

5h 3/13/1912/FP – Alterations and extensions to existing dwelling to include raising of roof ridge to create first floor at Appleby, Cradle End, Little Hadham, SG11 2EF for Mr Hoodless

Date of Receipt: 29.10.2013

Type: Full - Other

Parish: LITTLE HADHAM

Ward: LITTLE HADHAM

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. Three Year Time Limit (1T121)
2. Approved plans (2E103) - S2820/01; S2820/11A
3. Materials of construction (2E11)

Directives:

1. Other legislation (01OL1)

Summary of Reasons for Decision:

East Herts Council has considered the applicant's proposal in a positive and proactive manner with regard to the policies of the Development Plan (Minerals Local Plan, Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD 2012 and the 'saved' policies of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007); the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2012 (as amended). The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies and the limited harm to rural qualities of the surrounding area is that permission should be granted.

_____(191213FP.MP)

1.0 Background:

- 1.1 The application site is shown on the attached OS extract. The existing property is set in a rural location and comprises a modest detached bungalow which fronts onto the main road running through the small settlement of Cradle End. There is a large boundary hedge to the front of the dwelling which runs around the east and south east of the site. The property benefits from a fairly large rear garden which is of an

3/13/1912/FP

irregular shape. There is a vehicular access to the south of the dwelling which crosses over a small ditch to an area of hardstanding and a detached double garage.

- 1.2 The proposed extensions include the provision of an extension to the side of the dwelling and extensions to the roof involving an increase in the ridge height of the dwelling to provide living space at first floor with dormer windows to the front and rear roof slopes.

2.0 Site History:

- 2.1 Planning permission was granted for side extensions under LPA reference 3/362-78.
- 2.2 Planning permission was later granted for a detached garage and internal alterations under LPA reference 3/86/1106/FP.
- 2.3 The latest planning history relates to LPA reference 3/13/1912/FP which proposed alterations and extensions to the existing building to include raising of roof ridge and first floor. The application was however withdrawn.

3.0 Consultation Responses:

- 3.1 No consultation responses have been received.

4.0 Parish Council Representations:

- 4.1 Little Hadham Parish Council has not commented on the application.

5.0 Other Representations:

- 5.1 The application has been advertised by way of site notice and neighbour notification.
- 5.2 Seven letters of representations have been received in objection to the application. Concern is raised in respect of the increase in the size of the dwelling and conflict with policy GBC3 and ENV5 of the Local Plan; the increase in height of the building and the design of the proposal which would be out of keeping with the rural setting; and the impact on neighbour amenity.

6.0 Policy:

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

following:

GBC3	Appropriate Development in the Rural Area
ENV1	Design and Environmental Quality
ENV5	Extensions to Dwellings
ENV6	Extensions to Dwellings – Criteria
TR7	Car Parking – Accessibility Contributions

6.2 The National Planning Policy Framework is also a material consideration in this case.

7.0 Considerations:

7.1 The main planning considerations in this application relate to the principle of development and the impact of the extensions on the character and appearance of the dwelling and rural setting and neighbour amenity.

Principle of development

7.2 As the site lies within the Rural Area, the principle of development is assessed under policy GBC3 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007. Under part (c) of this policy, consideration is given as to whether this proposed extension can be considered as “limited” and whether it accords with the criteria of policy ENV5. The principle objective of this policy is to limit the impact an extension may have on the character and appearance of an existing dwelling, both in itself and in relation to any adjoining dwelling and on the appearance of the locality. Whilst the principle of extending a dwelling is generally acceptable, the main concern lies with the effect of extensions on the general maintenance of a supply of smaller dwellings outside of the main towns and settlements, and also with the cumulative impact of development in the countryside.

7.3 From the planning history of the site it is understood that the original property had a floor area of around 73 square metres. The dwelling has previously been extended to the side and also features a store and garden room. Those previous extensions combined with those now proposed in this application will increase the size of the dwelling to around 122square metres, which increases to 174 square metres when the first floor space forming master bedroom, en-suite and study are taken into account. In Officers opinion, the floor area increase in the size of the dwelling exceeds what may reasonably be considered as a limited extension as required in policy GBC3 of the Local Plan.

