

Planning Committee Report

<u>Application Number:</u>	WND/2023/0187
Location:	The Folly, Old Forge Lane, Preston Capes
Development:	Proposed first floor extension to existing garage to create habitable accommodation to be used ancillary to main dwelling (Revised scheme)
<hr/>	
Applicant:	Mr Moysen & Miss Lewis
Agent:	Archi-tec Architectural Design
Case Officer:	Nisar Mogul
<hr/>	
Ward:	Woodford & Weedon
<hr/>	
Reason for Referral:	Called in by Councillor Frost on the grounds of loss of amenity to neighbouring properties.
Committee Date:	10th January 2024

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS AND RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS as set out below with delegated authority to the Assistant Director – Planning and Development to approve an amendment to conditions as deemed necessary.

Proposal

This full application seeks permission for the construction of a first floor extension above the existing detached flat roofed garage to create a home office and habitable accommodation to be used as an ancillary annex to the main residence at The Folly.

This is a revised proposal following the previous refusal under planning application reference number WND/2021/0689 for a similar proposal which included a first floor balcony area to the rear elevation. That application was refused on the grounds that *'the proposal would be out of character with the principal dwellinghouse and would detract from the character, form and setting of main dwellinghouse and, in turn, would fail to conserve, enhance or make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Preston Capes Conservation Area'*.

That application was subject to an appeal under reference number APP/W2845/D/22/3303301 where the Inspector concluded *'that the principle of altering the existing flat roof to one of a pitched roof would not cause harm to the historic environment. The proposal would preserve, or slightly enhance, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area from its current situation. With regards to the balcony to the rear of the building, it is of a relatively large scale and would contrast sharply with the more simplistic*



Planning Committee Report

cottage aesthetic of the rest of the village. I therefore consider that although the proposed change from the flat roof to pitched roof are acceptable in principle and meet the Policy requirements of the Local Plan and the CAAMP, the overall design and execution of the rear balcony feature area would represent a poor design response that would overly domesticate this elevation of the building and appear at odds with its surrounding sensitive context and thereby cause some harm to the character and appearance of the Preston Capes Conservation Area of which this site forms a part'.

The current application initially proposed a Juliet Balcony to the rear first floor elevation, however, through negotiations with the Agent, the scheme was amended to remove the Juliet Balcony and the inward opening doors to a more traditional type of window.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development now addresses all the concerns raised by the Inspectorate and therefore the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of design and impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and amenity of adjoining residential properties.

Consultations:

The following consultees have raised **objections** to the final proposed application:

Preston Capes Parish Council

The following consultees have raised **no objections** to the final proposed application:

WNC Local Highway Authority

WNC Conservation Area Officer concerns raised but concedes that the changes proposed with omission of the balcony has overcome the Inspectors findings.

2 letters of objection have been received.

0 letters of support have been received.

Conclusion:

The application has been assessed against the relevant policies in the NPPF, the adopted Development Plan and other relevant guidance as listed in detail below in the report.

The key issues arising from the application details are on:

- Principle of the development
- Impact on the Conservation Area and the surrounding Listed Buildings.
- Impact on highway safety

The report looks into the key planning issues in detail below, and Officers conclude that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions.

Members are advised that the above is a summary of the proposals and the key issues contained in the main report below provide full details of all consultation responses, planning policies, the Officer's assessment and recommendations. Members are advised that this summary should be read in conjunction with the detailed report.



Planning Committee Report

MAIN REPORT

1 APPLICATION SITE AND LOCALITY

- 1.1 The application site comprises an existing detached double garage positioned within the curtilage of The Folly – a two storey dwelling dating back to the 18th century and with the neighbouring property, Arch Cottage, form a pair of historic structures that echo a Medieval Castle. The main dwelling and enclosed gardens are located to the immediate west. The existing garage has a flat roof set behind a simple coped parapet wall that blends in with the rest of the boundary walling that encloses the garden from the public realm. The garage provides storage for the existing residence and is positioned behind a gravelled area which provides parking for the existing property (two spaces). The site is mainly surrounded by historic properties of a mixture of character and styles, but predominantly 18th Century development.

