

**4/02191/15/FHA - PART TWO STOREY, PART SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.
7 CHAPEL CLOSE, LITTLE GADDESSEN, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1QG.**

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Wallace.

[Case Officer - Rachel Marber]

Summary

The application is recommended for refusal for the following reasons:

1. The application site is located in the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt. Within this area there is strict control over built development. The cumulative size increase of proposed and previous extensions would result in a disproportionate addition, over and above 50% the size of the parent dwelling. Consequently, the proposed would result in detrimental impact upon the openness and visual amenity of the Rural Area.
2. The proposed part single, part two storey rear extension, by reason of excessive depth in conjunction with height and the close proximity to the neighbouring property would result in severe loss of outlook and light for neighbouring residents at number 8 Chapel Close. The application has therefore failed to secure good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings.

Henceforth the proposal fails to meet the requirements of the NPPF (2012), policies CS7, CS11, CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 7 and policy 22 of the Local plan (1991).

Site Description

The application site is located to the south of Chapel Close, Little Gaddesden. The site comprises of a 1920s semi-detached dwelling house located within the designated Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Rural Area. The dwelling house is externally finished in brown rendered masonry with a plain tiled half hipped roof. To the front of the dwelling there is a driveway formed of hard standing. Parking provision would sufficiently accommodate two domestic cars.

Chapel Close is a cul-de-sac and consequently the property was built as part of a wider road of similarly constructed properties. All properties are alike in regards to architectural detailing, separation gap, height, size and build line. The area has a verdant aspect emphasised by the large front garden plots serving the dwellings. Several properties have been extended within the street scene; however the overall character of the area remains very evident.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for a part single, part two storey rear extension in

order to provide additional living accommodation for a dining area and kitchen at ground floor level, and an enlarged bedroom and additional ensuite at first floor level. The existing rear dormer would also be replaced within the proposed alterations.

Referral to Committee

The application is referred to the Development Control Committee due to the contrary views of Little Gaddesden Parish Council.

Planning History

4/00440/00/FHA SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND LOFT CONVERSION INCLUDING REAR DORMER EXTENSION
Granted
22/06/2000

Policies

National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Dacorum Core Strategy (2013)

CS7- Rural Area

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS24- The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (1991-2011)

Policy 13 – Planning Conditions and Planning Obligations

Policy 22- Extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt and Rural Area

Policy 97- Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Appendix 3 - Gardens and Amenity Space

Appendix 7 - Small-scale House Extensions

Constraints

Rural Area of Little Gaddesden

- Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- Area of special control for adverts

Summary of Representations

Comments received from local residents:

8 Chapel Close

Objection

- Loss of light
- Overbearing and loss of outlook

DBC Trees & Woodlands

No Objection

"No trees or significant landscape features on this site."

Comments received from consultees:

Little Gaddesden Parish Council

Support

"Little Gaddesden Parish Council have reviewed this application and have no objections."

Key Considerations

Principle of Development within a Rural Area

Policy

The application site resides within a Rural Area where Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy (2013) advises that limited extensions to existing buildings are acceptable provided that there is no detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the countryside. Saved policy 22 of the Local Plan (1991) promulgates that development should not be inappropriate or result in disproportionate addition, over and above 150% the floor area of the original building.

Assessment

The table below compares the floorspace of the existing dwelling house against the proposed and previous alterations.

	Original	Previous Extensions (4/00440/00/FHA)	Proposed extension
Floorspace (approx..)	85.5m ²	42.065m ² (+49%)	37.9m ² (+94%)

In accordance with the submitted application the rear extension has a maximum proposed depth of 2.65 metres, width of 7.35 metres and height (to ridge) of 4 metres; which including the first floor addition would create a total proposed floor of 37.9m², resulting in a cumulative floor space increase of 80m² (approximately). This would result in an 94% increase in total dwelling floorspace. This is a significant increase in

total dwelling size and would result in a disproportionate addition well over the maximum 50% increase permitted under policy 22 of the Local Plan (1991).

It is important to note that due to the proposal residing within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty a Permitted Development fall-back position is null void.

Subsequently, the proposed would result in a disproportion addition over and above the size of the original dwelling house, resulting in unmitigated impact upon the Rural Area. The proposal fails to comply with the NPPF (2012), policies CS7, CS11, CS12 and Saved policy 22 of the Local plan (1991).

Principle of Development in the Chilterns AONB and Impact on Visual Amenity

Policy

The application site is also located within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty wherein the principle of development is subject to prime planning considerations which give regard to the conservation of the beauty of the area in addition to the economic and social well-being of the area and its communities. Thus, development is permitted subject to its satisfactory assimilation into the landscape and accordance with saved policy 97 of the Local Plan (1991) and policy CS24 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Paragraph 60 of the NPPF states that, *'planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.'*

In addition, paragraph 64 of the NPPF states that *'permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunity available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.'*

Saved appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (1991), 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.

Assessment

The proposed extension would be of simple traditional design comprising of cream painted rendered masonry walls, plain tiled hipped roof and powder coated aluminium/timber stained windows and doors tiles; all of which would complement the existing dwelling house. These materials are considered acceptable for this type of proposal and would not detriment the appearance of the Chilterns AONB.

Moreover, no aspect of the proposed rear extension would be visible from the street scene. As a result there would be no adverse impact on the street scape, preserving both the character and appearance of the existing house and wider street scene. For this reason the proposed rear extension is considered to be a subservient element as it would not detract from the appearance of the existing building. In addition, the proposed design and roof form of the rear extension would match the parent dwelling and remain subservient to the existing dwelling house.

In regards, to the proposed replacement of the rear dormer, it would be marginally smaller in diameter than the existing and would be a minor change, of nominal impact upon the visual amenity of the dwelling house.

Overall, it is considered that the single storey rear extension and rear dormer would be subservient additions to the appearance of the dwelling house and street scene; accordingly the proposed coheres with the NPPF (2012), saved policy 97 and appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (1991) and policies CS11, CS12 and CS24 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Effect on Amenity of Neighbours

Policy

The NPPF outlines the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (1991) and policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact upon neighbouring properties and their amenity space. Thus, the proposed should be designed to reduce any impact on neighbouring properties by way visual intrusion, loss of light and privacy. Moreover, appendix 7 of the Local Plan advises that alterations should be set within a line drawn at 45 degrees from the nearest first floor neighbouring habitable window.

Assessment

Although, the first floor of the rear extension does not breach the 45 degree line as drawn from the neighbouring habitable windows, the ground floor element of the proposed does significantly beach this 45 degree line as drawn from neighbour pair number 8 Chapel Close resulting in a loss of light and outlook. The detrimental harm caused as a result of the proposed would be heightened by the close proximity of the extension to the neighbouring pair. Moreover, the proposed height (4 metres) coupled with the expansive overall depth (6 metres) of the proposed single storey rear extension would appear overly dominant and result in sever visual intrusion to the residents at number 8 Chapel Close. It is also important to note that Appendix 7 of the Local Plan (1991) states that single storey rear extension should only be up to 3 metres deep on the party wall boundary between semi-detached or terraced houses. This proposed rear extension's depth of 6 metres along the boundary of number 8 Chapel Close is a direct breach of the policy requirement. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed would appear overly dominant and result in a loss of outlook and

light to neighbouring residents at number 8 Chapel Close.

No invasion of privacy would occur as a result of the rear extension as no windows are proposed directly facing neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the proposed sliding doors, windows and replacement dormer to the rear elevation are appropriate in size, position and height; in-keeping with the existing fenestrations of the dwelling house. Subsequently, they would not result in additional impact on the residential amenity and privacy of neighbouring residents.

Appendix 3 of the Local Plan states that rear extensions should not result in momentous loss of rear garden space; a 40 metre (approximately) deep garden would be preserved as a result of the proposed. This would be significantly more than the 11.5 metres recommended.

Thus, it is considered that the proposed would result in a loss of daylight and outlook to neighbouring residents at number 8 Chapel Close and would appear overbearing and dominant. As such, the proposal would fail to comply with the NPPF (2012), appendix 7 of the Local Plan (1991) and policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Other Considerations

Sustainability

Policy CS29 of the Core Strategy (2013) states that new development should comply with the highest standards of sustainable design and construction possible. In this instance a sustainability checklist has been completed and submitted by the applicant for the proposed extension.

The checklist highlights that during the construction of the rear extension water and waste consumption would be minimised. Moreover, the proposed materials would be sourced from sustainable sources, with building insulation levels upgraded and water and electricity supply would be preserved. Furthermore a tree would be planted in order to incorporate at least one new tree per dwelling/per 100sqm.

Overall, the proposed sustainability checklist is considered to satisfy the sustainability criteria as set out under policy CS29 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Pre App Advice

Although, Pre application advice was sought for the proposed rear extension in 2014, no formal report or email was generated as a result of the meeting. The only comments noted by the Planning Case Officer was that "*Proposals appeared to be generally permissible - depth of first floor extension only question.*" Moreover, the applicant is made aware that although every effort is made to provide comprehensive advice at pre app stage, it is advised that this service constitutes officer opinion only, based on the

information supplied, and is not binding on the Council. In particular, should a formal planning application be submitted, other matters pertinent to the proposed development may be raised by further details, third parties and consultees.

RECOMMENDATION - That planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

- 1. The application site is located in the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt. Within this area there is strict control over built development. The cumulative size increase of proposed and previous extensions would result in a disproportionate addition, over and above 50% the size of the parent dwelling. Consequently, the proposed would result in detrimental impact upon the openness and visual amenity of the Rural Area.**
- 2. The proposed part single, part two storey rear extension, by reason of excessive depth in conjunction with height and the close proximity to the neighbouring property would result in severe loss of outlook and light for neighbouring residents at number 8 Chapel Close. The application has therefore failed to secure good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings.**

Henceforth the proposal fails to meet the requirements of the NPPF (2012), policies CS7, CS11, CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 7 and policy 22 of the Local plan (1991).