

5n 3/12/0620/FP - Rear extension and raised roof for front and rear dormers for first floor rooms at High Hedges, The Street, Haultwick SG11 1JQ for Mr John Doran

Date of Receipt: 11. 04. 2012

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 (1T12)
2. Materials of construction (2E11)
3. Approved plans (2E10) - insert: '1130 E01 and 1130 P01 Rev E'
4. Vehicular use of garage (5U10)

Directives

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, ENV9, TR7) and the National Planning Policy Framework. The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies and the permission granted under ref: 3/11/2006/FP is that permission should be granted.

_____(062012FP.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. Members may recall that planning permission was granted by committee in February this year for extensions and alterations to the property to raise its roof and provide three new bedrooms within the enlarged roof space (ref: 3/11/2006/FP). A copy of the February committee report is attached to this report as Appendix A.
- 1.3 This current application is for a very similar development to that earlier approved scheme – the difference being that the proposal has been amended to enlarge the proposed dormer windows at the front and rear of the property. The number of rooflights is also proposed to increase on each of these elevations from two to three.

2.0 Site History:

- 2.1 The site's planning history can be summarised as follows:
 - 3/59/1120/FP Proposed bungalow - Approved
 - 3/83/1172/FP Erection of chimney stack - Approved
 - 3/11/2006/FP Rear extension and raised roof with front and rear dormers - Approved

3.0 Consultation Responses:

- 3.1 No statutory consultations were required on this application and no representations have been received from any other consultees.

4.0 Parish Council Representations:

- 4.1 At the time of writing this report no comments have been received from Little Munden Parish Council who had objected to the original proposal.

5.0 Other Representations:

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

3/11/2006/FP

5.2 Six letters of objection have been received and these objections can be summarised as follows:

- the original dormer windows and roof approved under planning application 3/11/2006/FP were reduced in size to meet Council guidelines and should not now therefore be increased in size;
- a gable end roofline appears to now be proposed on the southwest elevation whereas this was previously considered unacceptable;
- the size of the proposal continues to raise concerns with local residents.

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
- ENV9 Withdrawal of Domestic Permitted Development Rights

6.2 In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework is of relevance to the determination of this application.

7.0 Considerations:

7.1 The principle of this development was agreed by the Planning Committee under the previous planning application reference 3/11/2006/FP and a copy of the earlier report is, as mentioned above, attached at Appendix A.

7.2 The current scheme proposes a very similar development with the same footprint and height as previously approved. Members are requested to note that, despite the concern raised by some local residents as set out above, there is no change to the proposed roofline within this application. The plan referred to in those letters of objection - showing a gable end on the south western elevation - was submitted in error and has now been substituted with the correct, previously approved plan.

7.3 This proposal envisages only a change to the fenestration at first floor level to increase the size of the proposed dormer windows. These are

now proposed to be wider than those previously approved with three window panes in place of two.

- 7.4 In considering the earlier application, Officers had sought amendments to the original submission to replace a gable end roof on the proposed rear extension with a hipped roof and also to reduce the size of the dormer windows with a view to improving the proportions and overall appearance of the dwelling and the applicant had agreed to this. However, the applicant now wishes to revert back to larger, three pane windows as he considers that this would provide enhanced accommodation in the house and he feels that it would be similar to other development approved nearby. As mentioned above, the current proposals also include an increase in the number of rooflights to the front and rear elevations from two to three.
- 7.6 Members will be aware that amendments are sometimes suggested in order to improve the appearance of developments and it is a matter for applicants to decide whether or not they wish to amend their proposals as a result. In this case, whilst the applicant initially agreed to revise the proposed design as suggested, they have since considered the matter further and now wish to revert back to the originally proposed fenestration. Whilst Officers are of the view that their earlier suggestion is preferable, the determining issue in this application is whether the revised fenestration detail now proposed is so detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and its surroundings that it renders the whole development unacceptable and warrants refusal of the application.
- 7.7 Officers have, therefore, considered the impact of the amendments on both the character and appearance of the building itself and on the surrounding area very carefully. However, having regard to the form and design of the building; its location, and the varied form and design of surrounding development, Officers consider that the revised fenestration details would not detract so significantly from either the building itself or the character and appearance of the surrounding area, such as to warrant a refusal of planning permission.
- 7.8 Officers are satisfied, therefore, that the revised design would accord with Policies ENV1, ENV5 and ENV6 of the Local Plan and that planning permission should be granted accordingly.

8.0 Conclusion:

- 8.1 While it is considered by Officers that the previous fenestration detailing would perhaps sit more comfortably with the proportions and overall

3/11/2006/FP

appearance of the dwelling, this amended proposal would, nevertheless, have an acceptable visual impact on the character of the area and would not result in a discordant or over-dominant feature on the building such that would warrant the refusal of planning permission.

8.2 Similarly, the increase in the number of rooflights from two to three at the front and rear of the dwelling would not detract from the appearance of the dwelling to any significant degree.

8.3 For these reasons, it is considered that the changes to the fenestration of the dwelling would not in themselves be a sufficient reason to warrant refusal of the application. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted.