

3/11/1320/FP – Two storey rear extension, single story side/rear extension incorporating a garage, extended rear patio and retaining wall at 35 High Road, Waterford, SG14 2PR for Mr and Mrs Stocker.

Date of Receipt: 25.07.2011

Type: Full – Other

Parish: STAPLEFORD

Ward: HERTFORD – RURAL NORTH

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. Three year time limit (1T12)
2. Approved plans (2E10) - 6041.11.02 B, 6041.11.03, 6041.11.04)
3. Materials as on plan (2E42)

Directive:

1. Other legislation (01OL)

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 SD2, GBC1, ENV1, ENV5, ENV6, OSV3, and PPS1 and PPG2. The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies, and the impact of the development in this case, is that permission should be granted.

_____ (132011FP.HI)

1.0 Background:

- 1.1 The application site is shown on the attached OS extract. It comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling located in the village of Waterford, a Category 3 village. The surrounding area is characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying sizes and design.
- 1.2 This application proposes a two storey side extension and single storey side and rear extensions, along with an extension to the rear patio and retaining walls. The application is being referred to Members as the site

3/11/1320/FP

lies within the Green Belt and Officers consider the proposal to conflict with the strict interpretation of policies GBC1 and ENV5 in terms of the size of the proposed extensions.

2.0 Site History:

2.1 There is no relevant history for this site.

3.0 Consultation Responses:

3.1 At the time of writing this report, no response has been received from the Landscape Officer or Veolia Water.

4.0 Parish Council Representations:

4.1 At the time of writing this report, no response has been received from Stapleford Parish Council.

5.0 Other Representations:

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

5.2 1 letter has been received from a neighbour confirming they have no objections, and the proposal appears to be in-keeping with the house and the extensions locally (including neighbouring extensions).

6.0 Policy:

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

SD2	Settlement Hierarchy
GBC1	Appropriate Development in the Green Belt
ENV1	Design and Environmental Quality
ENV5	Extensions to Dwellings
ENV6	Extensions to Dwellings - Criteria
OSV3	Category 3 Villages

6.2 In addition to the above it is considered that Planning Policy Statement 1, 'Delivering Sustainable Development', and Planning Policy Guidance 2 'Green Belts' are considerations in determining this application.

7.0 Considerations:

- 7.1 The site lies within the Green Belt in a Category 3 village wherein only limited extensions are permitted to dwellings that do not cumulatively with earlier extensions disproportionately alter the size of the original dwelling.
- 7.2 The dwelling has already been extended by way of a single storey rear extension and conservatory; however both are proposed to be demolished and replaced as part of this proposal.
- 7.3 The application proposes approximately 43.2m² of additional floorspace, with the total cumulative floorspace amounting to some 75% over and above the size of the original dwelling. This is considered to be more than limited, and disproportionate to the size of the original dwelling in conflict with policies GBC1 and ENV5; hence the application has been referred to Members for a decision.
- 7.4 When looking at the impact of the proposal on the character of the dwelling and surrounding area, it is not considered that the proposed extensions are excessive in scale. The single storey rear extension is proposed across the full width of the dwelling, and approximately 4.2m out to the side of the dwelling. The first floor projection will measure 6m in width and 3.3m in depth and comprises a rear gable. It is material to note that a two storey extension of 3m depth in this location would amount to permitted development and not require planning permission.
- 7.5 Although large, the two storey extension would respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and would not be readily visible from the surrounding area. There will be some impact on openness at the rear of the dwelling; however Officers do not consider this to be harmful.
- 7.6 The single storey side extension is sympathetic in its scale, style and design and will respect the character of the dwelling and street scene. It will be set back some 1.7m from the front elevation and have a truncated pitched roof to a height of 4m. Again, it is material to note that a single storey side extension of up to 4m in height could be constructed here under permitted development rights.
- 7.7 It is also material to note that there are a number of other large two storey rear extensions to neighbouring properties, including Nos. 37 and 39. The scale of development proposed in this case is therefore not considered to be out of keeping with neighbouring properties, and the letter of support from a neighbour is noted.

3/11/1320/FP

- 7.8 Overall, it is your Officers' opinion that although the proposal conflicts with the strict interpretation of policies GBC1 and ENV5, the resulting scale of the extensions will not be harmful to the Green Belt or character and appearance of the surrounding area. It is therefore considered that there are very special circumstances to allow this development contrary to adopted planning policy.
- 7.9 The design of the extensions is considered to be acceptable with gable roofs complementing the existing dwelling. Although the rear gable will match the main ridge height, this will not appear out of character. The roof of the single storey side extension has been amended during the course of the application to appear more sympathetic. Finally, the extension is proposed to be formed of matching materials, and the fenestration details are also considered to be acceptable.
- 7.10 Officers do not consider that any harm would arise to neighbour amenity as a result of this development due to the retention of an appropriate distance between the two storey projection and neighbouring boundaries. Further, although a side window is proposed, this will not result in any harmful overlooking. The window is shown on the plans as obscure glazed but it is not considered reasonable or necessary to require this by condition.
- 7.11 The application also includes works to extend the existing rear patio and retaining walls. This will have no impact on the character of the dwelling, surrounding area or neighbour amenity.
- 7.12 There are no trees to be affected by this proposal and no additional landscaping is considered necessary.
- 7.13 There are no highway implications as a result of this development and no additional bedrooms are proposed.

8.0 Conclusion:

- 8.1 Overall, although the cumulative effect of the extensions is considered to be disproportionate to the size of the original dwelling, the visual impact is not considered to be harmful to the character of the dwelling, the surrounding area or openness of the Green Belt. It is also a material consideration that there are existing large neighbouring rear extensions, and the proposal would not therefore be out of keeping with the character of the area.
- 8.2 The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out above.