

4/01559/18/FHA	TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND PART SINGLE, PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH REAR ROOFLIGHT AND FRONT PORCH
Site Address	80 WESTFIELD ROAD, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3PW
Applicant	Mr B Greene, 80 Westfield Road
Case Officer	Briony Curtain
Referral to Committee	Objection from Berkhamsted Town Council

1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**

2. Summary

2.1 The application site is located in a residential area of Berkhamsted wherein extensions are acceptable in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy 2013. The size, scale and design of the extensions respect the existing building and would successfully integrate into the existing streetscape. There are other examples of very similar extensions in the immediate vicinity. Given their size, position and orientation the extensions would not cause significant harm to the residential amenities of adjacent properties. The proposal complies with Policies CS4, CS8, CS11, and CS12.

3. Site Description

3.1 The site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling which falls within the BCA16 (Durrants) Character Area. In common with the adjacent properties in this part of the road, the property sits at a lower level than the highway with a grassed bank in front. The spacing between each pair of houses is fairly generous in this part of the road, with each property having a brick built storage shed / outbuilding to the side. However the wider street scene is fairly dense and less open, with a variety of housing types and sizes, many of which extend across the full width of plots at two storey level.

3.2 Several properties in the immediate vicinity (most noticeably No.s 72 & 74) have undertaken similar two storey side extensions to the boundaries.

4. Proposal

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the construction of a two storey side/rear extension and a single storey rear extension.

The proposal has been amended during the course of the application, the two storey rear projection has been reduced from 3m to 2m and a hipped roof, has replaced the originally proposed gable.

5. Relevant Planning History

None.

6. Policies

6.1 National Policy Guidance

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

6.2 Adopted Core Strategy (2013)

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

6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004)

Appendix 3 - Layout and Design of Residential Areas

- Appendix 7 - Small-Scale House Extensions

7. Constraints

- 15.2M AIR DIR LIMIT
- HALTON DOTTED BLACK
- CIL1

8. Representations

Consultation responses

8.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

8.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B

9. Considerations

Main issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Policy and principle
- Impact on character and appearance of existing dwelling house / street scene
- Impact on residential amenities of adjoining properties
- Impact on Highway Safety
- Other

Policy and Principle

9.2 The application site is located in the built up area of Berkhamsted, wherein the principle of residential extension is acceptable subject to compliance with the relevant national and local policies outlined below. The main issues in the consideration of this application relate to the impact of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling house, immediate street scene and residential

amenity of neighbouring properties.

Impact on existing dwelling house / Street Scene

9.3 There would be no adverse effects and no objection has been received from the Town Council in relation to the visual appearance of the proposed extensions.

9.4 The extensions would reflect the design, roof form, and overall appearance of the existing building and would be finished in materials to match. The two storey side element of the proposal would result in the loss of all of the spacing between the property and the side boundary, and this impact would be compounded if the adjacent property No. 78 were to similarly extend. However, the loss of this spacing would not have a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. It would reflect similar existing developments in the area, and, being set at a lower level than the highway, would not represent a prominent or visually intrusive feature.

9.5 The rear extensions would not be readily visible from the street scene. Given the reduced spacing to the side boundary, there would be limited glimpses of the two storey rear extension, however, given its minimal rear projection at only 2m, it would not appear incongruous or intrusive. The single storey rear extensions would not be visible and as such would not alter the overall appearance of the wider area.

9.6 Overall the impact on the street scene is considered acceptable, the proposals would intergrate into the streetscape character and thus accord with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013.

Effect on amenity of Neighbours

9.7 The impact of the development would largely be confined to the immediate neighbouring properties of No.s 78 and 82 Westfield Road. The proposal is not considered to have a significant adverse impact on their residential amenity in terms of light, privacy or visual intrusion and thus complies with Policy CS12 (c) in this regard.

