a hard surface replacing the attractive front garden.
- The surface water drainage system on Florence Drive does not work at present and this problem would be compounded with further hard landscaping.
- Loss of green space caused by the extension.

Amenity and Wellbeing

- There are concerns over loss of privacy due to the increase in height and proximity of the extension to neighbouring properties.
- There will be a detrimental impact on residential amenity due to noise and general disturbance to the quiet neighbourhood whilst works are being carried out.
- There will be noise impacts during construction.
- There are concerns over loss of light into neighbouring properties.
- There will be overlooking and loss of privacy.

One letter of objection received was from the Kilmacolm Civic Trust. The Trust stated that it does not oppose in principle the proposal to enlarge the house, however it objects to the proposal due to a lack of detail on the plans; a lack of indication of horizontal and vertical dimensions and a lack of information on proposed materials, finishes and detailing. It considers the drawings to lack any design consideration or pay any respect to the existing building. Furthermore the elevational treatment lacks design consideration and the Trust requests that the applicant resubmits the plans and that the resubmission must provide all the information which is deficient.

ASSESSMENT

The material considerations in determination of this application are the Inverclyde Local Development Plan (LDP); Draft Planning Application Advice Note (PAAN) 4 on "House Extensions"; the impact of the proposed development in preserving and enhancing the pattern of development and overall character of the area; and the impact on neighbouring and residential amenity. The LDP has been adopted following notification from the Scottish Ministers on 15 August 2019 that "the Council may now proceed to adopt the Plan".

Policy 1 of the LDP requires all development to have regard to the six qualities of successful places. Consideration must be given to the factors set out in Figure 3 to the Policy. The most

relevant in this regard are being 'Distinctive' through reflecting local architecture and urban form and being 'Safe and Pleasant' by avoiding conflict with adjacent uses.

Firstly addressing impacts on the character of the area, the proposal includes an increase in height of the building from one storey to two storeys, being clearly visible from Florence Drive. In considering the impact of the proposal on the overall character of the area, the property is one in a row of detached houses, which contain a mixture of 1.5 and two storey properties. This is currently the smallest house in the row both in terms of height and scale. The proposal will maintain the existing street front building line and the overall pattern of development in terms of being a detached house set within a mature garden. The proposed changes to the front elevation will see the existing roof raised in height by approximately 2.2 metres, with two larger pairs of windows directly above the two bay windows and a smaller pair of windows directly above the front door, which will maintain the symmetry on the principal elevation. The upstairs windows are proposed to have the same glazing style as the existing downstairs windows which is compatible with the character of the original house. In assessing the increase in height on the property, I note that the roof ridge of the existing property sits approximately 1.5 metres lower than the roof ridge of the adjoining properties and consider that the increase in height of the house by 2.2 metres will not negatively impact on the public realm. I consider the proposal to be in keeping with the overall character of the area.



In considering neighbour amenity, the guidance given in Draft PAAN4 looks at the impact of house extensions. In assessing the two storey rear extensions, Draft PAAN4 states that they will be considered on individual merit, but they should not extend beyond 3.5 metres from the rear wall of the original house or result in unacceptable loss of light to a room in a neighbouring house. As the rear extension extends more than 3.5 metres, Draft PAAN4 requires the impact of the proposal to be assessed to determine whether it results in an unacceptable loss of light to a neighbouring window. This has been assessed against the BRE publication "Site Layout Planning for daylight and sunlight: A guide to good practice", measuring the existing and proposed vertical sky component (VSC). The VSC for the closest neighbouring windows, which are the kitchen and sunroom windows on the side elevations at Sunart and which face directly onto the property at a distance of approximately 6.6 metres have been measured. If the VSC is greater than 27% then enough skylight will reach the window of the existing building. If the VSC, with the new development in place, is both less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value, occupants of the existing building will notice the reduction in the amount of skylight. The daylight indicator shows that the sunroom window has an existing VSC of 35.5% VSC and the VSC with the proposal in place will be 29%. This is above the minimum 27% recommended. For the kitchen, the existing VSC is 29.5% and the proposed VSC will be 26%. This is below the minimum 27% recommended; however as the VSC will be above 0.8 times the existing VSC, the reduction in the amount of skylight is unlikely to be noticed by occupants. It stands that the

proposal will not result in an unacceptable loss of light to any rooms in neighbouring houses, in accordance with the guidance in Draft PAAN4.

Draft PAAN4 also advises that extensions should not result in more than 50% of the rear garden area being developed and should not encroach within 5.5 metres of the rear garden boundary. The proposal will result in approximately 19.3% of the rear garden area being developed, with the undeveloped garden area reducing from approximately 442 square metres to approximately 356 square metres. The proposed rear extension will be a minimum of 14 metres from the rear garden boundary, well exceeding the minimum 5.5 metres required.

With regard to the windows proposed, Draft PAAN4 states that windows on side elevations should be avoided where they offer a direct view of neighbouring rear/private gardens. The existing house contains windows on the both side elevations. The proposal includes the installation of the new ground floor windows, a smaller window in front of the garage and an enlarged window on the Aysgarth side, set back between 4.9 and 5.8 metres from the principal elevation. An upstairs window is proposed above the enlarged window. These windows will be positioned far enough forward so as not to afford a direct view of any neighbouring private/rear gardens, however they will provide an opportunity for direct overlooking into the neighbouring kitchen side window which sits almost directly across from these windows at a distance of 6.7 metres. This is less than the 18 metre minimum required window intervisibility distance given in Draft PAAN4. I note that the continued existence of both side boundary hedges is essential in maintaining the amenity of the overall area through mitigating any invasion of privacy issues from the ground floor windows. The proposal indicates that the high boundary hedges are to be preserved, which I consider to be an acceptable means of mitigating overlooking between the ground floor windows. Following further discussions, the applicant has agreed to install obscure glazing into the upstairs window to prevent any overlooking into the neighbouring property. Both of these measures can be secured by means of condition.



