

5k 3/11/1929/FP - Two storey side extension, front porch and rear conservatory at 1 Grove Cottages, Ginns Road, Stocking Pelham, SG9 0JA for Miss Cornelius

Date of Receipt: 22.11.2011

Type: Full – Other

Parish: STOCKING PELHAM

Ward: LITTLE HADHAM

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. Three year time limit (1T12)
2. Approved plans (SE1; 26-11) (2E10)

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 GBC3, ENV1, ENV5 and ENV6. The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies and the considerations of LPA references 3/07/0437/FP and 3/07/0679/FP is that permission should be granted.

_____ (192911FP.SE)

1.0 Background:

- 1.1 The application site is shown on the attached OS extract. The site is located on Ginns Road to the north-east of the centre of the settlement of Stocking Pelham. The dwelling is semi-detached and, together with the adjoining number 2 Grove Cottages, offers a balanced and uniform frontage to the highway.
- 1.2 To the south-west of the application site is the neighbouring dwelling Longcroft, which is a grade II listed building and located approximately 43 metres to the southwest. The rear of the application dwelling faces an open rural landscape.
- 1.3 The application seeks permission for a two storey side extension to the above dwelling, together with a front porch and a rear conservatory. The two storey side extension incorporates a garage at ground floor and a

3/11/1929/FP

bedroom at first floor. It is proposed to be 3.7 metres in width, 5.7 metres in depth at ground floor and 5 metres in depth at first floor. The eaves height and hipped ridge height are to match those of the original dwelling. This side extension is to be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling by 2.8 metres.

- 1.4 The proposed porch extension is to be 2.3 metres in width and 1.5 metres in depth. It is to be a simple lean-to design with an eaves height of 2.1 metres and a ridge height of 2.9 metres.
- 1.5 The proposed conservatory is to have a width of 4.5 metres, a depth of 3.5 metres, an eaves height of 2.3 metres, and a height of 2.9 metres to the ridge of the hipped roof design. It is to be of a simple glazed form with the flank wall adjoining the adjacent property no 2 being of a solid construction.

2.0 Site History:

- 2.1 In 1955 (3/55/1637/FP) planning permission was granted for a single storey rear extension.
- 2.2 In 1995 (3/95/0528/FP) planning permission was granted for single and two storey extensions.
- 2.3 In 2000 (3/00/0990/FP) planning permission was granted for the change of use of land to the rear of the dwelling from agricultural land to residential.
- 2.4 In 2006 (3/06/2388/FP) a planning application was made for a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. This application was withdrawn by the applicant.
- 2.5 In 2007, planning permission was granted for a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension, together with an extension to the existing dropped kerb (3/07/0437/FP). This permission was not implemented.
- 2.6 A second application in 2007 (3/07/0678/FP) for a second storey rear infill extension was withdrawn by the applicant.
- 2.7 A third application in 2007 (3/07/0679/FP) was granted planning permission for a first floor rear extension over the existing ground floor extension to 1 Grove Cottage, together with a two storey rear extension to 2 Grove Cottage.

3/11/1929/FP

3.0 Consultation Responses:

3.1 No consultation responses have been received.

4.0 Parish Council Representations:

4.1 Stocking Pelham Parish Council have concerns over the excessive footprint increase that the proposed extension would have on the cottage (this cottage has been subject to a number of extensions over the last few years). Also when a similar application for this cottage was submitted in 2006 (3/06/2388/FP) we raised concerns about the removal of onsite parking for the two cars and the potential road safety issues of parking on Ginns Road – this is still the case with this application.

5.0 Other Representations:

5.1 The application has been advertised by way of site notice and 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)

7.0 Considerations:

Principle of development

7.1 The application site is located within the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt, wherein limited extensions and alterations to dwellings will be permitted in accordance with policies GBC3 and ENV5 of the Local Plan. Policy ENV5 states that the extension to a dwelling will be expected to be of a size and scale that would either by itself, or cumulatively with other extensions to the original dwelling, not disproportionately alter the size of the original dwelling nor intrude into the openness or rural qualities of the surrounding area.