2 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 2.1 The proposal consists of the construction of a first floor pitch roofed extension above the existing flat roofed detached garage to create habitable accommodation to be used ancillary to the main residence at The Folly. The pitch of the proposal would be built from the same level as the existing parapet/eaves of the existing garage.
- 2.2 The height to the eaves is circa 2.5 metres and the height to the pitch of the roof is circa 6 metres. The proposal will provide a home office and a garage space to the ground floor and habitable accommodation to the first floor.
- 2.3 The external facing materials to be used on the extension are red facing bricks to the external walls and slate tiles to the roof slopes, both to match the materials to the existing house.
- 2.4 The initial plan proposed a Juliet Balcony to the first floor rear elevation, however, this was removed and replaced with a traditional style window and a oculus type window is proposed to the first floor front elevation facing Old Forge Lane.

3 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The following planning history is considered relevant to the current proposal:

Application Ref.	Proposal	Decision
DA/1982/0571	Front porch/ detached double garage and store.	Approved
DA/2021/0164	Proposed first floor extension to existing garage to create habitable accommodation to be used ancillary to main dwelling and construction of external balcony on rear elevation.	Refused



Planning Committee Report

WND/2021/0689	Proposed first floor extension to existing garage to create habitable accommodation to be used ancillary to main dwelling and construction of external balcony on rear elevation (resubmission of DA/2021/0164)	Refused
APP/W2845/D/22/3303301	Appeal for WND/2021/0689	Dismissed

4 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

Statutory Duty

- 4.1 Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 4.2 Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 place a statutory duty upon Local Planning Authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of listed buildings and conservation areas.

Development Plan

- 4.3 The Development Plan comprises: the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) which was formally adopted by the Joint Strategic Planning Committee on 15th December 2014 and which provides the strategic planning policy framework for the District to 2029; and the adopted Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2) (2020). The relevant planning policies of the statutory Development Plan are set out below:

West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (2014) (Part 1) (LPP1)

- Policy SA – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy S1 – The distribution of development
- Policy S10 – Sustainable Development Principles
- Policy BN5 – Historic environment and landscape
- Policy R1 – Spatial Strategy for the rural areas



Planning Committee Report

Daventry District Settlements and Countryside (Part 2) Local Plan (2019) (LPP2)

Policy SP1 – Daventry District Spatial Strategy

Policy RA3 – Other Villages

Policy ENV7 – Historic environment

Policy RA5 – Renovation and Conversion of Existing Buildings within Settlements

Policy ENV2 – Special Landscape Area

Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (as revised)

SPG on Designing House Extensions (1997)

National Design Guide (2019)

Local Highway Authority Standing Advice (2016)

Northamptonshire Parking Standards (2016) (as revised)

5 RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

5.1 Below is a summary of the consultation responses received at the time of writing this report.

Consultee Name	Position	Comment
Preston Capes Parish Council	Objection	The application is essentially the same as the previously refused applications with the viewing balcony replaced with double glass doors and a Juliette balcony. The property is on the Local List as a Heritage Asset. The Archyard - this and the adjoining cottage - was designed as an 'eyecatcher' c1815 by Thomas Cundy, the idea being that when viewed from Fawsley it would appear as a castle on the brow of the hill. It is a prominent feature when approaching the village on the Knightley Way, with this and the Church being the only obvious buildings – the pitched roofs of neighbouring cottages are not noticeable due to the undulations of the hill. The current flat roof garage is fairly unobtrusive, but raising it to 2 storeys with a pitched roof



