

**3/10/0323/FP – Two-storey side and rear extensions to North Lodge, Rowney Priory, Rowney Lane, Dane End, Ware, Herts, SG12 0JY for Mr D Lang**

**Date of Receipt:** 24.02.2010

**Type:** Full – Other

**Parish:** LITTLE MUNDEN

**Ward:** MUNDENS & COTTERED

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

1. Time limit (1T121)
2. Matching materials (2E133)
3. Tree survey (4P013)
4. Tree retention and protection (4P053)

**Directives**

1. Other legislation (01OL1)

**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 the saved policies of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007), and in particular policies ENV1, ENV5, ENV6 and GBC3. The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies and national policy guidance in PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development and PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas guidance is that planning permission should be granted.

\_\_\_\_\_ (032310FP.MC)

**1.0 Background**

- 1.1 The application site is shown on the attached OS extract. It comprises the former lodge building associated with the main Priory, and two outbuildings. The site is located within the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt.
- 1.2 The proposal involves a two-storey extension to the southwest corner of the house, and the raising of the ridge height over the north-west corner to allow the creation of a habitable room in the roofspace.

### **3/10/0323/FP**

- 1.3 The house has previously been extended on a number of occasions, resulting in a floor area more than double that of the original building.
- 1.4 An application made in November 2009 for extensions to the house was refused as officers considered that the extent of proposed works was excessive for this site located within the Rural Area.
- 1.5 This application seeks permission for an amended scheme with a reduced scale of extensions in order to overcome the previous reason for refusal.

### **2.0 Site History**

- 2.1 The following applications have previously been submitted on this site:

3/80/0112/FP – Two-storey side extension – Approved May 1980

3/94/1337/FP – Replacement garage – Approved November 1994

3/09/1972/FP – Ground and first-floor front, side and rear extensions, including the replacement of an existing conservatory and the addition of an orangery and porch – Refused January 2010

### **3.0 Consultation Responses**

- 3.1 The County Archaeological Officer comments that the development is unlikely to have any impact on significant deposits, structures or features of archaeological interest
- 3.2 The Landscape Officer comments that the site is covered by an Area Tree Preservation Order. He adds that the proposed foundations would be outside the Root Protection Area of the nearest tree on site as defined in British Standard 5837: Trees in Relation to Construction – Recommendations. In order that this tree be protected, however, he recommends that a condition be imposed on the permission, and also that a tree survey be completed prior to works beginning to ensure that the protected trees on the site are shown accurately in relation to the proposed works.

### **4.0 Parish Council Representations**

- 4.1 Little Munden Parish Council has made no comment on this application

## **5.0 Other Representations**

5.1 The application has been advertised by way of neighbour notification.

5.2 No letters of representation have been received

## **6.0 Policy**

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

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

6.2 In addition, the following National policy guidance is relevant:-

Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

## **7.0 Considerations**

7.1 The main considerations in this case are a) whether the proposed extensions would be acceptable development in the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt, and b) the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding area.

7.2 The property is a detached house located on Rowney Lane. It is an isolated location outside of any of the villages, although it is located at the north end of the Rowney Priory site, which includes a number of buildings including the main Priory. The site lies within the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt, where extensions are expected to be of a scale and size that would either by themselves or cumulatively with other extensions not disproportionately alter the size of the original dwelling nor intrude into openness or rural qualities of the surrounding area.

7.3 The property as existing has a floor area of approximately 260 square metres, including the conservatory. This floor area includes a considerable extension which was constructed following a grant of permission in 1980, and which in turn has been enlarged and renovated considerably in the intervening years. The original application states that the property had a floor area of around ninety-two square metres in 1980, which appears to have been the original floor area. Following the approved extension, the property would have had a floor area of around 150 square metres with a

### **3/10/0323/FP**

substantial area of void roof space. Subsequently, the approved roof void has been refitted to include one bedroom, and a new kitchen has been added to the west elevation of the property.

- 7.4 The proposed extensions would result in an approximate increase of 60 square metres to the existing floor area. The resultant floor area including the existing and proposed extensions would be approximately 320 square metres; a 250% increase in floor space over the original property.
- 7.5 The extensions built since the original permission was granted have diminished the original lodge character of the property. They have been concentrated on the south and west side of the property. In the previously refused application (3/09/1972/FP), the proposed extensions would have enclosed the north elevation. In this revised application, however, the extensions are limited to the west side of the property. Officers consider that they would not have any adverse impact on the original character of the house, which would remain apparent in the north-east corner of the building. They would also not result in a material increase in the footprint of the house as the proposed extension to the southwest would be next to the existing conservatory and would square off the footprint of the house.
- 7.6 The increase in the height of the ridge line over the north-west corner of the house would be approximately 0.6 metres, and the proposed two-storey extension would match this height. This would not materially increase the presence of the building within the Rural Area, nor affect the openness of the surrounding area.
- 7.7 The property has already been significantly extended. However, the proposed alterations to the roof would not materially alter the appearance of the house and are considered to be acceptable. The proposed extension to the southwest corner of the house would be more prominent. However, it would be in keeping with the character of the house. It would not be readily apparent that the extension would be a later addition from those existing on site. The proposed dormer windows would be in keeping with those already in place on the building, and would appear appropriate to its character. The extensions would not, therefore, result in a material alteration of the character of the property beyond that which currently exists.

### **8.0 Conclusion**

- 8.1 The property has been significantly extended in line with a previous permission, and further altered in the intervening period. The remaining original character of the house is concentrated in the north-east corner of the existing building.

### **3/10/0323/FP**

- 8.2 The proposed extensions would be restricted to the west side of the building, and their design and appearance would be in keeping with the existing building. The development would not, in the officers' opinion, have any greater impact on the original character of the building than the presently existing extensions.
- 8.3 The extensions would create additional living space within the building, but would not materially alter its footprint. The openness of the Rural Area would not be materially affected by the proposed extensions.
- 8.4 The scale of additions as a numerical calculation goes beyond what would be accepted as "limited" under Policy GBC3. However, there are material considerations that justify the proposal nonetheless and the specific tests of Policy ENV5 are satisfied. Accordingly it is recommended that planning permission be granted.