

**5h 3/11/0782/FP – Single and two storey side extensions, single storey rear extension and 2no dormer windows to front elevation at 35 Bishops Road, Tewin, Herts, AL6 0NP for Mr and Mrs Barry Roche**

---

**Date of Receipt:** 06.05.2011

**Type:** Full – Other

**Parish:** TEWIN

**Ward:** HERTFORD RURAL NORTH

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

1. Three year time limit (1T121)
2. Approved plans (2E102; MC1, MC2 and 2504-E01 received on the 6<sup>th</sup> May 2011 and 2504-P01 Revision F received on the 7<sup>th</sup> June 2011)
3. Matching materials (2E133)

**Directive:**

1. Other legislation (01OL1)

**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 ENV1, ENV5, ENV6 and GBC1 and Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development and Planning Policy Guidance 2 – Green Belts. The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies is that permission should be granted.

\_\_\_\_\_(078211FP.MC)

**1.0 Background:**

- 1.1 The application site is shown on the attached OS extract.
- 1.2 The existing dwelling is a detached two-storey house located on Bishops Road in Tewin Wood. The area is a post-war low-density residential area of semi-rural character. Properties in Bishop's Road are typically detached, and located on large plots with considerable space to either side boundary. The back gardens of the houses are in part

## **3/11/0782/FP**

commonly given over to woodland.

- 1.3 No. 35 sits on a hill with no. 37 to the north-west being approximately half a storey higher on the road, and no. 33 to the south-east being approximately 1.5 storeys lower. There is an extensive raised terrace to the rear of no. 35, with the rear garden of the house being approximately one metre below this, and which drops away towards the rear site boundary.
- 1.4 The proposal is for a single-storey rear extension, first-floor side extension and a single-storey side extension to create a garage. Two dormer windows would be introduced on the front roof slope, one of which would be a replacement for an existing dormer window.
- 1.5 The application has been referred to the Development Control Committee as it is considered that the proposals would, when taken together with existing extensions to the house, result in a disproportionate enlargement of a property within the Green Belt.

## **2.0 Site History:**

- 2.1 Bishops Road is a post-war estate located within Tewin Wood. The following applications comprise the history of this site:
  - 538-61 – Two-storey house – Approved May 1961.
  - 3/79/0713 – Two-storey side extension – Approved July 1979.
  - 3/87/0109/FP – Front lobby and garage – Approved March 1987.
  - 3/88/0062/FP – Widening of an access and laying of hard standing – No permission required.
  - 3/96/0441/FP – First-floor side extension – Approved May 1996.
  - 3/98/0351/FP – New garage and garage conversion to gym – Refused April 1998.
  - 3/10/1839/FP – Single storey rear and side extensions and front dormer – Refused December 2010.

## **3.0 Consultation Responses:**

- 3.1 County Highways: No objection to the proposed development.
- 3.2 Landscape: No harm would be caused to any significant trees; The

scheme is non-contentious in landscape terms.

**4.0 Parish Council Representations:**

4.1 Tewin Parish Council have objected on the grounds of loss of openness and overdevelopment in the Green Belt.

**5.0 Other Representations:**

5.1 The applications have been advertised by way of neighbour notification.

5.2 The occupants of nos. 37 and 33 neighbour have commented on the proposals. The occupants of no. 37 had concerns regarding the initial proposed development, but these have subsequently been addressed by amended plans.

5.3 The objections of the occupants of no. 33 can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of light; Loss of outlook
- Impact on openness and character of area
- Loss of privacy

**6.0 Policy:**

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

GBC1	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 Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development  
Planning Policy Guidance 2 – Green Belts

**7.0 Considerations:**

7.1 The principle issues are considered to be whether the proposal constitutes appropriate development in the Green Belt; whether it would unduly impact on the openness of the Green Belt or the character of the Bishops Road street scene, and; whether it would have an

unacceptable impact on neighbour amenity.

Green Belt

- 7.2 The proposal would represent in a disproportionate enlargement of this Green Belt property when taken together with the previous extensions to the house. Very special circumstances must therefore be shown to exist that would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt in order to justify the development.
- 7.3 The property has been significantly extended since it was first built approximately fifty years ago. The additions have resulted in an additional 40% (approximately 50.5m<sup>2</sup>) floorspace above that originally built (approximately 131.5m<sup>2</sup>). The proposed additional floorspace would represent approximately a further 46m<sup>2</sup>/35% increase in floor space.
- 7.4 The majority of the floorspace created by the development comprises modest single-storey extensions to the side and rear of the property. The property has already been significantly extended in the past, and the proposals do not materially add to this. They would be located on opposite sides of the property, with limited views from which they could be viewed together.
- 7.5 The first-floor side extension would result in an enlargement of the existing living area within the roof space. This would not materially increase the width of the house, although it would result in the property having a slightly greater presence in the street scene. However, the increase in the roofscape would be relatively slight.
- 7.6 Cumulatively the development represents a 74% increase, a disproportionate increase in the size of the property, taking into account the previous extensions. The proposals are therefore contrary to policy GBC1 of the Local Plan, and guidance in national PPG2. Very special circumstances are therefore necessary to justify the development.

Impact on openness and the Bishops Road street scene

- 7.7 The rear extension would have no material impact on the openness of the Green Belt. It would be visible primarily from the neighbouring property at no. 33, but would be set approximately 1.5m off that boundary. No 33 has a rear conservatory and also a shallower rear extension. Although no. 33 is set substantially lower on the hill than no. 35, the extension would only be about 4m deep, and this is not considered to be so deep that it would have a significant impact on the

openness of the area when viewed from the neighbouring property.

- 7.8 The single-storey side extension has the greater impact on the openness of the area as it would close the gap between the house and the boundary with no. 37. The previous application was refused, in part, because of the harm resulting from a similar proposal. As a result, the side extension has been set back from the front building line of the house by approximately 1.2m. In addition, the ridgeline of the roof to the side extension has also been lowered. The house is set well back from the edge of the road, as well as being substantially lower than the street. It is considered that these amendments successfully address officers' previous concerns about this element of the proposal.
- 7.9 The first-floor side extension relates to the footprint of the building, and would retain a hipped roof to the side. The flank elevation of the wall would be brought approximately 2.8m towards the boundary with no. 37, but would still remain more than 3m from the boundary. The resulting pattern of development is considered to be consistent with that of other properties within the area and the general street scene.
- 7.10 The new dormers would be subordinate to the roof of the house, as well as the central projecting gable roof. The properties on Bishops Road have an individual character, and many properties in the street have front dormer windows.
- 7.11 It is therefore considered that there would be no significant impact on the open nature of this Green Belt location and no adverse impact on the character of the Bishops Road street scene. The proposal would be in accordance with policies ENV1 and ENV6 of the Local Plan, and national guidance in PPG2.

#### Neighbour amenity

- 7.12 The single-storey side garage extension would be set wholly alongside the flank elevation of the house, and would not extend beyond the rear wall of the property. The adjacent property at no. 37 has two small flank windows that would face onto the roof of the garage, as no. 37 is approximately half a storey higher than no. 35. The windows are not primary windows, and therefore the impact on the amenities of the neighbours would not be materially harmed.
- 7.13 The single storey rear extension would be set off the boundary with no. 33 to the south-east by several metres. The only windows to the flank of the extension are proposed to be high-level windows of around 1.7m above the internal floor level, so there would be no material increase in

overlooking from the proposed extension.

- 7.14 No. 33 is approximately one storey lower than no. 35. However, the separation between the two buildings, and the siting of no. 33 to the south-east of the application dwelling, would ensure that there would be no material harm from overshadowing or loss of natural light to the occupiers of no. 33 from that proposed extension.
- 7.15 It is therefore considered that the development would not result in material harm to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV1 (d) of the Local Plan.

## **8.0 Conclusion:**

- 8.1 The proposals represent a disproportionate enlargement of the property when taken together with existing extensions to the house.
- 8.2 However, the development would not result in any significant loss of openness within the Green Belt, nor result in any harm to the character of the Bishops Road street scene being consistent with extensions added to other dwellings in the area.
- 8.3 There would be no material loss of amenities or privacy to neighbouring occupiers as a result of the proposed extensions.
- 8.4 For these reasons it is considered that there are very special circumstances to justify the extensions, contrary to Green Belt policy. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted for the proposed development, subject to the conditions outlined above.