

**4/02491/17/FHA - FRONT, SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION. LOFT CONVERSION WITH CROWN ROOF AND FRONT GABLE EXTENSION.
74 SCATTERDELLS LANE, CHIPPERFIELD, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 9EX.
APPLICANT: MR DOOUSS.**

[Case Officer - Sally Robbins]

Summary

The application is recommended for approval.

Site Description

The application site is located on the southeast side of Scatterdells Lane in Chipperfield. The site comprises a single storey detached dwellinghouse in an elongated plot. The site is located within the Green Belt and the surrounding area is characterised by a varied mix of mostly detached dwellinghouses in a range of architectural styles and sizes.

Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for a front, side and rear extension, a loft conversion with crown roof and front gable extension.

Referral to Committee

The application is referred to the Development Management Committee due to the contrary views of Chipperfield Parish Council.

Planning History

4/1560/86	Replacement dwelling Granted 16/12/1986
-----------	---

Building Control History - Single Storey Rear Extension from 1996 (ref. BN96/0756).

Policies

National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Adopted Core Strategy

CS5 - The Green Belt
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design

Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policy 22
Appendices 3 & 7

Summary of Representations

Chipperfield Parish Council

CPC OBJECTS to the application for reasons:

Excessive scale and bulk- not in keeping with the character/vernacular of Chipperfield village properties.

Contrary to 'Village Design Statement' in respect of

- Avoid integral garages
- Respect established building patterns
- Avoid deep floor plan and resulting roof bulk
- Allow for car parking away from frontage
- Reduced roof spans by use of T or L shaped building layout

45 deg light rule to neighbouring property is not observed

Response to Neighbour Notification/Site Notice

72 and 76 Scatterdells Lane - Objects:

- Over allowance for extensions in Green Belt
- Large percentage increase
- Loss of light
- Overlooking
- Extends up to boundary line
- Fails 45 degree test
- Scale and design not in keeping with the original property
- Impact on street scene
- Overshadowing
- Dominant and overbearing
- Potential disturbance of Japanese knotweed

Considerations

Policy and Principle

The application site is located within the Green Belt. Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS5 aims to protect the character and openness of the Green Belt and states that small-scale development will be permitted, such as limited extensions to existing buildings, provided that it has no significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) is broadly consistent with this approach stating that one of the exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Policy CS5 itself is silent in terms of what constitutes small-scale development or a limited addition. Saved Policy 22 of the Local Plan (2004) is relevant, but is given less weight than the NPPF, as the assessment differs slightly from Section 9 of the NPPF. Specifically, saved Policy 22 requires an assessment of the floor space increase above the original building (allowing 30% above the original floor area).

The existing dwelling is a replacement of 'Holliday House', permission for which was granted in 1986. The replacement dwelling saw an increase in floor area of around 36 sq m (17%). The Case Officer provided justification for the minor increase in floor area due to the relocation of the dwelling further back in its plot, more in line with the neighbouring dwellings, and the fact that the proposal included the demolition of a number of outbuildings that amounted to around 78 sq m. No mention was made of height, although the original dwelling and the replacement dwelling were both single storey. As such and for the purposes of this Green Belt assessment, the original dwelling and the existing dwelling are considered to be the approximately the same

size.

The applicant has provided figures for the existing and proposed floor area, footprint and volume, as shown in the table below:

	Existing	Proposed	% Increase
Floor Area (sq m)	326	457	40
Footprint (sq m)	176	269	52
Volume (cu m)	996	1189	19

Whilst the increase in floor area exceeds the threshold set out in Saved Policy 22, as mentioned above less weight is given to this than an assessment in terms of proportionality as defined in the NPPF. Furthermore, there would be no increase in roof height with the majority of the increase in floor area comprised within the roof space. The dwelling would retain a half hipped roof with a small crown roof section, which is considered to minimise the impact in terms of scale.

All of the above factors have been taken into consideration when making an assessment of the increase in bulk and mass. It is considered that the proposed extension would remain proportionate to the size of the original house. As such, the extension proposed would constitute appropriate development in the Green Belt and would, in principle, be acceptable.