Planning Committee Report

		<p>would have an affect on the skyline when approached from the Knightley Way impacting on the original intention of the castle design.</p> <p>The proposal will have a negative impact on the range of neighbouring pre-1742 ironstone cottages: Despite being set back from the lane, the larger expanse of red brick on the boundary line with Rosebank's aged ironstone will be jarring and out of character. The building would be much more dominant in its setting. The 'coachhouse' design not in keeping with either the historic Archyard or surrounding ironstone cottages, some of which are listed, as all of them were originally humble farmworkers cottages. A coachhouse would never be found in such a setting. The double glass doors and juliette balcony on the upper floor are not in keeping with the surrounding traditional workers cottages, and will overlook and be intrusive to neighbouring gardens. It will not blend into or be sympathetic to the overall village design when viewed from Old Forge Lane, the Churchyard, or the approach from the Knightley Way - noted picturesque views. This additional development detracts from rather than adds to the heritage asset, its setting and the surrounding cottages. The Heritage Impact Statement incorrectly claims that Church Wood now obscures the view from Fawsley and that the trees in the Folly garden, which currently partially obscure the proposed development, all have Tree Preservation Orders. The trees of Church Wood, being an ancient woodland, are as mature now as when the cottages were built. The area the wood occupies has not increased. If the Archyard could be seen from Fawsley when it was built, it more than likely still is. It can be clearly seen on the approach to the village from Fawsley along the Knightley Way.</p> <p>None of the trees within The Folly garden or the neighbouring area has a TPO. These could be reduced or removed making the proposed development even more noticeable from the northerly aspect. It would also increase the intrusion felt by the private residential gardens of Rosebank, Evenlode, Danecot and Medlars.</p> <p>We have concerns regarding parking. With the existing 2 garages and short drive space, the applicants currently park vehicles in the vicinity of</p>
--	--	--



Planning Committee Report

		<p>the village hall. There is no provision for guests/clients at this additional office and living space, and limited available parking around the village due to its narrow lanes.</p>
Highways	No objection	<p>Work to convert the double garage would retain a single garage as well as the 2 existing off-road parking spaces to the front. The main dwelling would therefore retain the required amount of off road parking for this dwelling as a result of these proposals.</p> <p>Should the Local Planning Authority (LPA) be minded to grant Planning Consent for this application, the LHA would ask the LPA that a suitably worded planning condition be attached to that consent tying the annexe to the existing dwelling; that is that the development is to be made ancillary to the main dwelling only.</p>
Heritage Officer	Concerns	<p>Given the proportions of the proposed garage remodelling as a whole, I think the upper window is too large. Taken together, the two windows dominate the gable in a way not reflected elsewhere in the village. However, this does overcome the concerns raised by the Planning Inspectorate.</p>

6 RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY

Below is a summary of the third party and neighbour responses received on the amended plans removing the Juliet Balcony:

There has been 1 objection raising the following comments:

- There appears to be little material change from the previously refused scheme, compared to the current scheme.
- Arch Cottage will still remain adversely affected.
- The circular window is not the same construction or shape as any other windows on The Folly.
- There is a need to demonstrate an adequate parking plan for both the ancillary dwelling and the main dwelling.
- Impact additional loading may have on tree roots and foul drainage.

