

**4/00884/15/FHA - SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION.  
10 ATHELSTAN ROAD, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 9QE.  
APPLICANT: Benley Developments - Mr J Crawley.**

---

[Case Officer - Martin Stickley]

## **Summary**

The application is recommended for approval.

The principle of residential development is considered acceptable in the sites location within a residential area. Certain permitted development rights (Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B and E), including extensions, were removed (see 4/00239/14/FUL), following an approval for an application for two semi-detached dwellings in the rear garden. These permitted development rights were removed to safeguard the residential and visual amenity of the locality. However, the proposed single-storey rear extension has been kept limited in scale and is not considered to significantly impact the amenities of the neighbours when compared to the existing urban layout.

The proposed works would not have any adverse impact on the appearance of the dwelling and would not significantly detract from the street scene. The access and car parking is deemed satisfactory. Therefore, the proposal is acceptable in accordance with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework; Policies CS4, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy 58, and saved Appendices 5 and 7 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (DBLP).

## **Site and Surroundings**

The application site is located on the southern side of Athelstan Road, within the Hemel Hempstead Character Area of Belswains (HCA18). The plot comprises a 1930s detached three bedroom dwelling characterised by a hipped roof, white render and white uPVC. The plot size has recently been reduced to allow for three new dwellings, one adjacent and two in the rear garden. The street is characterised by mildly varying styles of residential development, mostly typical suburban styles associated with the 1930s. There is mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings in the vicinity.

## **Proposal**

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for a single-storey rear extension, projecting 3.4m from the rear wall and stretching the full width of the property (6.25m). The proposed extension has a lean-to roof, with a maximum height of 3.6m and a maximum eaves height of 2.45m. The proposal incorporates two small roof lights.

## **Referral to Committee**

The application is referred to the Development Control Committee at the request of Councillor Suqlain Mahmood.

## **Planning History**

4/01173/15/FUL SINGLE 4 BED DETACHED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND

	GARDEN (AMENDED SCHEME). Awaiting decision
4/00775/15/FUL	CONSTRUCTION OF A 2-BED AND 3-BED SEMI-DETACHED BUNGALOW INCLUDING ACCESS ROAD AND CAR PARKING Awaiting decision
4/02553/14/FUL	CONSTRUCTION OF A 2-BED AND 4-BED SEMI-DETACHED BUNGALOW INCLUDING ACCESS ROAD AND CAR PARKING Granted 13/11/2014
4/01227/14/FUL	DETACHED FOUR-BED BUNGALOW WITH ASSOCIATED PRIVATE DRIVE AND PARKING (AMENDED SCHEME) Granted 29/07/2014
4/00239/14/FUL	SINGLE 4 BED DETACHED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND GARDEN. Granted 14/07/2014

## **Relevant Policy**

### National Planning Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

### Dacorum Core Strategy 2006-2031

NP1 - Supporting Development  
 CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages  
 CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design  
 CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design  
 CS12 - Quality of Site Design  
 CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction  
 CS31 - Water Management  
 CS32 - Air, Water and Soil Quality

### Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011

Policy 58 - Private Parking Provision  
 Appendix 5 - Parking Provision  
 Appendix 7 - Small-scale House Extensions

## **Summary of Representations**

### Local Residents

58 Glebe Close, Hemel Hempstead, HP3 9PA

The plans don't appear to show the surrounding properties, or very much at all to give any indication of distances or relationships with the wider street scene, this does not appear to be an adequate application to be considered.

## **Considerations**

The main issue of relevance to the consideration of this application relate to the impact of the works upon the amenities of the neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 and saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the DBLP. Other issues of relevance relate to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene (HCA18, Policies CS11 and CS12), and the impact on car parking (saved Policy 58 and saved Appendix 5 of the DBLP).

### Effect on Appearance of Building and Street Scene

An assessment of the impact of the proposed works has considered the impact on the appearance of the building and street scene. The proposal would not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the property or the wider street scene. The works are situated to the rear of the property and views from the public realm are generally obscured. The proposal would therefore not appear incongruous to the existing dwelling or street scene in accordance with Policy CS12.

The proposed extension is considered satisfactory in terms of its design, bulk and scale. It is subordinate in terms of scale and height to the parent building as required by the Hemel Hempstead Character Appraisal (HCA18 - Belswains) and saved Appendix 7 of the DBLP.

The existing building is covered in white render and the walls of the proposal are constructed with buff rustic brick work without render. Although this does not match the parent building, it does match the neighbouring property. The roof tiles (profiled concrete tiles) also differ from the existing building (plain concrete tiles). The proposed materials, although conflicting with the existing dwelling, would not cause significant harm to the appearance of the property in accordance with Policy CS12.

In conclusion, it is not considered that the proposed works would significantly detract from the character of the street scene or the appearance of the dwelling in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy, saved Appendix 7 of the DBLP and HCA18.

### Effect on Amenity of Neighbours

Consideration has been given to the impact that the proposed extension would have on the adjoining neighbours. Policy CS12 states that regarding the effect on the amenity of neighbours, development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of privacy. It is anticipated that the proposal would not reduce the light to the ground floor windows of the neighbours, as the proposed extension would not interfere with the 45 degree guidelines set out by saved Appendix 7 of the DBLP.

As mentioned previously, certain permitted development rights were removed following an approval for two semi-detached dwellings in the rear garden. The reason for this was to avoid a cramped appearance on the plot, maintain a suitable garden size commensurate with the character of the area, preserve adequate amenity provision for a family home and uphold adequate distances between the rear of No.10 and adjacent properties.

Saved Appendix 3 of the DBLP states that development should retain sufficient

spacing around residential buildings to avoid loss of privacy. Saved Appendix 3 of the DBLP also states that spacing between dwellings should be provided at a distance which is consistent with the surrounding areas. The surrounding area consists of development in the medium density range.

F. From studying the site plan for the proposed dwellings to the rear of No. 10 (see PL/001A on application 4/00775/15/FUL), it appears that a distance of approximately 22m would be retained. Furthermore, the separation distance to the sides would also be considerably higher than many other developments in the surrounding area and Hemel Hempstead as a whole. It is therefore considered that sufficient spacing is maintained and therefore the impact with regards to loss of privacy would be extremely minimal. It should be noted that in most urban situations permitted development rights allow significant single storey rear extensions to properties without the requirement for planning permission, this often results in separations between dwellings being well below that currently proposed.

In conclusion, although the proposed extension would reduce the spacing between properties, it is felt that the issues would not be significantly worsened by this small single-storey rear extension but are resultant of the surrounding urban development. Therefore, the application would not warrant a refusal in this respect. Therefore, there would be no significant harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties as a result of this proposal. The proposed extension would not impact the immediate neighbouring properties in terms of visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of privacy in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and saved Appendix 7 of the DBLP.

#### Access and Car Parking

The proposal would not create any additional bedrooms or affect the existing car parking layout. It follows that the parking arrangements are acceptable in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy 58 of the Local Plan.

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

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.**

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the materials specified on the approved drawings or such other materials as may be agreed in writing by the local planning authority.**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:**

**PL/001**

**PL/003**

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

**Article 31 Statement**

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2012.