

**4/03265/17/FHA - DEMOLITION OF REAR CONSERVATORY AND STORE AND CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS.  
56 BEACONSFIELD ROAD, TRING, HP23 4DW.  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Prescott.**

---

[Case Officer - Sally Robbins]

### **Summary**

The application is recommended for approval.

### **Site Description**

The application site is located in a residential area of Tring. The site comprises a two storey detached dwellinghouse with a detached single storey store and rear conservatory extension. The house is composed of painted render to the front elevation with red brick detailing around the front door. The roof is hipped and finished in plain clay roof tiles. The property is set in a generous sized plot with a fairly large rear garden. The surrounding area is varied in character and includes single storey and two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings in a wide range of architectural styles and materials.

### **Proposal**

The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing store and rear conservatory followed by the construction of a single storey side and rear extension. The side extension would have a lean to roof with an eaves height of 2.2m and a ridge height of 4m. It would be set back from the principal elevation by 2.2m and would contain one window. The rear extension would have an M shaped roof with an eaves height of 2.2m and a maximum ridge height of 4m.

### **Referral to Committee**

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

### **Planning History**

4/01894/02/FHA CONSERVATORY  
Granted  
01/11/2002

### **Policies**

#### National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

#### Adopted Core Strategy

CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design  
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design  
CS12 - Quality of Site Design

#### Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Appendices 3, 5 & 7

## Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

Area Based Policies (May 2004) - Residential Character Area [TCA2 Miswell Lane]

### **Summary of Representations**

#### Tring Town Council

The council recommended refusal of this application on the grounds that the extension's wall was so close to the neighbouring property that the result would be out of keeping with the character in a neighbourhood of detached properties. The development would result in loss of car parking spaces and the proposed provision would be unworkable in practice.

#### Response to Neighbour Notification

##### 54 Beaconsfield Road- Objection

1. Because of the distance and length by which it is planned to extend 56's side wall, the necessary foundation work is likely to have an adverse effect on the foundations / condition of 54.

2. The side wall of the planned extension (parallel to the side wall of 54) is within half a metre of the fence dividing 56 from 54. This means that the edge of the eaves, guttering etc will be virtually overhanging the dividing fence, which (on the 54 side) is the only usable means of front to back access. As a result -

- a) access between new wall and current fence for any subsequent maintenance work will be made extremely difficult (from either side)
- b) any runoff from heavy rain, thawing snow etc from the new sloping roof will fall on or inside the 54 side of the dividing fence. The passage alongside this fence is the only front to back access at 54

Further to 1 & 2 above, it is suggested that the distance between the extension side wall and the fence should be increased to at least 1 metre

The Location Plan 2207-LP1 does not show the outline of 54 Beaconsfield Road correctly. The errors are that -

- the house is shown as built right up to the boundary with 56. This is not so - between the side of the house and the dividing fence there is a passageway, providing 54's only front to back access
- the rear of the house does not extend as far back as the plan shows - the back of the house is level with a point halfway along the side wall of 56's existing store
- the proportion of the (reverse) L shape is wrong - the rear wall of the L's base extends at least a yard beyond the current rear wall of 56
- 54's integral garage is not shown at all. The front extends slightly forward of the main house, and half of the garage extends sideways from the house towards the boundary with 52

### **Considerations**

#### Policy and Principle

The application site is located in a residential area of Tring. Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS4 states that appropriate residential development is acceptable in towns and large villages subject to compliance with the relevant national and local policies outlined below. The main issues to the consideration of this application relate to the impact of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the parent dwelling, the streetscene and residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

### Effect on appearance of building

Saved appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), policies CS11, CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2012) all seek to ensure that any new development/alteration respects or improves the character of the surrounding area and adjacent properties in terms of scale, massing, materials, layout, bulk and height. TCA5 relates to the Miswell Lane area and states that extensions should normally be subordinate in terms of scale to the parent dwelling and that the use of the architectural themes, design, proportions, colours and materials on the parent building will be expected to be followed.

The proposed side extension would project 3m from the flank elevation of the host property, to provide a 0.5m separation between the northeast flank elevation and the boundary. It would be finished in facing brickwork, to match the brickwork detailing surrounding the front door. It would contain one window that would match the existing ground floor window in terms of size, proportion, divisions and material. There would be four roof lights within the lean to roof of the side extension.

The rear extension would project from the rear elevation by 6m and would comprise an M shaped roof with two sets of doors opening onto the rear garden. The eaves of the roof would measure 2.2m and the ridge would measure 4m. It would be finished in plain concrete tiles in a colour to match the existing tiles of the main roof.