Effects on appearance of building and Street Scene

Core Strategy Policies CS11 and CS12 and Saved Appendix 7 of the Local Plan state that development within settlements should respect the typical density in the area, integrate with the streetscape character and respect surrounding properties. Furthermore, chapter 7 of the NPPF (2012) emphasises the importance of good design in context and, in particular, paragraph 64 states permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to improve the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

The proposed extension would see the front projection extended from a hip to gable roof with an additional gable end projection added. The extension would project from the southwest flank elevation by 3m and from the rear elevation by 3.8m. The roof height of the extension would match the height of the main roof, at 7m. There would be three modestly sized dormer windows on the rear elevation that would be spaced evenly apart. Extensive glazing is proposed for the ground floor rear elevation.

The proposed extension would be finished in materials to match the parent dwelling including plain roof tiles, facing brickwork and PVC windows and doors. It is considered that the form, scale and design of the extension suitably reflects the scale and design of the existing house and would not result in any adverse impacts on the existing property or the adjacent residential properties. As such, the proposal complies with identified policies in this regard.

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

There are no trees of significance that will be removed as a result of the proposed extension. Neighbours have raised concerns regarding the presence of Japanese Knotweed. However, as this is not a material planning consideration, it has not been taken into account during the determination of this application.

Impact on Neighbours

There have been objections from both 72 and 76, the neighbours on either side of the application site. The objections relate to:

- Over allowance for extensions in Green Belt
- Large percentage increase
- Loss of light
- Overlooking
- Extends up to boundary line
- Fails 45 degree test
- Scale and design not in keeping with the original property
- Impact on street scene
- Overshadowing
- Dominant and overbearing
- Potential disturbance of Japanese knotweed

Core Strategy Policy CS12 aims to preserve neighbouring amenity. Furthermore, guidance in paragraph 17 of the NPPF is to always seek to secure high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers of land and buildings.

There are no additional windows proposed on the side elevations, however the southwest flank elevation would be closer to the neighbouring property 72 Scatterdells Lane by 3m. The potential for any additional overlooking or loss of privacy would be mitigated by the fact that the side facing windows would be obscure glazed.

Turning to the impacts of the proposal in terms of light provision and visual intrusion in relation to 76 Scatterdells Lane, the rear element of the extension would see an increase in height of 2.8m above the existing single storey rear extension, with a maximum ridge height of 7m. The dormer windows would be set down from the main ridge by around 0.5m and from the flank elevation by 1m. The main roof would be half hipped with an eaves height of 5m and a ridge height of 7m. The existing single storey rear extension projects from the rear elevation by 5m with an eaves height of 2.5m and a ridge height of 4.5m. It is considered that the proposed extension would not add significant bulk in relation to the existing extension when viewed from 76.

In terms of 72 Scatterdells Lane, the proposed extension would project from the southwest flank elevation by 3m. There are no windows at ground or first floor level on the northeast elevation of 72 Scatterdells Lane. There is one door on the ground floor, although this serves a hallway.

Taking all of the above into account, whilst visible from neighbouring residential units, it is not considered that the proposed extension would have a significant impact in terms of loss of privacy, overlooking, loss of light or visual intrusion.

Parish Council Objection

The Parish Council's objection relates to the following issues:

- Avoid integral garages
- Respect established building patterns
- Avoid deep floor plan and resulting roof bulk
- Allow for car parking away from frontage
- Reduced roof spans by use of T or L shaped building layout.

Regarding respecting established building patterns, the surrounding area of Scatterdells Lane is varied in terms of dwelling size, positioning within the plot and building line. Each plot is relatively unique, and it is considered that the proposed extension would sit well within the plot and would integrate with the surrounding area. The integral garage would allow for parking away from the frontage. With respect to the 45 degree rule, and in terms of the nearest habitable windows on the rear elevation of number 76, the proposed extension may breach a 45 degree line when viewed in plan but it would not breach a 45 degree line when viewed in

elevation.

Regarding avoiding integral garages, avoiding a deep floor plan and resulting roof bulk and reducing roof spans by the use of T or L shaped buildings, it is not considered that the proposal could be refused on any of these grounds.

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, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS12.

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

74SCLN002 REV A
74SCLN004 REV A
74SCLN006 REV A
74SCLN007 REV A
74SCLN008 REV A
74SCLN009 REV A
74SCLN010 REV A
74SCLN011 REV A

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS12.

Article 35

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 2015.