

**4/01792/17/RET - RETENTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.
83 DEACONSFIELD ROAD, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 9JA.
APPLICANT: MR D AQBAL.**

[Case Officer - Briony Curtain]

Summary

The application is recommended for approval.

A householder prior approval application was granted in January 2017 for the construction of a 5m deep single storey rear extension in accordance with Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. Condition A.3 of Class A requires the materials used in the exterior work of the extension must be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building.

The extension has been completed but the exterior has been constructed of red brickwork not painted render as per the existing building. As such, the extension is not lawful under Class A permitted development and planning permission is required.

Whilst the red brick of the recently constructed extension contrasts with the white paint of the existing dwelling, it is located to the rear of the property, aligns with the side elevation and is set behind the side access fence and gate. It is thus is not readily visible from public vantage points and its impact on the overall character and appearance of the street scene would be negligible.

The extension would not harm the overall character or appearance of the area and thus would comply with Policy Cs12 in this regard. A refusal could not be sustained.

Site Description

The application site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling house which has recently been extended by way of a 5m single storey rear extension. The extension has been constructed in accordance with the approved dimensions of application 4/03371/16/HPA but the exterior has been constructed of brick.

Proposal

Retrospective permission is sought for the retention of the brick single storey rear extension.

Referral to Committee

The application is referred to the Development Control Committee as the applicant is the husband of a council employee.

Planning History

4/03371/16/HPA SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION MEASURING 5M DEEP WITH A
MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF 3.45M AND A MAXIMUM EAVES HEIGHT OF 3M
Prior approval required and granted
19/01/2017

Policies

National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Circular 11/95

Adopted Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS2 - Selection of Development Sites
CS3 - Managing Selected Development Sites
CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Summary of Representations

Response to Neighbour Notification / Site Notice / Newspaper Advertisement

No comments received.

Considerations

The size, position, and design of the single storey rear extension has already been established through the granting of a householder prior approval application (4/03371/16/HPA).

This application thus deals solely with the materials and not the extension itself. The main consideration is thus whether the alteration in materials detrimentally effects the appearance of the extension, host dwelling and street scene.

Adopted Core Strategy CS12 : Quality of Site Design does encourage site development to respect adjoining properties in terms of materials, however, this is not prescriptive and it is common for extensions to be built in varying materials. Using a differing façade material on an extension can in some circumstances allow a clear definition between the existing dwelling and the extension, thus helping the extension to appear subservient.

There is no brickwork on the existing dwelling, and thus the extension does appear in contrast to the main dwelling. This does not however appear awkward or contrived or alter the overall character or appearance of the dwelling in any way. The extension is located to the rear of the property and is set beyond a 2m high fence and side access gate, it is therefore only visible from within the site itself. It therefore has a very limited visual impact.

It is accepted that the houses in Deaconsfield Road are predominantly painted render/ pebbledash render, however, there are examples of properties which have been extended and the extensions have been treated in differing materials. Looking at the general area there are also numerous examples of existing brickwork, most notably to the ground floor front elevations of No. 87 & 89 Deaconfield Road, immediately to the north, which, whilst, the only examples of brickwork in the immediate area, do not appear unduly prominent or incongruous.

The extension, despite not being readily visible from the street scene, would thus not appear unduly incongruous and would not adversely affect the area.

Taking the above into account it is considered that the materials proposed are acceptable and will not have a significant detrimental impact on either the host dwelling or the street scene. Therefore, on balance it is considered acceptable in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and saved Appendix 7 of the DBLP.

Impact on Neighbours

The use of different materials in the extension is not considered to impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property.

RECOMMENDATION - That planning permission be **GRANTED** for the reasons referred to above and subject to the following conditions:

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

CHM/3645/A1 sheet 2
CHM/3645/A1 sheet 1 Rev A

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

Article 35:

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 2015.