The proposed build and form of the extension is considered to respect the overall design, scale and bulk of the parent dwelling and therefore not considered to be visually intrusive or harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling. In accordance with Residential Character Area [TCA2 Miswell Lane], the proposed extension is subordinate in scale and follows the architectural themes of the parent dwelling. The proposal therefore coheres with the NPPF (2012) and is in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004).

### Impact on Street Scene

Tring Town Council recommended refusal of the application on the grounds that the extension's wall would be so close to the neighbouring property that the result would be out of keeping with the character in a neighbourhood of detached properties.

As outlined above, the surrounding area is varied in terms of character and scale of residential properties. There are several pairs of two storey semi-detached properties within the immediate vicinity on Beaconsfield Road, including numbers: 57 and 59; 50 and 52; and 46 and 48. There are also detached bungalows as well as other two storey detached dwellings. There are examples of dwellings that extend right up to the boundary (such as number 44) and also front and side extensions that extend right up to the boundary (such as 41 and 48).

The side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the parent dwelling by 2.2m and away from the boundary by 0.5m. As the side extension is single storey it is not considered that there would be a terracing effect. A separation distance of 5m would be maintained between first floor elements of the host property and number 54. The proposal includes the removal of the chimney stack, however this will not have a significant impact upon the streetscene and could be carried out under Permitted Development.

It is considered that the modest scale and sympathetic design of the extension would integrate with the streetscape character and would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

### Impact on Neighbours

There has been an objection from number 54 Beaconsfield Road. The concerns raised are addressed in turn below.

*1. Impact on foundations of number 54*

This is not a material planning consideration and is covered by separate legislation.

*2. Proximity to boundary, eaves overhanging number 54 resulting in:*

*a) Limited access for maintenance*

*b) Rain/snow melt runoff into 54's side of fence*

In accordance with the submitted elevational drawings, the eaves of the proposed side extension would be 15cm from the boundary at the front and 10 cm from the boundary at the rear. In terms of access for maintenance, this is not a material planning consideration.

*3. Inaccuracies on location plan with respect to the outline and shape of number 54.*

The submitted location plan is an Ordnance Survey style map that has not been altered by the applicant.

Taking into account all neighbouring properties, it is not considered that the proposed extension would have a significant impact in terms of residential amenity. As outlined above, the proposed extension would be single storey with an eaves height of 2.2m and a ridge height of 4m. The extension would project from the rear elevation of number 54 by 4m and would be in line with the existing single storey rear extension of number 58. As such it is not considered that there would be a significant impact in terms of light provision to these neighbouring properties.

Though visible from surrounding residential units, the proposed single storey side and rear extension will not have a significant impact upon the residential amenity, daylight provision or privacy of neighbouring residents. As a result the rear extension in regards to residential amenity is acceptable in terms of the NPPF (2012), Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

#### Impact on Trees and Landscaping

No trees of significance are affected by the proposal, the Trees & Woodlands Officer has raised no objection.

#### Other Material Planning Considerations

- Contamination

The site is located within an area of potentially contaminative material. No comments have been received from the Contaminated Land Officer, however the developer is advised to keep a watching brief during ground works on the site for any potentially contaminated material.

- Parking

Tring Town Council raised an objection with regards to the loss of one car parking space and that the proposed parking arrangement would be unworkable in practice.

The proposal includes the addition of one bedroom, taking the property from a three to a four bedroom property. There would be two off-road parking spaces provided. The Council's Parking guidelines within Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004) set out the 'maximum' parking standards. The guidance sets out that a maximum of three spaces should be provided for a four bed house.

Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision and Paragraph 39 of the NPPF (2012) states that if setting local parking standards authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport; local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles. As such, each application is considered on its own merits, taking factors such as the location and accessibility of the site into consideration. It is considered that the application site is in an accessible location, in close proximity to Tring town centre and within walking distance of local bus routes. Furthermore, there are no parking restrictions evident on Beaconsfield Road. As such it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant impact upon local parking provision nor would impact upon the safety and operation of the adjacent highway. The proposal meets the requirements of policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004) in this regard.

- 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. This application is not CIL Liable due to it resulting in less than 100m<sup>2</sup> of additional floor space.

## Conclusions

The proposed single storey side and rear extension through size, position and design would not adversely impact upon the visual amenity of the existing dwelling house, immediate street scene or the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendixes 3 and 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS11, CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2012).

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

### **2207-P1**

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. 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.