3/10/0049/FP - Single Storey rear extension and re-positioning of existing conservatory at 41 Heath Drive, Ware SG12 0RF for Mrs. N Compton.

Date of Receipt: 13.01.2010

Type: Full - Other

Parish: WARE

Ward: WARE - Trinity

RECOMMENDATION

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

- 1. Three year time limit (1T12)
- 2. Matching Materials (2E133)

Directives

1. Other legislation

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 ENV1, ENV5 and ENV6. The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies is that permission should be granted.

_____(220210AK.FP)

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The application is being reported to Members because the applicant is a staff member of the District Council.
- 1.2 The application site is shown on the attached OS extract. It comprises a semi-detached dwelling, part brick, part rendered with a tiled pitched roof, and has been extended by a rear conservatory and a two storey side and rear extension. The front garden is mainly hard standing with sufficient space for parking two vehicles.
- 1.3 The application proposes a single storey rear extension, which will project out 4m from the rear elevation of the house and be some 5.5m wide. It would extend approximately 0.7m further out than the existing single storey extension at no 43, which has a common boundary with the application site

<u>3/10/0049/FP</u>

and a 2m high close boarded wooden fence. The proposed rear extension would replace the existing conservatory and patio area. It would have a lean to pitch roof to a height of 3.7m, although height to eaves would be 2.6m. The existing conservatory, measuring 2.7m wide x 2.5m deep would be repositioned at the rear of the two storey extension. The conservatory would have a glazed pitch roof and would be set away from the common boundary with No.39 by 1.2m. This boundary is delineated by a 1.8m high close boarded fence.

2.0 Site History

2.1 The planning history to this site includes application ref: 3/04/0049/FP for a two storey side and rear extension which was granted on 31 March 2004.

3.0 <u>Town Council Representations</u>

3.1 At the time of writing this report, no representations have been received from Ware Town Council.

4.0 Other Representations

4.1 The neighbour at No.43 has requested that he be kept informed of the outcome of the planning application, but makes no specific representations on the proposed development.

5.0 Policy

- 5.1 The relevant Local Plan policies in this application include the following:-
 - ENV1 Design and Environmental Quality
 - ENV5 Extensions to Dwellings
 - ENV6 Extensions to Dwellings Criteria

6.0 <u>Considerations</u>

Principle of Development

- **6.1** The site lies within the main settlement of Ware, wherein planning permission will be granted for extensions to existing dwellings provided that the character, appearance and amenities of the dwelling and any adjoining dwellings would not be significantly affected to their detriment.
- **6.2** Although in this case the existing dwelling benefits from a two storey side and rear extension, the proposed single storey would be located on the site of an existing conservatory and visually absorbed between the single storey

<u>3/10/0049/FP</u>

rear extension at no 43 and the application property's rear two storey extension. It would not therefore detract from the amenities of the neighbouring properties. Similarly the re-positioning of the conservatory would not detract from the amenities of neighbouring properties, due to its set back from the common boundary, its limited size and the intervening 1.8m high wooden fence.

Scale and Design

6.3 The scale and design would be acceptable in terms of projection, width, height and matching materials. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policy ENV6 of the Local Plan.

Neighbour Amenity

6.4 In terms of neighbour amenity, the proposal would not be readily visible from the adjoining neighbouring properties. The extensions would not be visually dominant or overbearing or result in any loss of light or privacy to either adjoining property. Officers therefore consider that the proposal would not detract from the amenities of the adjoining neighbouring properties.

7.0 <u>Conclusion</u>

7.1 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in policy terms and would not adversely affect the amenities of adjoining residents or the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings. The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out above.