

**4/02296/15/FHA - LOFT CONVERSION INCLUDING ROOF ENLARGEMENT AND SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION.  
5 EGGLETON DRIVE, TRING, HP23 5AJ.  
APPLICANT: Mr Wall.**

---

[Case Officer - Francis Whittaker]

### **Summary**

The application is recommended for approval.

The principle of appropriate residential development is encouraged in this location. The roof alterations and single storey rear extension will not be harmful to the character of the area or the overall streetscene. The proposal will not result in a significant loss of amenities to neighbouring properties. The proposal therefore accords with Policies CS4, CS11, CS12 of the Core Strategy and saved Appendix 7 of the DBLP 1991-2011.

### **Site Description**

The application site is situated within the residential area of Tring and comprises a two-storey detached dwelling. The property was built in the early 2000s. The development of which this forms part of is accessed from Nathaniel Walk and comprises of chiefly detached and substantial 4-5 bed properties, although there is a split row of townhouses at its eastern end.

### **Proposal**

The proposal is for a loft conversion and enlargement of the roof space (to create new en-suite bedroom and attic space) and a partial wrap around single storey extension to the rear. The latter would occupy about two thirds of the rear elevation of the house. The applicant has indicated that he wishes to implement this scheme in two separate phases.

The proposal is virtually the same development that was the subject of pre application discussion under 4/1595/15/PRE. The applicant has followed through with the plans for the hipped roof form (as advised by the case officer), but there have been some minor changes to the number, grouping and location of new velux windows in the roof area.

### **Referral to Committee**

The application is referred to the Development Control Committee due to the contrary views of Tring Town Council

### **Relevant history**

4/01644/01/FUL - 23 DWELLINGS AND PROVISION OF ECOLOGICAL PARK

### **Policies**

National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

### Adopted Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development  
CS1 - Distribution of Development  
CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages  
CS8 - Sustainable Transport  
CS9 - Management of Roads  
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design  
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design  
CS12 - Quality of Site Design  
CS13 - Quality of Public Realm  
CS28 - Renewable Energy  
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction  
CS30 - Sustainability Offset Fund  
CS31 - Water Management  
CS32 - Air, Water and Soil Quality  
CS35 - Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

### Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policies 10, 58, 99  
Appendices 3, 5 & 7

### **Summary of Representations**

#### Comments received from local residents:

#### 6 Eggleton Drive

We do not object to the loft conversion however we do have the following comments / concerns :

- 1) **Over development** - the changes to the roof are very dramatic and change the scale of the property completely. The submitted photos of the roof are of the townhouses in the development, as a copy of what is proposed, but these are designated 3 storey properties, are designed as such from the outset ,and are situated amongst like minded properties . As such the proposed pans are not in keeping with the properties along Eggleton Drive / the Dundale Park development overall .
- 2) **Loss of light** - The development will impact on our quality of light, and could cast shadows over our garden and bathroom at times.
- 3) **Not in keeping with street scene** - The over bearing number of velux windows draw attention to what is already a large expanse of roof. Velux windows do not feature significantly in the area, and particularly not on the street elevation - front of the house. Your plans clearly show the loft conversion at No. 4 (approved and completed) and the proposed loft conversion at No. 7 (approved). Both these loft conversions are in keeping with the other properties along Eggleton Drive. See point 1 above also.

4) Number 5 sits forward of numbers 1-4 and No. 6, so becomes the first property to expose its flank elevation. The extent of brickwork in a relatively blank elevation, is dramatically magnified. Setting aside the massing issues, above, if the shape of the new roof did go ahead our concern would be the bricks and mortar will not match perfectly, and as such will draw attention to scheme. See points 1 and 3 above.

5) **Phase 2 family room at rear of property** : We do not object to this however we do object strongly to the additional chimney stack planned as part of this extension as it will look unsightly and spoil our view from our garden.

#### 4 Eggleton Drive

Please see below our comments and concerns with the above proposed planning application and plans.

