

3/10/0324/FP – Extensions to garage to provide workshop and greenhouse with storage under at 3 Downfield Cottages, Poles Lane, Thundridge, Herts, SG12 0SG for Mr Shearman

Date of Receipt: 23.02.2010

Type: Full – Other

Parish: THUNDRIDGE

Ward: THUNDRIDGE AND STANDON

RECOMMENDATION

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

1. Three year time limit (1T121)

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 East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007), and in particular saved policies GBC1, ENV1 and ENV5. The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies and that the proposed development would not result in a significant harmful impact on the openness or rural character and appearance of the locality, is that permission should be granted.

_____ (032410FP.MP)

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The application site is shown on the attached OS extract. The site is located to the southwest of the village of Thundridge in close proximity to Hanbury Manor. It consists of a fairly significant residential plot with the existing dwelling set into the site which slopes gently to the north west. To the far north west of the plot there are open views of the landscape and the golf course. The property currently benefits from extensions and outbuildings sited to the front of the dwellinghouse.
- 1.2 The proposal being considered within this application is the provision of extensions to one of the existing outbuildings comprising of a workshop set to the rear of the existing double garage and a greenhouse set alongside the garage albeit at a higher level with storage under.

3/10/0324/FP

2.0 Site History

2.1 The following provides an overview of the relevant planning history to the site:-

- 3/86/1606/FP Double garage conservatory and extension (approved with conditions)
- 3/00/1418/FP Conservatory (approved with conditions)
- 3/02/0049/FP Single storey side extension and front porch (approved with conditions)

3.0 Consultation Responses

3.1 The Environment Agency comments that the proposal represents a low environmental risk.

4.0 Parish Council Representations

4.1 Thundridge Parish Council have raised no objections to the proposed development

5.0 Other Representations

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

6.0 Policy

6.1 The relevant 'saved' policies from the East Herts Local Plan April 2007 in this case are:-

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

7.0 Considerations

7.1 The main planning considerations of this planning application relate to the following considerations:-

3/10/0324/FP

- Principle of development
- Impact on character and appearance of locality
- Impact on neighbour amenity

7.2 The site is located within the Green Belt wherein there is a presumption against inappropriate development. Policy GBC1 does however allow for limited extensions to existing dwellings in accordance with policy ENV5. Policy ENV5 outlines that within the Green Belt, extensions to dwellings and additional outbuildings will be expected to be of a size and scale that would, either by itself or cumulatively with other extensions, not disproportionately alter the size of the dwelling nor intrude into the openness of rural qualities of the surrounding area.

7.3 The first issue to consider is whether the proposed outbuildings represent a limited extension, as required in Green Belt Policy. The original dwelling provided a footprint of some 56.3 square meters. The existing extensions and outbuildings which have previously been granted planning permission (as outlined within paragraph 2.1 above) in combination with those outbuildings proposed in this application amount to a cumulative footprint of 135.8 square metres. The proposal would therefore result in an increase of 241% from the original size of the dwelling. Such a size increase in the property does not; in Officers opinion represent a limited extension. In this respect the proposal is considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt, and it is for this reason that the application has been referred to the committee.

7.4 However, whilst the proposed development represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt as outlined above, Officers consider that it is necessary to identify any harm associated with the proposal.

Impact on openness and rural character of Green Belt

7.5 The proposed workshop element of the proposal is set behind the existing garage building set within the existing land levels. In this respect, views of the workshop building will be almost totally obscured by the garage. Therefore in terms of the impact on the openness and rural character of the site, Officers do not consider that this element of the proposal will result in a significantly detrimental impact that would warrant the refusal of the application.

7.6 The more significant element of the proposal in visual amenity terms is the proposed greenhouse and storage area. The existing double garage building has a gabled roof and the proposed greenhouse is to be sited immediately adjacent to the garage at an elevated position with a storage

space below. The juxtaposition of the greenhouse with the existing garage building offers an unusual elevation particularly in terms of the differing forms of buildings and roof forms. However, the impact of such a relationship is, in Officers opinion, limited. From the approach to the dwelling from the south east along the driveway there will be isolated views of the greenhouse. The greenhouse will, in Officers opinion be perceived in conjunction with the roof of the garage. The relationship from this perspective is considered to be acceptable. From the west, there will be views of the frontage of the garage and greenhouse which, as identified above, creates a somewhat odd aspect. However, the harm on the openness and character of the locality from the west is limited and is not considered to be to such an extent as to warrant the refusal of the application.

- 7.7 The visual harm of the proposed extensions to the outbuildings combined with the existing outbuildings will not, in Officers opinion, lead to a significant harmful impact on the openness or rural character and appearance of the locality.

Impact on neighbour amenity

- 7.8 The proposed development is in close proximity to the boundary with the neighbouring property. However, the proposal is set at a lower level to the boundary and is at a distance of 15 meters from the neighbouring property. As such, it is considered that the proposal will not result in a significant impact on the amenity of that property that would warrant the refusal of the application.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed effect of the development combined with existing extensions and outbuildings is such that it cannot be considered as a 'limited' extension, and therefore represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt. However, the harm to the openness and rural character of the Green Belt is not considered to be to such an extent as to warrant the refusal of the application. Officers therefore recommend that planning permission is granted.