

5k 3/11/2006/FP - Rear Extension and Raised Roof with Front and Rear Dormers at High Hedges, The Street, Haultwick SG11 1JQ for Mr John Doran

Date of Receipt: 18.11.2011

Type: Full - Other

Parish: LITTLE MUNDEN

Ward: MUNDENS AND COTTERED

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. Three year time limit (IT12)
2. Materials of construction(2E11)
3. Approved plans – 1130 P01B; 1130 E01 (2E10)
4. Vehicular use of garage (5U10)

Directive:

1. This permission does not convey any consent which may be required under any legislation other than the Town and Country Planning Acts. Any permission required under the Building Regulations or under any other Act, must be obtained from the relevant authority or body e.g. Fire Officer, Health and Safety Executive, Environment Agency (Water Interest) etc. Neither does this permission negate or override any private covenants which may affect the land.

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, ENV6 and Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development. The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies is that permission should be granted.

_____(200611FP.JS)

3/11/2006/FP

1.0 Background:

- 1.1 The application site is shown on the attached OS extract. It comprises a detached single storey dwelling in Haultwick within the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt.
- 1.2 The dwelling was constructed in the 1960s and is in its original condition save for the addition of a garden room at the rear.
- 1.3 The proposal is to raise the roof pitch and incorporate a new upper floor with three bedrooms within the enlarged roof space.
- 1.4 Dwellings within the vicinity of the site include 'Welgelegen', a single storey property which lies on its southern side to the rear and 2 Farm Cottages which is next door on its north western side, and is one of a pair of two storey, semi-detached cottages.

2.0 Site History:

- 2.1 The site history is as follows:

3/59/1120/FP Proposed bungalow - Approved

3/83/1172/FP Erection of chimney stack - Approved

- 2.2 During the course of its history a garden room has been added to the building, which is to be removed under the current proposals.

3.0 Consultation Responses:

- 3.1 Five letters of objection have been received. Objections relate to:
 - the increase in size of the new dwelling, perceived as twice the size of the existing building.
 - overshadowing and loss of privacy in respect of no. 2 Farm Cottages.
 - insufficient parking available.
 - the creation of a precedent in respect of other single storey dwellings in Haultwick.
 - the proposals are out of keeping with the existing dwelling, and
 - the proposed development is not suitable for the size of plot.

4.0 Parish Council Representations:

- 4.1 Little Munden Parish Council consider that the perceived increase in floor area by over 100% is disproportionate to the size of the plot, taking into

3/11/2006/FP

account the proximity of the development to the highway and its relatively urban appearance in a rural area.

5.0 Other Representations:

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

5.2 No other 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 Guidance 1, Delivering Sustainable Development

7.0 Considerations:

Principle of development

7.1 Under Policy GBC3 – Appropriate Development in the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt – limited extensions to existing dwellings will be permitted in accordance with Policy ENV5. Policy ENV5 advises that outside the main settlements and Category 1 and 2 Villages, an extension to a dwelling will be expected to be of a scale and size that would, either by itself, or cumulatively with other extensions, not disproportionately alter the size of the original dwelling or intrude into the openness or rural qualities of the surrounding area. Policy ENV6 sets out certain criteria in respect of design and materials of construction which should be matching or complementary to those of the original building and its setting.

7.2 In the case of the application site, there are no previous extensions to be taken into account. The garden room, which has been added, will be removed under the current proposals.

7.3 The proposal to build a 1.5 storey rear extension, raise the height and

pitch of the roof to incorporate an upper floor and add front and rear dormers will increase the main ridge height of the dwelling from 4.2 metres to 7.1 metres. The flat roofed garage at 2.5 metres high will be given a pitched roof which will rise to 5.0 metres to its apex. The roof of the rear arm of the dwelling will be given a steeper pitch, rising in height from 3.9 metres to 5.1 metres at ridge height.

- 7.4 As a result of the roof extensions it is calculated that the living area will increase from 147.0 square metres to 270.7 square metres, an increase of over 80%. In principle such an increase is beyond what would normally be acceptable, and it is for this reason that the application has been referred to the Committee.

Design

- 7.5 The character of the existing dwelling does not have any distinctive features which would justify their retention in any redevelopment of the dwelling. The proposed design will provide a steep pitched roof which, while noticeably higher than existing, will allow for the addition of dormer windows reflecting the roof pitch of the new garage roof and the front porch, and providing a coherent design as a whole which is considered to enhance the character and appearance of the property. The applicants, at the officer's request, have modified the size and width of the dormers, which is considered to improve their proportions and the overall appearance.

Impact on Surrounding Area

- 7.6 It has been considered by officers in this case that the existing building does not enhance the character of the street scene in visual terms. It is not in itself rural in appearance and has no features which enhance the character and appearance of the village as a whole. Any alteration to the building which could improve the appearance of the dwelling is likely to include a first floor addition such as the design which is now proposed.
- 7.7 The village has a variety of dwelling types along its main street, both single and two storey. In purely visual terms, it is difficult to argue that a higher dwelling of 1.5 storeys would be out of place. The objection that, were this proposal to be approved, it would set a precedent for other single storey dwellings to be similarly extended, can be given only limited weight since each planning proposal is considered on its own individual merit.

Impact on Neighbour Amenity

- 7.8 Full consideration has been given to the likely impact of the proposals on the residents of no. 2 Farm Cottages which lies to the north west of the application site.
- 7.9 It is noted that the design of the proposed dwelling includes a long steeply hipped roof on its north western elevation. This roofline lies adjacent to the side elevation of no. 2 where there is a garage at ground floor level and a bathroom at first floor level. As such it is not considered that this roofline will have any adverse impact on the amenities of the residents at no. 2.
- 7.10 Attention has also been drawn to the fact that the rear arm of the dwelling at High Hedges runs along the side boundary of no. 2. The height of the rear roof has hitherto not given rise to any concern in terms of loss of light but the residents are concerned that the raising of the roof along the boundary will reduce the light enjoyed in the rear garden. Officers consider that, while some morning sunlight may be lost to the garden area, in planning terms little weight can be given to this limited loss of amenity. It is not considered that the resulting building will overshadow this neighbour.
- 7.11 The residents also consider that a rooflight serving the stairwell adjacent to no. 2 will lead to a loss of privacy. Officers are unable to give significant weight to this concern since the provision of a rooflight rarely leads to loss of privacy, particularly when it serves a stairwell and not living accommodation. The rear dormer windows are also considered not to invade the privacy of neighbours. Rear windows are a typical feature of most properties and the circumstances of this case do not appear to be exceptional.

Miscellaneous

- 7.12 The issue of parking provision has also been raised in respect of the application site. The garage, together with the space available at the front of the site will provide parking for at least three cars which is considered adequate in respect of the Council's SPD on parking provision. Nevertheless, it is considered appropriate that any permission granted should include a condition that the garage should be retained for vehicular use and not for additional living accommodation.

8.0 Conclusion:

- 8.1 To conclude, the extensions proposed go beyond what would be considered 'limited' extensions in accordance with Policies GBC3 and

3/11/2006/FP

ENV5.

- 8.2 However, having investigated the issues raised it is considered that, while the floor area of the living accommodation will be increased to a significant extent, the proposals will not cause undue loss of amenity to neighbouring residents. Furthermore, the reduced size of the roof dormers and the use of good roofing materials on a steeper pitched roof will improve the character and appearance of the dwelling as a whole.
- 8.3 For these reasons it is considered that planning permission should be granted in this case.