

4/00533/18/FHA	PITCHED ROOF TO GARAGE. REPLACEMENT GARAGE DOOR.
Site Address	16 BARTEL CLOSE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 8LX
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Macdonald, 16
Case Officer	Rachel Marber
Referral to Committee	Called-in by Cllr Sutton 'A development of this nature would be out of character with surrounding properties.'

1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**

2. Summary

2.1 The proposed replacement garage roof and door through size, position and design would not adversely impact upon the visual amenity of the existing dwellinghouse, immediate street scene or the residential amenity of neighbouring residents. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS4, CS11, CS12 and CS24 of the Core Strategy (2013), Leverstock Green East Character Area Appraisal (HCA28) (2004) and the NPPF (2012).

3. Site Description

3.1 The application site features a two-storey detached dwelling, linked to the neighbouring property through the adjoining garage. The application property is located on the south-west side of Bartel Close which falls within the Leverstock Green East (HCA28) Area Character Appraisal. The site is located on a corner plot on Bartel Close, set slightly further back from the other houses in the street scene. .

3.2 Bartel Close is a cul-de-sac and consequently the application site was built as part of a wider road of similarly constructed property. As such, each property is relatively regimented in terms of size and architectural detailing; however some properties within the street scene have been extensively extended and some newly built. Nonetheless, the overall character of the Close remains evident.

4. Proposal

4.1 Planning permission is sought for a pitched roof above the garage and replacement of two single garage doors for one detached garage door.

5. Relevant Planning History

4/03444/16/FHA TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, EXTENDED DRIVEWAY, REPLACEMENT GARAGE ROOF AND ENLARGEMENT OF FRONT PORCH
Granted
21/03/2017

6. Policies

National Policy Guidance (2012)

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

Adopted Core Strategy (2013)

CS4 – The Towns and Large Villages
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design

Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004)

Appendix 3- Gardens and Amenity Space
Appendix 7 - Small-scale House Extensions

Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG

Development Residential Area Hemel Hempstead HCA28 Leverstock Green East
(2004)

7. Constraints

Established residential area of Hemel Hempstead

8. Representations

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

8.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A

9. Considerations

Main issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Policy and Principle
- Impact on Existing Dwelling and Street Scene
- Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy and Principle

9.2 The application site is located within a residential area, wherein in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy (2013) the principle of a residential extension is acceptable subject to compliance with the relevant national and local policies outlined below. The main issues of consideration relate to the impact of the proposal's character and appearance upon the existing dwellinghouse, immediate street scene and

residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

Impact on Existing Dwelling and Street Scene

9.3 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.

9.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance Document, Leverstock Green East Character Area Appraisal (HCA28) (2004) outlines that extensions should normally be subordinate in terms of scale and height to the parent building.

9.5 The proposed replacement of the flat garage roof to a pitched roof is considered a relatively nominal alteration would not have a significant adverse impact to the visual amenity of the street scene.

9.6 It is noted that all properties with linked garages have retained a flat roof however, other properties within the street scene do feature hipped roofed garages. For this reason the proposed works are not considered to appear deleterious in relation to the surrounding street scene. It is further considered that although the adjoining double garage at No.18 will remain flat roofed, these properties appear as detached entities within the street scene and are not read in unison; in short, a change to one and not the other is considered acceptable.

9.7 The replacement garage door could commence without formal planning permission under Class A of the General Permitted Development Order (2015).

9.8 In short, whilst the introduction of the pitched roof would be different from the original design and character of the property, the merit of the uniformity and character of the street scene is limited and as such the introduction of the pitched roof would result in very marginal harm which would not be of significant detriment to warrant a refusal. As a result the proposed works would not result in visual detriment to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or street scene; accordingly the proposed coheres with the NPPF (2012), Leverstock Green East Character Area Appraisal (HCA28) (2004), Saved Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) and Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.9 The NPPF outlines the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact on neighbouring properties and their amenity space. Thus, the proposed should be designed to reduce any impact on neighbouring properties by way of visual intrusion, loss of light and privacy.

9.10 Due to the nature of the proposed works no loss of outlook, privacy or daylight to neighbouring properties would result.

CIL

9.11 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 floorspace.

10. Conclusions

10.1 The proposed replacement garage roof and door through size, position and design would not adversely impact upon the visual amenity of the existing dwellinghouse, immediate street scene or the residential amenity of neighbouring residents. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS4, CS11, CS12 and CS24 of the Core Strategy (2013), Leverstock Green East Character Area Appraisal (HCA28) (2004) and the NPPF (2012).

11. RECOMMENDATION – That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

No	Condition
1.	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> 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.</p>
2.	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:</p> <p>04 05 06 BP01</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p>
3.	<p>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.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development; in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).</p> <p><u>Article 35 Statement</u></p> <p>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</p>

and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

Appendix A

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

Objections

Address	Comments
18 Bartel Close	<p>I oppose this Planning Application on the following grounds:</p> <p>The proposed development is out of character, and not in keeping with the design and appearance of the other linked detached properties in Bartel Close. Please refer to appendix 1, showing the other 12 linked detached properties. You will see that none of them have a pitched/hipped roof over the garage. Furthermore, this will look incongruous next to my existing flat roof.</p> <p>There doesn't appear to be any mention of draining from the proposed garage/pitched hip roof. I understand that you have emailed Building Control on this matter and I would be grateful if you would contact me by email or phone when you have received a response.</p> <p>Under the terms of the Party Wall etc. Act 1996, I fail to see how such construction on the roof of No 16 will not involve damage to the party boundary wall and trespass onto my garage roof.</p> <p>Dropped kerbs of 16/18 & 22 form part of the public footpath and should be accessible to pedestrians at all times during the period of this construction. This has not been the case on many occasions since July 2017, when the original works commenced.</p> <p>I trust that you will be conducting a site visit in the near future and would be grateful if you would confirm when this is to take place.</p> <p>In consideration of the above points, I therefore ask that this application be refused.</p>
Cllr Sutton	<p>I have been in discussion with Mrs. Hazel Bassadone of 18 Bartel Close regarding the application at No. 16 Bartel Close. I have given this matter some consideration and feel that I must agree with Mrs. Bassadone. A development of this nature would be out of character with surrounding properties. I would also be looking for</p>

	<p>guaranteed assurances that, should any development move forward, no damage would occur to Mrs. Bassadone's property.</p> <p>With this in mind, if you were of a mind to grant this application, then I would wish to call it in for consideration by The Development Management Committee.</p>
--	---