7 APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

- 7.1 Planning Law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for Daventry District consists of the policies within the WNJCS and Daventry District Council Settlement and Countryside (Part 2) Local Plan as well as the Preston Capes Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.
- 7.2 Annex 1 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes reference to due weight being given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the Framework and that the closer the policies in the plan are to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given. The development plan policies relevant to the determination of this application are considered to be consistent with the NPPF and should be given full weight.
- 7.3 Policy R1 of the JCS sets out that development within rural areas will be guided by a rural settlement hierarchy taking into consideration “the role, scale and character of the settlement” (5) and should “protect and enhance the character and quality of the rural area’s historic buildings and areas of historic or environmental importance” (9). Policy S10 (i) requires development to protect, conserve and enhance the natural and built environment and heritage assets and their settings. Policy BN5 seeks to conserve and enhance designated and non-designated assets and their settings in recognition of the individual and cumulative significance and their contribution to local distinctiveness and sense of place.
- 7.4 Preston Capes is defined as an ‘Other Village’ in the Part 2 Local Plan. Policy RA3 seeks to direct development within the confines of the village (Criteria A), be small in scale (Ci), “protect the form, character and setting of the village and areas of historic or environmental importance including those identified in conservation area appraisals and village design statements”, (Cii), “protect the integrity of garden or other open land that makes an important contribution to the form, character and setting of the settlement” (Civ), and protect the amenity of existing residents (Cvi). Policy SP1 (G) seeks to protect and enhance the built and natural environment and the District’s heritage assets.
- 7.5 The adopted Designing House Extensions SPG design guide advises that extensions/ alterations should seek to protect the character of the existing house and that of the area, as well as the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
- 7.6 Therefore, while the principle of extending and converting an existing building to bring the building into living accommodation to be used ancillary to the main residence located inside the confines of the village is considered to be acceptable in principle, the Council will need to be satisfied that the proposal could be carried out without harming the character and setting of The Folly as a locally listed building (building of local interest and as identified on the ‘Local List’ in the CAAMP) and the character and



Planning Committee Report

appearance of the Conservation Area, and all other material considerations would need to be satisfied.

Impact on heritage assets (including character and appearance of the conservation area and character and setting of locally listed building)

- 7.7 Policy ENV2 states that the Council will protect the special quality of Special Landscape Areas, consider the cumulative impacts and will resist proposals which would have a harmful effect which cannot be successfully mitigated.
- 7.8 Policies BN5, ENV7 and Paragraphs 194, 199, 200, 202 of the NPPF require consideration to be given to the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset and their setting, where any harm to the significance of the asset(s) should require clear and convincing justification and the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Specifically, Policy ENV7 requires:

- A) Proposals affecting the historic environment must demonstrate a clear understanding of any potential impact on the significance of heritage assets and their setting; any description of significance and the contribution of setting should be proportionate to the asset's importance;
- B) In decision making, great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets irrespective of the level harm. The more important the asset, the greater the weight will be;
- C) Any harm to a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification and would be judged against the tests in the NPPF;
- D) The Council will seek to sustain and enhance the historic environment by supporting
 - i) High quality proposals that respond positively to their context by reinforcing local distinctiveness including street pattern, siting, form, scale, mass, use, materials and architectural features;
 - ii) Proposals that make a positive contribution to, or which better reveal the significance of designated heritage assets;
 - iii) Proposals affecting conservation areas that would sustain or enhance those elements that have been identified as making a positive contribution to the character and special architectural or historic interest of the area. Proposals that respond positively to the opportunity to enhance neutral or detracting elements of the conservation area, as identified through conservation area appraisals and management plans, will be particularly supported;
 - iv) proposals that sustain or enhance key views of heritage assets and key views into and out of conservation areas identified in conservation area appraisals, landscape characterisation, neighbourhood development plans and village design statements; and



Planning Committee Report

- v) Proposals that are sympathetic to non-designated heritage assets (identified through a conservation area appraisal or other method) and their setting including their retention and re-use. In doing so, the impact of the scale of any harm or loss on the significance of the assets will be taken into consideration.
- 7.9 Policy ENV10 A) supports development that is of a high quality and which “reflects and integrates with the surrounding area and creates a strong sense of place”. This sets out a criteria for achieving high quality development and seeks to “Promote or reinforce local distinctiveness and enhance its surroundings” (i); “Ensure that the scale, density, massing, height, layout and access of the proposal combine to ensure development blends well within the site and with its surroundings” (iii); and “respond to the wider landscape context”(vii).
- 7.10 The proposed first floor extension and garage alterations affect a building located inside the village, which is visually associated with the existing established built-form. Therefore, due to the limited nature of the proposal it is considered that it would not have a significant impact on the wider surrounding landscape and Special Landscape Area.
- 7.11 In addition to the site being located in a Conservation Area (a designated heritage asset where harm to character must be justified and weighed against public benefits), The Folly is also identified as a building of local interest in the Preston Capes Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2021). While not a nationally listed building, it is a non-designated heritage asset of local importance. Paragraph 203 of the NPPF requires the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset to be taken into account and “In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”.
- 7.12 The application proposes to construct a pitched roof first floor extension over the existing flat roofed garage to create an ancillary annex to the main dwelling. This proposal is similar to the previously refused application which was subject to appeal that was dismissed. The main difference between the previously refused application dismissed on appeal and the current application is that the large balcony area to the first floor rear elevation has now been omitted and hence now addresses the reasons for dismissing the appeal.
- 7.13 Therefore, in line with the Inspectorates views, it is considered that the proposal will not cause harm to the historic environment and that due to the untidy nature of the existing garage in situ, that the proposal would preserve, and actually slightly enhance, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area from its current situation.
- 7.14 There are other pitched roof buildings along the lane and planning permission has been granted for other similar pitched roof garages in the area (i.e. at Holly Cottage further to the east, which is a more modern 19th Century pitched-roof house), but the



Planning Committee Report

Local Planning Authority must consider each application on its own merits. In the case of the current proposal consideration must be given to the historical interest and significance of The Folly (as identified in the CAAMP) and it has been concluded that the proposal would not be out of character and would not cause any undue visually harm to the character and setting of the main building. Moreover, it is considered that the creation of a further pitched-roof garage of the proposed style within the grounds of the existing castellated building would not only conserve but would positively enhance the character and appearance of Old Forge Lane and the Conservation Area as it would sit comfortably alongside other examples of pitch roofed buildings in this part of the Conservation Area . The Council's Senior Conservation Officer acknowledges that the proposal has addressed the Appeal Inspectorates concerns by removing the previously proposed balcony area to the first floor rear elevation, however, would have preferred to see a smaller window to the this area than the one proposed.

- 7.15 With the omission of the rear first floor balcony feature it is considered that the proposal will now not appear at odds with its surrounding sensitive context and thereby will not cause any harm to the character and appearance of the Preston Capes Conservation Area of which this site forms a part and overall the views from the church will now not be considered to be overly prominent.
- 7.16 Any harm arising from this proposal on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and setting of the nearby listed buildings, is considered to fall under the category of 'less than substantial harm' according to the terminology used in the NPPF. The proposal involves creating additional ancillary accommodation for the existing dwelling the proposal would overall enhance the visual amenity of the streetscene and the Conservation Area in which it lies and hence there will be a clear public benefit that demonstrably outweighs any harm identified.
- 7.17 The proposal for the reasons outlined above, is considered to cause no harm to the heritage assets and hence the proposal is considered to comply with the aforementioned development plan and national planning policies.

Impact on neighbouring residential amenity

- 7.18 In terms of the impact on neighbour amenity the proposed first floor extension would be relatively modest, particularly as the roof would slope away from the boundary, and it would not lead to undue overbearing on the neighbouring property or immediate adjacent gardens. In order to prevent undue overlooking from the proposed first floor rear window on the immediately adjacent premises and gardens of Rosebank, a condition would be necessary to require that this window and the two roof windows proposed in the east elevation be provided with obscure glazing and thereafter retained.
- 7.19 The proposed first floor rear window would be positioned approximately 50 metres away from the other neighbouring properties to the rear and hence due to the



Planning Committee Report

separation distances, it is considered that there would be no undue overlooking on the neighbouring premises or gardens that would justify refusal of the application.

- 7.20 The proposed first floor south facing window would be a small opening and the proposed two west facing rooflight windows would face onto the garden of the application property and would be orientated away from the other surrounding properties and gardens. Therefore, no undue overlooking issues would result from these elements of the proposal.