3/11/1929/FP

- 7.2 Extensions already undertaken to the dwelling together with the extensions proposed by this application would result in a cumulative increase in the floor space of the dwelling of some 184% above that of the 'original' dwelling (original meaning that standing in 1948). Such an increase cannot be considered as a 'limited' extension to a dwelling in the Rural Area in accordance with policy GBC3 of the Local Plan. It is therefore necessary to consider whether special circumstances exist in this case to warrant a departure from policy.
- 7.3 Other considerations in this case are the previously approved applications to this dwelling, particularly 3/07/0437/FP, which is an approval for a similar scheme of extensions approving a cumulative 128.4% increase in floor area. In approving this 2007 application the Officer considered that the proposed extensions were of a limited size and had been designed to reduce the visual impact and cumulative effect of all the extensions to the dwelling. The side extension of the dwelling had been stepped back from the front of the dwelling to maintain the original appearance of the two cottages and prevent an unbalancing effect on the adjoining neighbour. This approved scheme was never constructed.
- 7.4 The neighbouring dwelling (number 2) has also benefited from similar sized extensions, which has resulted in a cumulative increase in floor area of approximately 141%. The extensions to this neighbouring dwelling have resulted in a two storey extension protruding 4.3 metres from the side wall of the original dwelling, and stepped-in from the front elevation of the dwelling.
- 7.5 It is Officers opinion that both the 2007 approval for the extensions to the application dwelling and the size, scale and siting of the extensions to the adjoining dwelling are material considerations in the determination of this application. Whilst the proposed 184% increase in floor area is considered disproportionate to that of the original dwelling it is noted that the additional accommodation achieved is one extra bedroom above a garage, and a conservatory. Officers consider that the accommodation achieved cannot be considered excessive, given that the size, scale and siting of the proposed extensions are similar to that achieved at the neighbouring dwelling. The proposed resultant dwelling would not intrude into the openness or rural qualities of the surrounding area or result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. For these reasons it is reasonable to consider this proposal as a departure from policy GBC3 of the Local Plan.

Size, scale, siting and design

- 7.6 With regard to the two storey side extension, it is noted that its size, scale, siting and design is similar to that approved and constructed to number 2. Whilst Officers consider that the undisturbed uniform appearance of these two dwellings is of significance, the development of this proposed two storey addition would balance the pair of semi detached dwellings when viewed from the highway.
- 7.7 It has also been noted that this side extension would be within 1 metre of the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling, Longcroft. Policy ENV6(b) of the Local Plan states that side extensions at first floor level should ensure appropriate space is left between the flank wall of the extension and the common curtilage with a neighbouring property (as a general rule a space of 1 metre will be the minimum acceptable), to safeguard the character and appearance of the street scene, existing trees and hedgerows, and to prevent visually damaging “terracing” effects. Although this proposal involves the development of the flank wall within 1 metre of the common boundary with this neighbouring dwelling, the spacing between the two dwellings (43 metres) means that this extension would not be harmful to the rural character of the locality. It is also noted that whilst some of the existing hedgerow bounding the two properties may be affected, Officers do not consider that it would be to such a degree to cause harm to either the character of the locality, or to the amenity of the neighbouring dwelling.
- 7.8 With regard to the proposed porch, whilst Officers consider it unfortunate that the existing canopy would be lost and the development of the porch would create a degree of loss of symmetry between the two dwellings, the simple design and minimal scale of the porch could not be considered inappropriate. Officers are also mindful that a porch of reduced depth could be constructed under ‘permitted development rights’ (Class F, Part 1, Schedule 2) without the need for express planning permission.
- 7.9 With regard to the proposed conservatory, Officers consider this to be of reasonable size and scale, and not an excessive addition to a dwelling of this size. The simple glazed form will not be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling, and the siting to the rear would not encroach into the openness of the surrounding rural area.
- 7.10 For the above reasons Officers consider that this proposal would not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or its setting, and therefore accords with the design considerations of policies ENV1, ENV5 and ENV6 of the Local Plan.

Impact on surrounding amenity

7.11 Officers consider that the size, scale and siting of these proposed extensions would not cause harm to the enjoyment of the neighbouring dwellings by reason of loss of light, overbearing or loss of privacy impacts. The flank wall of the proposed conservatory would be in close proximity to the boundary with number 2. However, Officers consider that this flank wall would be of a reasonable size and scale in relation to that property and would not result in any significant harm to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers. This proposal therefore accords with the amenity considerations of policy ENV1 of the Local Plan.

8.0 Conclusion:

8.1 Officers consider that, although the cumulative increase in the floor area of these proposed extensions, together with previous extensions undertaken to the dwelling, could not be considered as 'limited' extensions as required by policies GBC3 and ENV5, in this case the size, scale, siting and design of the extensions are considered to be appropriate. The proposed resultant dwelling would not intrude into the openness or rural qualities of the surrounding area nor result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore the proposal would not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or its setting.

8.2 It is therefore considered that whilst the proposal does not accord with elements of policies GBC3 and ENV5 of the Local Plan there are special circumstances in this case to allow a departure from policy. It is therefore recommended that permission be granted subject to the conditions set out above.