3/13/1912/FP

7.4 Whilst third parties object to the application on these grounds, it is the visual impact of the floor area increase that is material in the determination of this application, which is discussed below:

Impact on surrounding area/amenity

7.5 Officers have carefully considered the submissions made in the supporting Planning Statement and reviewed the concerns raised by third parties.

7.6 The existing dwelling is modest in terms of its height and the existing landscape features to the front of the site obscure views of the dwelling from the street. Whilst the property does have a good sized garden to the side which may allow for more development on the site, the corner location of the site with the road running to the east and south east makes the site sensitive to development which increases the importance of ensuring that the scheme is compatible with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

7.7 Other dwellings within the immediate locality are of varying heights, scales and forms – although there is generally a traditional character to dwellings in their form and materials of construction. Having regard to the mixed height of dwellings in the surroundings, Officers do consider that the principle of increasing the height of the dwelling is acceptable. The proposed roof extensions have evolved from the application withdrawn under LPA reference 3/13/1288/FP (which proposed a greater increase in the height of the roof) and the increase in the roof ridge height is from around 5metres existing to 6.5metres (an increase in height of 1.5metres). The overall proportions of the proposed development, however, retain a building of limited height which is in keeping with the mixed architectural style and height of other dwellings in the street.

7.8 The dormer windows proposed to the roof are modest and do not dominate the roof slope in accordance with policy ENV6 of the Local Plan. The extension projects to the side (south facing) following the ridge and pitch of the roof with additional, albeit subordinate, gable projections to the east, south and west elevations of the building. Those gable projections, particularly on the east and south elevation do add some mass to the building. However, such features are not uncharacteristic within the surroundings and do, in Officers opinion, add a greater level of interest to the building.

7.9 Some criticism from third parties has raised concern with the provision of boarding to the external elevations. Whilst boarding is not a prevalent

3/13/1912/FP

building material in the immediate surroundings, it does exist locally and the overall design of the proposed extensions and alterations to the dwelling are, in Officers opinion, in keeping with the rural setting.

- 7.10 Having regard to the above considerations and, taking into account the set back nature of the development with the road and the location of a boundary hedge to the front of the site, Officers do not consider that the proposed development will result in significant harm to the character or appearance of the dwelling, street scene or surrounding area in accordance therefore with policies ENV1, ENV5 or ENV6 of the Local Plan.

Neighbour amenity considerations

- 7.11 Officers note the concerns raised by third parties but consider that the main consideration relates to the impact on the nearest neighbour, Meadowsweet. All other neighbours are an appropriate distance (20 metres as a minimum) such that there will be no significant impact that would warrant the refusal of planning permission.
- 7.12 Turning to the impact on Meadowsweet, Officers note the objections raised by this neighbour in terms of an overbearing and loss of light impact to habitable rooms (which includes a bedroom which has a window at ground floor facing onto the application site) and the rear garden area which includes decking.
- 7.13 The proposed increase in the height of the dwelling to 6.5metres is such that Officers acknowledge that there may be some loss of light to the rear garden and window on the south elevation of Meadowsweet which fronts the application site. However, having regard to the size increase in the height of the dwelling as proposed, combined with the distance/relationship between the proposed extension and the boundary with Meadowsweet (between 4-5 metres) the degree of impact is not to such an extent as to warrant the refusal of planning permission. With regards to the impact on the window serving the room on the south elevation of Meadowsweet, Officers understand that there are patio doors on the west elevation of Meadowsweet serving the same room. In such circumstances, the degree of impact on that part of Meadowsweet is considered to be such that there will be no significant impact that would warrant the refusal of planning permission.
- 7.14 An objection is also received from Meadowsweet in respect of overlooking from the proposed rear dormer windows onto the rear garden of the neighbour. However, given the angle/relationship between the proposed dormer and the neighbour, in combination with the

3/13/1912/FP

outbuilding to the rear of Meadowsweet, Officers do not consider that there will be a significant overlooking impact.

8.0 Conclusion:

- 8.1 Officers consider that the amount of development proposed cannot be considered as 'limited', and is therefore contrary to policy GBC3 of the Local Plan. However, as the proposed extensions are considered to be appropriately designed, and will not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the open rural setting or neighbour amenity, it is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted.