

**4/03159/17/FHA - SINGLE STOREY SIDE/FRONT EXTENSION.
9 THORNTREE DRIVE, TRING, HP23 4JE.
APPLICANT: Mrs Hands.**

[Case Officer - Amy Harman]

Summary

The application is recommended for approval.

Site Description

9 Thorntree Drive is a detached property is located within a cul-de-sac on a 1980's planned estate to the north west of Tring. The property has a large rear garden and a detached garage located to the front of the property adjacent to the driveway. The dwelling is constructed of a simple brick with a pitched roof. The Estate is relatively uniform and the overall design of the area is evident, however there have been extensions and alterations recently granted.

Proposal

SINGLE STOREY SIDE/FRONT EXTENSION

Referral to Committee

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

Planning History

None Found

Policies

National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Circular 11/95

Adopted Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design

Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Appendices 4, 7

Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

Environmental Guidelines (May 2004)
Water Conservation & Sustainable Drainage (June 2005)
Energy Efficiency & Conservation (June 2006)

Advice Notes and Appraisals

Sustainable Development Advice Note (March 2011)

Summary of Representations

Tring Town Council

Object

The council recommended refusal of this application on the grounds that the abutment of the extension's wall created a situation that was out of keeping with the character in a neighbourhood of detached properties.

Response to Neighbour Notification / Site Notice

Numbers 1,10 and 11 Thorntree Drive - Object

10 Thorntree Drive

We own the property at 10 Thorntree Drive, Tring, next door to 9 Thorntree Drive, and wish to oppose the above application on numerous grounds. Thorntree Drive is a small close, consisting of 10 detached houses. We feel that this, large, proposed extension is entirely out of keeping with the look and feel of the street and will affect our property in the following ways:-

1. Loss of light into and already dark lounge by building so far forward of both our house and theirs. Whilst the proposed extension is only single storey, because it is very wide, the top of the pitched roof will reach second storey level.
2. As there will no distinguishable gap between our property and this extension, it will be very difficult to prevent damp building up between the properties and no way of keeping this dry. We have taken professional advice on this and been advised that a small gap is worse than no gap at all in terms of damp, not that we are proposing that they build right up against our wall either!
3. We are also concerned that the trench required for the footings of this proposed extension will be too close to our property and could cause problems in terms of subsidence to our property.
4. No provision for us to maintain our property in the future, for instance soffits and chimney will require extremely difficult access to reach.
5. The garage at the front of the property, which they intend to build up to is ours, as is the wall between the garage and our house. The proposed 'few' centimetre gap between these and their extension will look unsightly, especially as their bricklayers will be unable to effectively lay bricks neatly in this situation.

We would like to draw to your attention also to a 'Restrictive Covenant' in our Deeds that states "Not to erect or permit to be erected upon such part of the property that falls between the front face of the building erected thereon and the front boundary of the property any wall fence or other linear feature above ground level of any nature". Whilst we appreciate that this may not be something that you are able to enforce, this was written by the developer, in order to prevent the close from being overdeveloped, which this proposal does.

Further to our email, yesterday, regarding the above application, we have noticed a number of additional issues that we feel are important and should be brought to your attention, regarding the above application:-

1. It should be noted that the 'garage' shown in the drawings should say 'neighbour's garage', as this end of the garage belongs to us and not them.
2. We note on the application form that the agent has described the property as an 'existing semidetached' property, which is incorrect, as this, and all of the properties in Thorntree Drive, are detached.
3. On the plans shown on your portal, the architect has proposed a watertight seal joined to our property. This is totally unacceptable to ourselves as water will sit in the dip between the two properties and will have no way of flowing without a slope and will be difficult to keep clear of leaves etc. This feature will also make both properties look semidetached, which is out of keeping with the look of the street and something that we were reassured by the neighbours that they would not do (when we wrote yesterday's email, we were unaware that they had changed this detail from the original drawings that we were shown, which though also unacceptable to us, allowed for a few centimetres gap between the two properties).

We hope that you will take our concerns into consideration, when looking into this application.

Additional comments;

We feel that a 75% increase in footprint is somewhat excessive, especially as the properties will become attached making them the only semi-detached houses in the street. This is not in character with the current look and feel of the street and will make our house feel hemmed in. Our tree does not stop the morning winter sunlight streaming into our lounge, as the proposed extension will do (being so far forward of the front of our house). We are not happy about having the two properties joined in such a way and cannot see how you will be able to prevent ponding between the properties during heavy rain. Surely the Restrictive Covenant was written to protect against over development and we would be grateful to know why you feel this is not relevant? All references to no.8 in your Design & Access Statement should read no.10 as no.8 is unaffected! Also, the garage shown as 'existing garages' is in fact ours at the end to be joined to.

11 Thorntree Drive

There are a number of extensions in Thorntree Drive but they enhance the properties. Importantly, they all retain the individual properties' detached appearance. In this instance, we feel that two properties will appear like one large semi-detached property and that will be detrimental to the general look/feel of the road. We have no objection to a scaled back extension but feel this is too big for the size of the plot

1Thorntree Drive

The extension is not in keeping with the surrounding houses, the type of extension will remove the status of the neighbouring dwelling from detached, and make it a semidetached, this is not in keeping with the remaining properties within the road

Considerations

Policy and Principle

The site is situated within the urban area of Tring, where, in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy residential extensions are acceptable in principle.

Effects on appearance of building and street scene

Given the size, scale and position of the single storey side extension, the overall character and appearance of the dwelling would only slightly alter, in addition it would not be discordant with the existing building or wider street scene.

The extension will harmonise with the original design, appear subservient to and be of coherent appearance and materials. It is small in scale and the extension sits within a good sized plot with good set back from the front boundary and the new single storey side extensions will add visual interest to the existing building. Although the scale of the property will be increased it will not dominate the building. The matching tiles and brick work will be in keeping with the character of the property.

Due to the location of the extensions, to the rear of the detached garage and the existing trees and landscaping, it is only visible if you are standing in the driveway of the application site itself. The ridge height of the extension is kept lower than that of the existing garages however the pitch of the new roof will be in line with the garage roofs.

This part of Thorntree Drive is characterised by regular detached dwellings. In particular, the application property forms part of a group of dwellings that are almost identical in their appearance. There have however been some significant recent extensions and alterations to the respective frontages which have disrupted the overall rhythm to the street scene.

Whilst uniformity is clearly evident, the design is not so exceptional it is considered it should be rigidly conformed to.

Members attention is particularly drawn to No. 4 Thorntree Drive which has benefited from a front and side extension and number 7 Thorntree Drive which has recently gained approval for significant two storey side extensions.

Neither Tring Town Council nor the Local Planning Authority objected to this and it was granted permission under delegated powers in 2016 and 2017 respectively.

This proposal is much less significant when viewed in the street scene. These recent approvals would be considered to set a precedent and would be a material consideration that should be afforded weight in current considerations.

In addition it is important to note that the properties are set a generous distance back from the highway. The set back is sufficient to avoid an overbearing impact upon the street scene. In this particular case, the extension would be set to the rear of an existing detached garage which obscures the view of the extension from the street scene.

The extension is a single storey extension and therefore it is not considered that it would change the character of the property by way of it appearing semi-detached in nature.

It is considered the proposal would preserve attractive streetscapes in accordance with CS11 and integrate with the streetscape character in accordance with CS12.

Due to the location of the proposed extension (hidden from the public realm behind an existing detached garage and landscaping), there would not be a detrimental impact on the appearance of the dwelling or streetscene. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy and saved Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (DBLP).

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

No impact

Impact on Highway Safety

No impact - the extension is limited to additional ground floor living accommodation and therefore there is no requirement for additional parking.

Impact on 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. The proposal is of a single-storey composition and limited in height. Therefore, the surrounding properties would not be negatively affected by the proposal in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

It was noted on site that the front elevations of both 9 and 10 Thorntree Drive face North East and hence receive limited sunlight after mid-morning due to their orientation. Winter sunlight is obscured by the location of the properties' detached garaging in front of the dwellings. Daylighting to No 10 Thorntree Drive largely remains unchanged throughout the year due to the single storey nature of the extension, furthermore the extension does not impact on the 45 degree line taken from the centre of the nearest habitable room.

Neighbours have raised concerns about party wall issues and a restrictive covenant, however these are not planning considerations.

Other Material Planning Considerations

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. This application is not CIL Liable due to resulting in less than 100m² of additional floor space.

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:**

9THD 003/PL/A1/100 C
9THD 003 /PL/A4 /102 /102 3 D Sketches
9THD 003/ PL/ A4 /103 Site location and site layout
Design and Access Statement

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

3 **The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the materials specified on the approved drawings**

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

Article 35 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 2015.