

**3/09/0659/FP – One and a half storey front extension including 2 dormer windows and two storey rear extension at Wickham Hill Farm Nursery, Wickham Hill, Braughing for Mrs Hudson-Clements**

---

**Date of Receipt:** 11.05.2009

**Type:** Full

**Parish:** BRAUGHING, STANDON

**Ward:** BRAUGHING, PUCKERIDGE

**Reason for report:** Requested by Councillor Ashley

**RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission be **REFUSED** for the reason:-

1. The proposed extensions by reason of their size, scale, form and design would appear disproportionate, out of keeping with, and detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy policies ENV1 and ENV5 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_ (065909FP.MP)

**1.0 Background**

- 1.1 The application site is shown on the attached OS extract. The property is sited just off Station Road (B1368) which links Puckeridge with Standon. The site is well screened from the road by mature foliage. There are however views of the site from the open rural landscape to the west.
- 1.2 The existing property is of a chalet bungalow design with a single 'cat slide' dormer to the front elevation. At the time of Officers site visit the building was generally in a poor state of repair and the site in general appeared un-kept. There is also a detached garage within the plot which is of a significant size with a flat roof.
- 1.3 The proposals seek the retention of the existing building with extensions to the front and rear. To the front, the proposed extensions include two traditionally designed dormers with pitched roofs and a gable element with extensive glazing on the frontage with the eaves height 1000mm above the eaves line of the original dwelling. To the rear a 3.7 metre projection at ground floor is proposed across the full width of the rear elevation. At first floor the projection is 4.0 metres, creating a slight overhang. Three gables are proposed also on this elevation with the roofs hipped. The overall design and external detailing of the dwelling is proposed to be altered, with the introduction of timber latticing, creating a mock Tudor design.

### **3/09/0659/FP**

- 1.4 The site lies within the Rural Area as defined in the Local Plan and also within a site identified as a Scheduled Ancient Monument (the site of a Roman Town near to the former Railway Station).

### **2.0 Site History**

- 2.1 The following applications are considered to be relevant to the considerations of this application:-

3/07/1935/CL: Erection of detached double garage and covered swimming pool/games room with hardstanding, all incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse (Approved).

3/07/2319/OP: Replacement dwelling (Refused).

3/07/2320/FP: Erection of single storey front and side extensions (Approved with conditions).

### **3.0 Consultation Responses**

- 3.1 English Heritage comment that Scheduled Monument Consent has been granted in respect of the development and no objections are therefore raised.

### **4.0 Parish Council Representations**

- 4.1 Braughing Parish Council understand that the application site is within the Parish of Standon and Puckeridge, no comments have therefore been made.
- 4.2 Standon Parish Council raise no objections to the proposal.

### **5.0 Other Representations**

- 5.1 The applications have been advertised by way of press notice, site notice and neighbour notification.
- 5.2 No letters of representation have been received.

## **6.0 Policy**

6.1 The relevant Local Plan policies in this application include the following:-

GBC2	The Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt.
GBC3	Appropriate Development in the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt.
ENV1	Design and Environmental Quality.
ENV5	Extensions to Dwellings.
ENV6	Extensions to dwellings – Criteria.
BH1	Archaeology and New Development.
BH3	Archaeology Conditions and Agreements.

## **7.0 Considerations**

- 7.1 The property is sited within the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt wherein there is a presumption against inappropriate development. Policy GBC3 allows some exceptions to this, of which 'limited extensions', is one such exception. The starting point of planning considerations for this application must therefore revolve around an analysis of the size and scale of the existing building compared with that proposed.
- 7.2 The property currently has no existing extensions implemented; accordingly, the proposal represents an increase in the floor area of the property by approximately 100 square metres, which is approximately commensurate to a 55% floor area increase. Whilst mindful that this is a significantly sized extension, this is considered to be the very upper limit of what may represent a 'limited' extension in terms of policy.
- 7.3 Notwithstanding the acceptability of the proposal in terms of Policy GBC3 in terms of 'limited extensions', the principal planning considerations should relate to how the proposals impact on the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and its rural locality.
- 7.4 The proposed front extension involves the addition of a large gable element and dormer windows. The proposed dormers are of a limited size and scale which do not dominate the roof slope and would appear to be of a modest and limited form. Criteria ENV6 e) of the Local Plan requires that dormers should be of a limited extent and modest proportions so as not to dominate the roof slope. Officers are of the opinion that this element of the scheme would satisfy that policy.

### 3/09/0659/FP

- 7.5 With regards to the front gable element, it is pertinent to note the previous decision within LPA reference 3/07/2320/FP. That permission granted consent for a front gable, albeit with the eaves line flush with the existing roof eaves line. That gable was considered to be of an appropriate size, scale and design to the character and appearance of the dwelling. However, the gable proposed within this application is significantly different, in terms of its height and associated massing. Officers are concerned with the height of the eaves of the gable element proposed within this application. The height of the eaves line would, in Officers view, lead to a bulky, top heavy gable on the front elevation which would appear out of keeping with, and detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse.
- 7.6 With regards to the rear extensions, these elements are, in Officers opinion the more significant element of the scheme. The existing form of the property is that of a modest property, simple in terms of its design and not competing or visually obtrusive within its rural setting. The overhanging nature of the first floor element and the depth of the extension gives the impression of a property with a significant depth. The degree of projection of this element combined with the gable to the frontage of the property (an overall increase in depth of 5.8 metres) creates a side elevation which would appear bulky and out of proportion with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, which is lacking in any significant vertical emphasis to break up the massing and bulk of the rear projection (the rear extensions are not set away from the existing flank elevations). From the rear elevation, Officers are concerned with how the gable elements and rear projections would fit within the façade. In Officers opinion the hipped gable elements are lacking in subservience and would appear overtly bulky and thereby out of keeping with and detrimental to the character and appearance of the property.
- 7.7 Having regard to the above considerations Officers consider that the proposed extensions would not be proportionate to the existing character and appearance of the property, they would impact detrimentally on it. This degree of impact is not considered to be sympathetic to the rural and open character of the site.
- 7.8 With regards to neighbour amenity, having regard to the siting of the property in relation to the neighbouring, there will not, in Officers opinion be a significant or harmful impact on neighbour amenity.
- 7.9 In terms of the Scheduled Ancient Monument, having regard to the advice outlined by English Heritage, it is considered that the proposed development would not impact on this area.

**8.0 Conclusion**

- 8.1 Notwithstanding the acceptability of the scheme in terms of neighbour amenity and the Scheduled Ancient Monument, Officers are concerned with the size, scale, form and design of the extensions and the impact that these elements have on the character and appearance of the property. For the reasons outlined above, it is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused.