

5g 3/10/1905/FP – Single storey rear extension at 58 Bayford Green, Bayford, Hertford, SG13 8PU for Mr P Bensted.

Date of Receipt: 04.11.2010

Type: Full - Other

Parish: BAYFORD

Ward: HERTFORD – RURAL SOUTH

RECOMMENDATION

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

1. Three Year time limit (1T12)
2. Approved plans (2E10) – 2010/58/1, 2010/58/2, 6009/3, 6009/4
3. Matching materials (2E13)

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 GBC1, ENV1, ENV5 and ENV6. The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies and that the proposed extension would not result in significant harm to the character or appearance of the dwelling itself or the open rural character of the site is that permission should be granted.

_____ (190510FP.LP)

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The application site is located at the end of a narrow lane on the outskirts of Bayford, as shown on the attached OS extract. The site is bounded to the south by the adjoining dwelling; to the east and west by open fields, and to the north by the sports ground. It lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt.
- 1.2 The dwelling forms one of a pair of 2 storey semi detached dwellings and is situated within a parcel of land of approximately 0.17 hectares.
- 1.3 The proposal involves the erection of a 4.7m deep single storey rear extension to the property to provide an additional bedroom.

3/10/1905/FP

2.0 Site History

2.1 The relevant planning history at the site is as follows:-

3/09/1648/FP – Single storey side extension, refused. Appeal dismissed.

3/09/0378/FP – 2 storey side extension, refused

3/98/0045/FP – 2 storey side extensions and single storey rear extension, granted

3.0 Consultation Responses

3.1 Hertfordshire Biological Records Centre have made no comments.

3.2 Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust have made no comments.

3.3 Sport England has responded and stated that they have no comment to make on the proposal.

4.0 Town Council Representations

4.1 Bayford Parish Council have made no comments.

5.0 Other Representations

5.1 The applications have been advertised by way of site notice and neighbour notification. No letters of representation have been received.

6.0 Policy

6.1 The relevant Local Plan policies in this application include the following:-

GBC1 Appropriate Development in the Green Belt

ENV1 Design and Environmental Quality

ENV5 Extensions to Dwellings

ENV6 Extensions to Dwellings - Criteria

6.2 In addition to the above it is considered that Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts is a consideration within this application.

7.0 Considerations

- 7.1 The site lies in a Category 3 village within the Metropolitan Green Belt wherein the normal Green Belt policy restrictions apply. Permission will not be given for inappropriate development unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated that clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness or any other harm. Policy GBC1 advises that extensions to existing dwellings will be inappropriate within the Metropolitan Green Belt unless they can be regarded as limited extensions or alterations to existing dwellings in accordance with Policy ENV5.
- 7.2 Policy ENV5 advises that outside the main settlements and Category 1 and 2 Villages, an extension to a dwelling or the erection of outbuildings will additionally 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 nor intrude into the openness or rural qualities of the surrounding area.
- 7.3 Policy ENV6 advises that proposed extensions should be to a design and choice of materials of construction, either matching or complementary to those of the original building and its setting.
- 7.4 58 Bayford Green has already been extended with a 2 storey side and single storey rear extension. Therefore any further extensions are likely not to be 'limited' in terms of policy GBC1. Indeed the Inspector in dismissing the previous appeal for a single storey side extension of 40 square metres, as well as raising design concerns, did note that the property had already been disproportionately extended. Calculations have been made in respect of this proposed extension, (proposing a rear extension of 16.2 square metres), which will result in an overall increase of 100% over and above the floor space of the original dwelling. As such, the size and scale of the proposal would be considered to disproportionately alter the size of the original dwelling and would therefore not satisfy the requirements of Policies GBC1 and ENV5 which permit only limited extensions.
- 7.5 While the proposed development would not satisfy those policies, it is considered that extensions approved at the adjoining property, No. 56 Bayford Green, should be considered as a material consideration in respect of the determination of the application at no. 58. No. 56 was granted approval for a 2 storey side and single storey rear extension (planning

3/10/1905/FP

reference lpa 3/85/1818/FP) and a later rear single storey extension (planning reference lpa 3/89/1416/FP). These extensions allowed a floor area increase similar in size to the proposals now being considered at No. 58.

- 7.6 Furthermore, the siting of this extension is to the rear requiring the demolition of the lean to and enclosed oil tank enclosure. This extension is of the same depth as that extension to be demolished, albeit 1.2 metres wider. The extension would only increase the footprint of the property by a modest amount and due to its siting would have limited impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.
- 7.7 Therefore, while the development is considered to be inappropriate within the guidelines of PPG2 and Policy GBC1 there are very special circumstances relating to the demolition of an existing rear extension and giving weight to the neighbours extensions which, in this case, justify a departure from Green Belt Policy.
- 7.8 In design terms there are no fundamental objections to the size, scale and design of extension that appears in keeping with the character and appearance of the property. Materials are proposed to match the existing property.
- 7.9 In respect of neighbour amenity, given that the depth is the same as the existing rear extension, designed with a shallow pitched roof, and taking into account the extensions to the neighbouring property, it is not considered that the extension would create an unacceptable impact to their amenity from outlook, loss of light, overlooking or similar.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 In summary, the proposal is considered to be inappropriate development as defined by policies GBC1 and ENV5 of the East Herts Local Plan. However, the particular circumstances of the extensions to the adjoining semi-detached house and nature of the 'replacement' extension is considered to amount to the very special circumstances required in this case to justify a departure from Green Belt policy.
- 8.2 On this basis I have recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions provided at the head of this report.