

<b>4/00524/18/FHA</b>	<b>TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND DETACHED SINGLE STOREY GARAGE.</b>
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>PENTWYN, COURTAULDS, CHIPPERFIELD, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 9JR</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Mr &amp; Mrs Head, Pentwyn</b>
<b>Case Officer</b>	<b>Sally Robbins</b>
<b>Referral to Committee</b>	<b>Contrary views of Chipperfield Parish Council</b>

## 1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**

## 2. Summary

2.1 The proposed two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and detached single storey garage through design, scale and visual impact will not adversely impact upon the local character of Chipperfield Village, visual amenity of the existing dwellinghouse, immediate street scene or the residential amenity of surrounding properties. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS6, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2012).

## 3. Site Description

3.1 The application site is located within the selected small village of Chipperfield and is situated within the Green Belt. The site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the southwest of Courtaulds, a small private road off Langley Road to the northeast of the village centre. Courtaulds is composed of six uniquely-styled detached and semi-detached properties. The application site is situated in a generous plot with mature gardens bordered by hedges, trees and shrubs. To the front of the property is a gravel driveway which can comfortably accommodate three cars.

## 4. Proposal

4.1 The proposal is an amended scheme of planning permission ref. 4/00097/17/FHA (two storey side extension). The current application seeks full planning permission for the construction of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and single storey detached garage.

## 5. Relevant Planning History

4/00097/17/FHA	TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION Granted 10/03/2017
4/00364/97/4	TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION Granted 14/04/1997
4/00436/96/4	TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION Granted 14/05/1996
4/00359/95/4	DOUBLE GARAGE Withdrawn 01/05/1995

4/00190/94/4      FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION  
Granted  
21/03/1994

## **6. Policies**

### 6.1 National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

### 6.2 Adopted Core Strategy

CS6, CS11 & CS12

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

Saved Appendix 3 & 7

## **7. Constraints**

- Small Village
- Area of Special Control for Adverts
- Former Land Use
- Green Belt

## **8. Representations**

### Consultation responses

8.1 Chipperfield Parish Council: CPC Objects to this application due to the excessive increase in floor area to original 'as built'

### Neighbour notification responses

8.2 None

## **9. Considerations**

### Main issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Policy and Principle
- Impact on Green Belt
- Layout, Design & Scale
- Impact on Street Scene
- Impact on Residential Amenity

### Policy & Principle

9.2 The application site is located within the village of Chipperfield in the Green Belt. Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS6 does not specifically include a reference to limiting percentage increases but states that house extensions are permitted within selected small villages provided

that the development is sympathetic to its surroundings, including the adjoining countryside, in terms of character, design, scale, landscaping and visual impact. It must also retain and protect features essential to the character and appearance of the village.

9.3 Paragraph 89 of the NPPF regards the construction of new buildings as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Therefore the proposed detached garage is considered to be inappropriate development and it does not meet any of the exceptions to inappropriate development set out in paragraph 89. As such, very special circumstances will need to be demonstrated in order to outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt, and any other identified harm.

#### Impact on Green Belt

9.4 The proposed single storey rear extension is acceptable in principle. However, as outlined above, the proposed detached garage is considered to be inappropriate development in terms of Green Belt policy. As such, the following very special circumstances are taken into consideration.

9.5 The proposed garage could be constructed under Permitted Development if it were situated 2m from the boundary. The submitted plans show that it would be situated a minimum of 1.2m from the boundary. It is therefore considered that the proposed detached garage is only marginally outside of the limitations set out in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the General Permitted Development Order. The garage would be situated 1.2m from the flank elevation of the proposed side extension and it is not considered that the proposed garage could be repositioned any closer to the dwelling without compromising access to the rear of the property. In terms of visual impact and impact on Green Belt openness, it is considered that there would be very little perceived difference between the proposed garage and a garage that was positioned 0.8m further away from the boundary, as could be constructed under Permitted Development.

9.6 The proposal includes the removal of two outbuildings to the rear of the dwelling, along the northwest boundary. The proposed garage would have a foot print of 27 sq m, which could be offset by the removal of the two outbuildings measuring a combined total of approximately 10 sq m. Therefore the impact in terms of Green Belt openness is considered to be modest, particularly taking into account the site's location within a built up area of a designated small village. In order for the Council to maintain further control over any future extensions or outbuildings, Permitted Development Rights would be removed in that regard.

#### Layout, Design & Scale

9.7 The proposed side extension would have a width of approximately 6m, a depth of 5m, an eaves height of 4m and a ridge height of 7m. The proposed side extension would have a new access door, a window and a dormer window on the southeast (front) elevation. On the rear elevation there would be bi-fold doors opening out on to the garden. Bi-fold doors would also replace the existing French doors on the northeast elevation of the existing single storey rear extension. At first floor level there would be a Juliette balcony, with views over the rear garden. The proposed two storey extension will be set back from the principle elevation of the parent dwelling by approximately 1m and the ridge height will be set down from the ridge of the main roof.

9.8 The proposed single storey rear extension would measure 4m deep and 2.4m wide with an eaves height of 2.5m and ridge height of 4m. The single storey rear extension would be modest in scale and would comprise a small utility room. The proposed side and rear extensions would be finished in materials to match the original dwellinghouse, including plain roof tiles, facing brickwork and painted render.

9.9 The proposed garage would measure 6.5 deep and 4.3m wide with an eaves height of 2m and a ridge height of 4m. It would be situated 1.2m - 1.5m from the northeast boundary and would have a timber frame with a horizontal wooden cladding finish.

9.10 It is considered that the layout and scale of the proposed extensions and detached garage would be subordinate to the original dwelling. The extensions would be finished in materials to match the parent dwelling and the garage would be finished in materials that integrate with the character and appearance of the surrounding village.

#### Impact on Street Scene

9.11 The proposal site is situated in a residential area of Chipperfield, a selected village within the Green Belt, which is characterised by a wide variety of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellinghouses in a range of architectural styles. Courtaulds is a small private road composed of six individually styled properties set in generous plots with mature gardens. Some of the surrounding properties show evidence of alteration and/or extensions. The proposed two storey side extension and detached garage would be visible from the street and surrounding properties. The maximum ridge height of the proposed side extension would be lower than the main ridge of the parent dwelling. Although the proposed extension would add bulk and mass to the property, it would be a subordinate addition.

9.12 The proposed build and form of the two storey side and single storey rear extensions and the single storey detached garage are considered to respect the original and surrounding properties. The scale of the extension is considered to harmonise with the scale of the parent dwelling and surrounding dwellings so will not appear bulky or overbearing. The detached garage would be modest in scale and would comprise a hipped roof in order to minimise the bulk and visual impact. There would be limited visibility of the single storey rear extension within the street scene. The proposal will therefore not have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the original building and would not look incongruous to the neighbouring properties.

#### Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.13 In accordance with the submitted plans, no trees or bushes would be affected by the proposed development.

#### Impact on Highway Safety

9.14 There would be no changes to the existing vehicular or pedestrian access.

#### Impact on Residential Amenity

9.15 The proposed two storey side extension includes the addition of first floor windows on the front and rear elevations. However, the large separation distances between the proposed extension and neighbouring properties Little Woodman (25m), Le Soken (40m) and Dellmead (40m) would not result in a significant loss of privacy or amenity.

9.16 Turning towards the northeast, the proposed extension would be visible from the neighbouring property Timdar. The separation distance between the proposed two storey side extension and Timdar would be approximately 20m, whilst the proposed single storey detached garage would be situated approximately 15m from Timdar. The front elevation of Timdar faces the side elevation of the application dwelling. The development would clearly be visible to the occupants of Timdar, however it is considered that the separation distance of 15m to the garage and 20m to the two storey side extension is significant enough to mitigate any loss of daylight or sunlight. Furthermore, the roof of the proposed two storey side extension would be hipped and set down from the main ridge, which will reduce the impact in terms of overbearing or loss of

light. There are no first floor windows proposed on the northeast elevation (facing Timdar) and therefore there will be no additional overlooking as a result of the proposal.

9.17 Taking all of the above into account it is considered that overall, though visible from surrounding neighbouring dwellings, the proposal will not result in significant harm to the living conditions of the occupants of surrounding units, in terms of overbearing, overlooking or loss of light.

#### CIL

9.18 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.

### **10. Conclusions**

10.1 The proposal complies with the Council's development strategy whereby house extensions will be permitted in selected small villages in the Green Belt, provided that the development is sympathetic to its surroundings, including the adjoining countryside, in terms of character, design, scale, landscaping and visual impact. It must also retain and protect features essential to the character and appearance of the village. The construction of the detached garage would be considered to be inappropriate development in terms of national Green Belt policy, however very special circumstances have been demonstrated that outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt. The impacts of the proposal have been considered with regard to the character and appearance of the area, the quality of the design and the impact on the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring dwellings. It has been concluded that the proposal is acceptable and conforms to the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Core Strategy (2013) and relevant sections of the NPPF (2012).

**11. RECOMMENDATION** – That planning permission be **GRANTED** for the reasons referred to above and subject to the following conditions / for the following reasons :

- 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.

- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within the following classes of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written approval of the local planning authority:**

#### **Schedule 2 Part 1 Classes A, B and E**

Reason: To enable the local planning authority to retain control over the development in the interests of safeguarding the residential and visual amenity of the

locality, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policies CS6 and CS12.

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

**DRW. NO. 01 Rev H**

**DRW. NO. 04 Rev J**

**DRW. NO. 05 Rev I**

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) Order 2015.