Parking and highway safety

- 7.21 Paragraph 111 of the NPPF advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- 7.22 Notwithstanding the comments made in neighbour representations and by the Parish Council on the proposal, the Highway Authority was consulted on the proposal and were of the opinion that the parking provision for the property following the proposed development (a single garage space and two off-road parking spaces at the front of the garage) would be in line with the parking requirement for a dwelling of this size. Providing the proposed accommodation is ancillary to the existing dwelling (as suggested in the application particulars), there would be no more off-road parking issues than what currently exists at present, and hence the highway safety/ parking issues raised by neighbours and the Parish Council would be insufficient to warrant a refusal of the application on the grounds of highway safety.

Other Matters

Condition Ancillary

- 7.23 A condition would be necessary to ensure that the proposed development be used as an annexe only in connection with the main residence. The development does not comply with the residential standards for a separate residence and in the absence of separate off-road parking, the proposal would not be suitable for use as a separate dwelling.

Flood Risk & Drainage

- 7.24 As the site lies in Flood Zone 1, no significant flood risk issues have been identified. As for any development, it is the owners/ developers responsibility to ensure that adequate measures be put in place to ensure that no undue drainage issues occur, and that the development complies with other statutory requirements, including Building Regulations.



Planning Committee Report

Biodiversity

- 7.25 No significant issues have been identified given the nature and condition of the existing garage building.

8. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1 As the proposed extension does not exceed 100sqm gross internal area and whilst forming additional accommodation it is not wholly self-contained therefore it is not CiL liable.

9 PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The principle of residential development on the site is acceptable due to the fact that the proposal site lies within the confines of the village. The proposal is considered to have overcome the concerns raised by the Planning Inspectorate following the refusal of the previous planning application for a similar proposal that included a large balcony area to the first floor rear elevation.
- 9.2 The proposal is considered to accord with aforementioned policies in the Joint Core Strategy and Part 2 Local Plan and the other relevant Chapters in the NPPF, which seek to protect, conserve and enhance heritage assets. The proposal is considered to be in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling/ non-designated heritage asset, would not impact on the character and setting of the asset, and would to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area (a designated heritage asset). There are some public benefits arising from the proposal due to the visual enhancement of the area which is considered to demonstrably outweigh any harm that may be identified.
- 9.3 The proposal would not result in any more impact on neighbour residential amenity and no significant highway issues or other issues have been identified that would justify refusal of the application.

10 RECOMMENDATION

- 10.1 GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS as set out below with delegated authority to the Assistant Director – Planning and Development to approve an amendment to conditions as deemed necessary:

Time limit

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.



Planning Committee Report

Approved plans

2. Except where expressly stated by other conditions on this planning permission, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details shown on the following drawings number:

M90-4 Rev J received by the LPA on 24th October 2023.

Reason: To clarify the terms of this planning permission, to ensure that the development is carried out as permitted interest of visual amenity and to ensure the development would not detract from the character and appearance of the application building, adjoining building and the local street scene.

Materials

3. Prior to any construction above slab level and notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, full details of all materials and finishes to be used in the construction of the approved dwelling, including representative samples (to be provided on site), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before being installed anywhere on the site. All works shall then be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the materials are appropriate to the appearance of the area in which the site lies which is a designated conservation area.

PD rights removal

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development shall be carried out which falls within Classes E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Order without the prior express consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the residential and visual amenity of the area in which the site lies which is a designated conservation area.

Window position

5. The proposed first floor window in the rear elevation in the extension hereby approved shall be obscure glazed below 1.8 metre level from the first floor level and the rooflight windows in the roofslope facing the neighbouring property, Rosebank, shall also be obscure glazed. These windows shall not be glazed or re-glazed other than with obscure glass. (Replacement of the glass with glass of an identical type would not necessitate the Council being notified).

Reason: In the interest of neighbouring residential amenity.