We do not object to the loft conversion providing it is carried out in keeping with the other properties in our beautiful development such number 4 (Our House) and Number 7. Currently as the plans are it isn't so we would object because we do have the following concerns:

1) **Over development** - The changes to the roof are very dramatic and change the scale of the property completely. The submitted photos of the roof are of the townhouses in the development, as a copy of what is proposed, but these are designated 3 storey properties and designed from the outset as such. The drawings are not clear exactly what is being proposed and the plans, elevations and the pictures contradict each other. The link <http://site.dacorum.gov.uk/PlanDocs/364/44/73/04/44730417.pdf> on your website is incorrect, it is wrong handed.

2) **Loss of light** - The development will impact on our quality of light, and could cast shadows over our garden at times. The end gables will look very tall and dominate the appearance of our house and number 6. We feel the side of the house will look like the side of a tall warehouse to ours. We would also strongly object to the 2 side windows on this elevation at high level because we will be over looked.

3) **Not in keeping with street scene** - The over bearing number of velux windows draw attention to what is already a large expanse of roof. Velux windows do not feature significantly in the area, and particularly not on the street elevation (Front of the house). I cannot see the benefit to the velux windows in the master bedroom (Facing front)

4) Number 5 sits forward of numbers 1-4 and number 6 so it becomes the first property to expose its flank elevation. The extent of brickwork in a relatively blank elevation is dramatically magnified. Setting aside the massing issues above, if the shape of the new roof did go ahead our concern would be the bricks and mortar will not match perfectly and as such will draw attention to scheme. See points 1 and 3 above.

5) I cannot see benefit of having the upper two velux windows for the impractical loft / attic area. It takes the eye right to the top of the ridge on the roof.

6) **Phase 2 family room at rear of property** - We do not object to this, however we do object strongly to the additional chimney stack planned as part of this extension as it will look unsightly and spoil our view from our garden.

#### Tring Town Council

Tring Town Council refuses this application the following grounds: (i) Over development the proposed changes alter the the scale of the property unacceptably (ii) Loss of light to neighbouring properties (iii) Not in keeping with neighbouring properties especially the velux windows to the front

#### Hertfordshire Ecology

1. We have no bat records from Eggleton Drive itself but there are records from adjacent roads and properties. Furthermore bats will be using the adjacent Dundale wood and lake Wildlife Site, so it is clear bats are active throughout this area, and could potentially be using the roof space of the property.
2. The proposals themselves will have a significant impact on the existing roof, and will affect any bats that may be present.
3. Although the properties are relatively recent, this in itself would not preclude bats from using them – they have been known to roost even within modern warehousing. However, it is apparent from the available Google streetview that the roofs are in very good condition with little or no missing or gaps between tiles. Furthermore the soffits are also modern, in good condition and tightly fitting leaving little or no gaps of any kind.
4. On this basis I consider that the potential bat access to the roof is most likely to be negligible and that it is therefore unreasonable for the LPA to require a bat assessment on this occasion.
5. However, bats and their roost remain protected and could still be unexpectedly discovered during the course of any works. Consequently **I advise that an informative is placed on any approval to the effect that:**
  - *If bats or any evidence of them is discovered during the course of any works, works should stop immediately and advice sought as to how to proceed. This may be obtained from: A suitably qualified ecological consultant; Natural England: 0845 6014523; The UK Bat Helpline: 0845 1300228 or Herts & Middlesex Bat Group: [www.hmbg.org.uk](http://www.hmbg.org.uk) ;*
  - I am not aware of any other ecological issues associated with these proposals for which I have any significant concerns.

#### **Considerations**

The site falls within the urban area of Tring wherein the principle of extensions is generally acceptable. The key issues to consider relate to the impact of the proposed works on the character and appearance of the original building and street scene, the impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties and adequacy of car parking.

### Effect on appearance of building

Policy CS12 states that development should respect adjoining properties in terms of scale, height and bulk.

Converting the existing space via the inclusion of dormers would have been the preferred approach as it would have had the least impact on the property. This has been the approach taken with Nos. 4 and 7 Eggleton Drive (resp. 4/1391/04 and 4/0683/14). However, it is recognised that this does not always maximise opportunities to increase living space and the concern of the applicant that part of the floor area would effectively be lost to the stairs in order to gain access.

The roof area would be increased outwards from the ridge line (by 5.3m) rather than upwards (and only to the same height as the existing ridge ). This is welcomed as an approach as any increase over this would be more difficult to support. This would require some of the brickwork to be taken up from the eaves on the side elevations. The half hipped ends help in reducing the impact of the enlarged roof area and end elevations, keeping the extension more subordinate, maintaining the general character of the dwelling and not detracting from the appearance of the original building.