9.8 To the east, No. 78 itself is set away from the common boundary and separated from the application site by its own sheds and outbuildings. The two storey rear element of the proposal has been amended during the course of the application to reduce its visual impact and has been limited to 2m deep as opposed to the 3m originally proposed. In addition a hipped roof to reduce the mass and bulk at roof level has been introduced. The extensions would be visible but would not breach a 45 degree angle of light from the nearest rear facing windows, and would not appear unduly prominent or oppressive. There would be no significant loss of light.

9.9 To the west there would be a limited impact on the amenities of No. 82 which is the other half of the semi-detached dwelling. The single storey rear extension would abut the common boundary and would, as the Town Council note, breach a 45 degree line from the rear facing ground floor windows. However, it should be noted that the extension does not breach the 45 degree rule in the vertical plane. Given the orientation, there would be a minimal loss of light in the morning. However, the extension is not excessive in height or depth and an acceptable amount of light would still reach the rear fenestration of No. 82. Moreover, it is important to note that a 3m deep extension identical to that proposed could be constructed in this exact position

without the need for planning permission. This is a material consideration that should be afforded significant weight. The two storey element would clearly be visible from the immediate garden area but given its limited 2m projection and the fact it is set almost 5m from the common boundary it would not appear intrusive to a degree that it would harm residential amenity.

Impact on Highway Safety

9.10 The extension would result in the creation of one additional bedroom. In accordance with saved Appendix 5 of the DBLP, three bedroomed properties give rise to a maximum standard of 2.25 parking spaces. However, it is important to note that there is no vehicular access to the existing property and no-off street parking provision for the current two bedroomed property. The additional parking demand arising from the creation of one additional bedroom is unlikely to be significant and, although on-street parking pressure in the area is high, a refusal solely on parking deficit could not be sustained, especially given the relatively sustainable location of the site and the lack of existing parking. In addition it is important to note that other similar proposals have recently been supported.

Response to Neighbour comments

9.11 These points have been addressed above.

Community Infrastructure Levy

9.12 Policy CS35 requires all development to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. This application is not CIL liable due to resulting in less than 100sqm of additional floor area.

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

Conditions/Reasons for Refusal

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>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.</p>
2	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:</p> <p>A100 Rev A A101 Rev A A102 Rev A A103 Rev A A104 Rev A A105 Rev A</p>

	A106 Rev A Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3	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. Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development. 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.

Appendix A

Consultation responses

Berkhamsted Town Council

Original Plans;

Objection. Loss of light to adjacent property and the 45-degree rule is infringed from the ground floor windows. Appendix 7 (v)

Amended Plans;

Objection

The infringement of the 45^o rule from the ground floor windows remains an issue.
Appendix 7 (c)

Appendix B

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

Objections

Address	Comments
---------	----------

78 Westfield Rd; object	In the autumn months we will be losing light in the hall way kitchen bathroom and top half of the garden we put in to. Darker shadow in the day time
-------------------------	--

82 Westfield Rd - Object

From the plans proposed the rear extension will extend 3 metres into the rear garden, we feel this will diminish the amount of sunlight available to the 3 metre stretch of our garden, from early to mid morning daily.

Our property 82 Westfield Roads back garden is north east facing and the sun rises in the east, moving clockwise throughout the morning. We already lose much light from large trees at bottom of our garden and gardens of 80 & 78 Westfield Road. We have taken photos of the suns position during these times and are happy to provide them. Also we think that we will lose light inside the main living area at rear of house. Light is already lost from the front of house due to large trees and the house being lower than the road.

During construction we are worried about parking as there are only 2 parking bays in front of the properties, where would a skip go and materials be left as parking is already at a premium, so many people have on average 2 cars per household.

Amended Plans;

82 Westfield Road - Object

We have looked at the plans and the only thing that we can see thats changed is the top floor extension has been decreased from 3m to 2m but ground floor is still 3m. Which means we will still lose light from our rear (dining room window) and our view to the right will be a solid brick wall.