

3/09/1181/FP

7. **3/09/1181/FP – Construction of two storey extension, single storey conservatory with balconies above including construction of a new slate roof and minor external alterations at Bansang, Queen Hoo Lane, Tewin for J James**
- 

Date of Receipt: 14.08.09

Type: Full – (Other)

Parish: TEWIN

Ward: HERTFORD – RURAL NORTH

### RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:-

1. Three year time limit (1T113)
2. Matching materials (2E133)

#### Summary of Reasons for Decision

The proposal has been considered with regard to the policies of the Development Plan (East of England Plan May 2008, Hertfordshire County Structure Plan, Minerals Local Plan, Waste Local Plan and East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007), and in particular policies GBC1, ENV1, ENV5 and ENV6. The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies that permission should be granted.

\_\_\_\_\_ (118109FP.MC)

#### **1.0 Background**

- 1.1 The application site is shown on the attached OS extract.
- 1.2 The property is a detached dwellinghouse set within considerable grounds on Queen Hoo Lane in Tewin. The site is within the Green Belt, and is bounded by substantial open land to the west. There is extensive woodland throughout the site, with mature trees surrounding the property and effectively screening the site from outside its boundaries.
- 1.3 The property is undergoing an extensive program of extensions and renovation through its “permitted development” rights. The proposed developments would build upon these, creating a larger footprint, adding a pitched roof in place of the property’s presently flat roof, and creating

## **3/09/1181/FP**

balconies on top of the previously agreed and currently proposed conservatory.

- 1.4 The property has been the subject of extensive negotiations over the last year between the Council and the applicant, resulting in the submission of the previous CL applications to determine the property's full "permitted development" rights. These have been agreed, and the developments were being implemented at the time of this officer's site visit on 2<sup>nd</sup> September.

## **2.0 Site History**

2.1 The relevant planning history for the site is as follows:

- 3/08/1654/FP – Pitched roof and single-storey extensions – Refused November 2008
- 3/08/1655/FP – Replacement dwelling – Refused November 2008 – Appeal dismissed September 2009
- 3/08/2145/CL - Erection of single storey extensions to the side and rear elevations and a replacement entrance vestibule – Approved February 2009
- 3/08/2147/CL – Erection of outbuildings – Withdrawn
- 3/09/0698/CL – Erection of a single storey garage and swimming pool building including gym and office – Approved May 2009
- 3/09/0799/CL - Erection of single storey extensions including two storey rear extension and replacement entrance vestibule, external alterations to house – Approved June 2009

## **3.0 Consultation Responses**

3.1 There were no external consultations carried out in this case.

## **4.0 Parish Council Representations**

4.1 Tewin Parish Council has no objections to the proposed developments.

## **5.0 Other Representations**

5.1 The application has been advertised by way of site notice and letters posted to the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

5.2 There have been no responses.

## **6.0 Policy**

6.1 The policies of the adopted East Herts Local Plan that are most relevant to the consideration of this application are as follows:

GBC1	Appropriate Development in the Green Belt
ENV5	Extensions to Dwellings
ENV6	Extensions to Dwellings – Criteria
ENV1	Design and Environmental Quality

## **7.0 Considerations**

7.1 The main considerations in this instance are the impact on the character of the original dwelling, and whether the cumulative impact of extensions totalling approximately 70% of the original floorspace of the dwelling is considered to be acceptable in this Green Belt location.

### **Character of the dwelling**

7.2 The extension of this property has been the subject of extensive negotiations over the last year between the Council and the applicant, resulting in the submission of the previous Certificate of Lawfulness applications to determine the property's full "permitted development" rights. These have been agreed, and the developments implemented. The proposed extensions would in the main be small additions to the property.

7.3 The proposed extensions are as follows:

- The first-floor rear extension (north-west elevation) would be increased in depth by one metre to line up the back building line with the agreed four metre depth of the ground floor extension.
- A bay window would be added to the north-east elevation in addition to the previously agreed entrance vestibule.
- A porch would be added to the rear elevation in addition to the previously agreed extensions.
- A utility room would be added to the south-east elevation.
- Two balconies.

7.4 These additions would each be small alterations to the appearance of

the property, and would not cumulatively result in a material alteration of the character of the property.

- 7.5 In addition to this, the conservatory to the south-west elevation would be increased in depth along the agreed rear extension. This could not be carried out under “permitted development”. This elevation is not visible from outside the site, except when viewed from the west, and faces over the largest stretch of land in the applicant’s ownership. It is not considered that the development would therefore materially affect the character of the property.
- 7.6 A new roof is also proposed over the dwellinghouse. The property presently has a flat roof. The proposed roof would have a dual-pitch with hipped ends. The ridge of the roof would be approximately 2.9m above the existing flat roof.
- 7.7 The addition of a roof would materially alter the character of the property. However, the flat roof of the property is atypical of houses in the immediate and wider area. The proposed pitched roof would have hipped ends, resulting in a relatively modest increase in the mass of the building.
- 7.8 It is considered that the addition of a roof in this form would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the character of the area. Although Bansang is set back from the road, and well screened by the mature trees surrounding it, it shares an access with three other properties and is clearly visible from that access. The addition of the proposed roof would improve the appearance of the property when assessed against the neighbouring properties.

**Whether the cumulative impact of the extensions would be acceptable in the Green Belt**

- 7.9 As noted above, the extensions to the ground and first floor of the property are considered to be relatively modest alterations that would not materially alter the footprint of the property.
- 7.10 However, the property has been significantly enlarged through the use of its “permitted development” rights. In addition, there are two ancillary outbuildings under construction that will occupy a significant area of the site, although these will be single-storey structures, and therefore subservient to the main dwellinghouse.
- 7.11 The “permitted development” extensions to this dwellinghouse represent an approximate 50% increase in the floor area. The proposed extensions would raise this to an approximate 70% increase over the original floor area. Policy GBC1 states that within the Green Belt extensions to

### **3/09/1181/FP**

dwellinghouses will only be acceptable where they would be of limited scale, and would be in accordance with the requirements of policy ENV5. Larger extensions will only be acceptable where very special circumstances can be shown to exist to justify the development.

- 7.12 The extensions as agreed and as proposed would result in a significant improvement to the appearance of the property. The property occupies a sizable plot of land (approx. 1.6 hectares), and therefore although the extensions result in a considerable increase to the size of the property, when set against the percentage of the site that would be occupied by the enlarged dwelling, this would not in officers opinion be material.
- 7.13 A pitched roof would increase the mass of the dwelling, and would result in a small decrease of the openness of the Green Belt. However, it is considered that the effect of adding a pitched roof that would be hipped at both ends is an acceptable proposal in this location.
- 7.14 As previously noted, the addition of a roof to the property would result in an appearance more in keeping with the neighbouring properties. The dwelling is so isolated that the proposed roof would not materially affect the openness of the Green Belt. Although it would have an impact when viewing the Green Belt from within the site, this would not be such that it would materially intrude on the openness of the surrounding area.

### **8.0 Conclusion**

- 8.1 The scale of addition in this case goes beyond what might normally be held to constitute limited extensions within the guidance of Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts. However, significant additions to the original house are possible within its “permitted development” rights and the proposed further extensions and roof would not unduly alter the character of the dwellinghouse or its surroundings, nor unduly intrude on the openness of the Green Belt.
- 8.2 For these reasons it is recommended that planning permission be granted for the proposed extensions and roof.