### Effect on street scene

The properties that make up this development have a strong overall character given they were built at the same time to a broadly similar design and palette of materials. As a rule of thumb, the roofs do tend to be large reflecting the substantial size of these properties. However, they do display slight variations in terms of design particularly in respect of the roof form. A number of the properties do exhibit the same broad bulk of roof as that proposed (e.g. Nos. 3 and 7 Eggleton Drive), especially the town houses. Thus what is proposed is not considered wholly out of keeping with the character of houses in this locality.

While the properties are built in a row, the road curves slightly and it is narrow. There are also a number of garages that extend forward of the building line. Eggleton Drive is also edged by a tall hedge line. These factors mean that any changes to the property will not be so visible/dominant as to detract from the general uniformity of the other houses.

The proposal includes a relatively large number of rooflights within the roof structure, however, with the removal of the highest level rooflight in the front elevation, as requested, these windows are placed in a symmetrical form and will not be so harmful to the appearance of the dwelling to justify refusal. It should be noted that in most urban situations the insertion of rooflights is permitted development and falls outside planning control.

Therefore, it is concluded that there should not be any significant harm to the character of the street scene.

It is recommended that the materials of the proposed extension match the existing dwelling. This will allow the proposed extension to harmonise with the original design and character of the house in terms external finishes (required by saved Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan).

### Effect on amenity of 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.

### Visual intrusion & loss of privacy

Adequate spacing (of at least 23m) exists between the property and its rear neighbour on Nathaniel Walk, including landscaping at the shared rear boundary. There is reasonable spacing between its side neighbours because of the existence of existing garages on the side boundaries of adjacent properties. All windows will form part of the roof slope and are inset from flank walls, and if side windows are to be provided they are small and high level. Such an arrangement should not significantly impact on neighbours in terms of visual intrusion and loss of privacy. The applicant has agreed to remove the two proposed second floor windows in the side elevation to overcome neighbours loss of privacy concerns.

The single storey extension is small scale and due to its height and separation between adjacent properties will not result in any significant loss of amenities.

The new chimney to the rear has been amended to slightly reduce its height. Due to the position of this element of the proposal, well away from the property boundary, it is considered grounds for objection could not be sustained.

### Loss of light

It appears that there would not be any significant adverse effect in terms of loss of light to neighbours. The roof area will be increased but this will remain within the existing extent of the property (rather than extending beyond it and closer to the neighbours). The hipped gables will reduce some of its impact by allowing additional levels of light compared to a gable treatment. The separation of neighbouring properties and the juxtaposition of the neighbours (to the east and west of the application property) will also further help in minimising the impact.

### Car parking and access

A new bedroom would be created by the development. There would be sufficient on-site parking for this proposal. The property is provided with a double garage which would allow for 4 cars to be parked off road. Policy 58 indicates a maximum of 3 parking spaces should be provided for a 4 bedroom (plus) property. The Provision of three parking spaces would be considered appropriate in this instance to accord with Core Strategy Policy CS8, saved DBLP policy 58 and Appendix 5.

Ample space also exists on the road for off-street parking (without restrictions). This is considered to be a satisfactory parking arrangement. Therefore the proposal would not have any parking implications.

### Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Policy CS35 requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. The Council's Community

Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on the 1st July 2015. Due to the small-scale nature of this application, it is not CIL Liable.

## Conclusions

The loft conversion / roof enlargement and single storey extension are not considered to give rise to any significant concerns sufficient to justify withholding consent. This scheme is therefore recommended for approval.

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 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match in size, colour and texture those used on the existing building.**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

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

Drawing No. 01  
Drawing No. 02  
Drawing No. 03

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

## INFORMATIVE

- *If bats or any evidence of them is discovered during the course of any works, works should stop immediately and advice sought as to how to proceed. This may be obtained from: A suitably qualified ecological consultant; Natural England: 0845 6014523; The UK Bat Helpline: 0845 1300228 or Herts & Middlesex Bat Group: [www.hmbg.org.uk](http://www.hmbg.org.uk) ;*

## Article 31 Statement

- Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. 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.