Draft PAAN4 also recommends that extensions should be finished in materials to complement those of the existing house. The new walls, windows, roofs and rainwater goods for the dwelling are proposed to match the existing dwelling in terms of both materials and finishes.

In assessing the proposed garage, the single storey extension comes to approximately 0.7 metres of the site's side boundary to Aysgarth; this is not in accordance with the 1 metre set back distance as advised in Draft PAAN4. Side boundary set back is required to avoid the terracing of houses and to ensure that there is suitable access between front and rear gardens. As the set back from the frontage and the retention of a boundary hedge will prevent any impression of terracing, and there remains ample access at the other side of the house for external movement between the front and rear gardens, I am satisfied that the intent of the guidance is achieved. Furthermore, I note that there is currently a detached garage to the rear of the house, which sits closer to the side boundary than the proposed garage and that other

houses on Florence Drive contain similar sized side extensions. The roof of the side extension is proposed to match the existing house roof in terms of materials, finishes and roof pitch angle. Taking this into account, I consider that the garage is designed in accordance with the traditional features of the house and does not negatively impact on the house's overall unique design, therefore it is acceptable with reference to meeting the quality of being 'Distinctive' in LDP Policy 1.

The guidance in Draft PAAN4 requires the off-street parking requirements of the Council's Roads Development Guide to be met. This is in order to minimise the impact of traffic and street parking on Florence Drive. The Head of Service – Roads and Transportation has identified that the parking requirement for the site will increase from 2 to 3 off-street parking spaces and the applicant has provided drawings demonstrating that this can be safely achieved within the site. In addressing the concerns raised in the objections that parking may occur on Florence Drive and that the garage is not large enough to accommodate a car; I note that the driveway has sufficient space to accommodate an additional two cars on top of the three spaces demonstrated by the applicant.

The Head of Service – Roads and Transportation has also requested a condition be placed on the granting of any consent that the surface water flow from the site should be limited to greenfield flow off. Furthermore, I note the concerns raised regarding impacts of the development on the surface water drainage system. This matter can be addressed by means of condition to ensure that the surface water flow from the site does not increase. Based on the above assessment, I consider the proposal to be in accordance with Draft PAAN4, as well as minimising the impact of traffic and parking on the street scene (LDP Policy 1).

Turning to the concerns raised in the objections not yet addressed, regarding loss of open space and impacts on trees and bushes in the garden, there are no environmental designations covering any part of the site nor are there any in the surrounding area. The footprint of the extension comprises grass and part of the existing driveway, with a variety of small, immature bushes that are currently in an unmaintained condition. Accordingly, no concerns regarding protected species arise. Notwithstanding this, there remains the potential for birds to nest in the area. Accordingly, I consider this matter can be addressed by a condition that checks are carried out for nesting birds prior to the removal of any bushes. Concerns over structural issues are matters to be resolved outwith the planning application process and can have no impact on the determination of this application. Planning permission may not be refused on the basis that this will reduce the number of bungalows in the local housing market. Finally, concerns about noise pollution generated during construction is a matter which is regulated by The Head of Environmental and Public Protection (Environmental Health) and can have no bearing on planning considerations.

Taking all of the above into account, I consider that the proposal does not have any adverse impacts in terms of noise; smell; vibration; dust; air quality; flooding; invasion of privacy; or overshadowing, and therefore it meets the quality of being 'Safe and Pleasant' in LDP Policy 1.

To conclude, I am satisfied that the proposal can be considered acceptable with reference to LDP Policy 1 and Draft PAAN4. Having taken into account all representations received, I consider that there are no material planning considerations that would justify the refusal of the planning application.

RECOMMENDATION

That the application be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. That prior to their use on site, samples of all external materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority: development thereafter shall proceed utilising the approved materials, unless the Planning Authority gives its prior written approval to any alternatives.

2. The extension hereby approved shall not be occupied until the off-street parking spaces shown in approved drawing number HAIGLEA – WATKINS_200 Rev A have been provided within the site.
3. That the upstairs window hereby approved on the north-east side elevation shall be fitted with opaque glazing.
4. That the existing side boundary hedges detailed on drawing number HAIGLEA – WATKINS_200 Rev A shall be retained. Any future proposals to lop, top or fell any part of these hedges shall not be executed without the prior written approval of the Planning Authority.
5. All surface water shall be contained within the site.
6. All works to trees and bushes shall be preceded by a check for nesting birds, in accordance with the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004.

Reasons:

1. To ensure a continuity of finishing materials in keeping with the character of the building and surrounding area.
2. In the interests of road safety on Florence Drive.
3. In the interests of privacy and to prevent overlooking between properties.
4. To ensure that a quality landscape setting is maintained in the interests of neighbouring amenity and to prevent an invasion of privacy.
5. To ensure adequate drainage is in place to prevent surface water running from the development hereby permitted onto neighbouring properties or a public footway.
6. To comply with the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004.

Stuart Jamieson
Head of Regeneration and Planning

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 – Background Papers. For further information please contact David Sinclair on 01475 712436.