

<b>4/02890/18/FHA</b>	<b>HIP TO GABLE ROOF EXTENSION, REAR DORMER AND FRONT ROOFLIGHTS TO FACILITATE LOFT CONVERSION. SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION</b>
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>146 BRIDGEWATER ROAD, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1EE</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Mr &amp; Mrs Newman, C/o agent</b>
<b>Case Officer</b>	<b>Briony Curtain</b>
<b>Referral to Committee</b>	<b>Contrary views of Berkhamsted Town Council</b>

## **1. Recommendation**

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**

## **2. Summary**

2.1 The site is situated within a residential area of the town of Berkhamsted wherein appropriate residential development is encouraged. The extensions would harmonise with the existing street scene and mirror many similar extensions in the immediate vicinity. There would be no loss of light, privacy or visual intrusion as a result of the proposals.

## **3. Site Description**

3.1 No. 14 6 is a semi-detached property located on the northern side of Bridgewater Road within the residential area of BCA14 in Berkhamsted. The property has car parking to the frontage and is set back some distance from the road with private garden to the rear. Ground levels slope such that the property is set at a lower level than propertyies in Meadow Road behind. The surrounding area comprises similar properties, many of which have been extended in one way or another over the years. Many have undertaken almost identical extensions to that currently proposed.

## **4. Proposal**

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the construction of a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and a hip to gable loft conversion to include rear dormer and front velux roof lights.

## **5. Relevant Planning History**

4/02855/04/FHA TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (AMENDED SCHEME)  
Granted  
26/01/2005

4/02509/04/FHA TWO STOREY SIDE WITH SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSION  
Withdrawn  
14/12/2004

## **6. Policies**

### **6.1 National Policy Guidance**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

## 6.2 Adopted Core Strategy –

NP1, CS4, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS13 and CS29.

## 6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policies 13, and 58.  
Appendices 5 and 7

## 6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents [include only those relevant to case]

Environmental Guidelines  
Residential Character Area - BCA14 Chiltern Park

## 7. Constraints

- 15.2M AIR DIR LIMIT
- HALTON DOTTED BLACK
- AREA OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE
- CIL1

## 8. Representations

### Consultation responses

8.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix X

### Neighbour notification/site notice responses

8.2 None Received.

## 9. Considerations

### Main issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Policy and principle
- layout, design, scale in relation to parent property
- Impact on street scene
- impact on adjoining properties
- Impact on Highway Safety
- Other

### Policy and Principle

9.2 In residential areas appropriate residential development is encouraged in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy.

9.2.1 The main issues in this case relate to the impact of the extensions on the appearance of the building, the street scene, and residential amenities. Policies CS10, 11, 12 and 13 are

relevant.

9.2.2 It is important to note that the roof alterations (hip to gable) and extensions (rear dormer including balcony) could be constructed under Permitted Development Rights without the need for formal planning permission. As such the main considerations must relate to the two storey side extension and the single storey rear.

#### Layout, Design, Scale, etc.

9.3 BCA14 states that extensions should normally be subordinate in terms of scale and height to the parent building.

9.3.1 In relation to the parent building the proposed side extension would be relatively modest in overall width and would harmonise with the form and materials of the existing. The extension follows the same front and rear building lines as the existing dwelling and that of all neighbouring properties and is thus considered appropriate.

9.3.2 The hip to gable is unfortunate and would unbalance the pair but there are many other examples in the immediate street and, but for the side extension, could as stated be done under Permitted Development without the need for formal planning permission. The rear dormer including the juliette balcony could also be constructed without the need for permission. These are material considerations that should be afforded weight in current considerations.

9.3.3 The single storey rear extension is appropriate in its depth, height and design and would respect the parent property to harmonise well.

The proposal would accord with Policy CS12 and Appendix 7.

#### Impact on Street Scene

9.4 Saved Appendix 7 state that there should be sufficient space around residential buildings to avoid a cramped layout and maintain residential character.

9.4.1 The development Principles in Character Area BCA14 (Chiltern Park) (Area Based Policies 2004) state that extensions should normally be subordinate in terms of scale and height to the parent building, and should maintain a minimum spacing of 2-5 metres.

9.4.2 The proposal would maintain a 1 m gap to the common side boundary giving an overall 2 m gap. Given the relatively modest width of the extension, the proposal would have an acceptable appearance to the street scene. In addition it is important to note that there are many identical examples in the immediate vicinity, including the immediate neighbour at No. 144 and one away at 150.

9.4.3 The proposal would comply with Policies CS11 and 12.

#### Impact on adjoining neighbours

9.5 There would be no material impact on adjoining neighbours.

9.5.1 The side extension follows the existing front and rear building lines of the parent property (and that of the adjacent pair of semis) and as such would not breach a 45 degree line from adjacent habitable windows. No. 144, the property most affected by the two storey side extension, has its own identical two storey side extension, which features only front and rear facing windows. Given there are no windows to the side and no breach of the 45 degree line, there would be no impact on light nor would the side extension appear visually intrusive.

9.5.2 The single storey rear extension would project beyond those of adjacent properties but given its flat roof design, it would not appear visually intrusive or overbearing. To both sides it would extend just over 2m beyond the existing rear extension of No. 144 & 148. This is not excessive and would not result in any harm to their residential amenity.

9.5.3 The considerable back to back distance ensures no significant loss of privacy to the properties of Meadow Road behind. Moreover there are existing first floor rear facing windows that already permit mutual overlooking. Despite the level change there would be no significant increase in overlooking. In addition again it is important to note that many adjoining properties have identical dormers and that the dormer proposed, including the balcony could be constructed without the need for permission.

9.5.4 In all other respects the proposal is considered acceptable.

The proposal would comply with Policy CS12.

#### Impact on Highway Safety

9.6 The proposal would result in the creation of an additional bedroom, so giving rise to a 4 bedroom dwelling.

9.6.1 The proposal has a generous frontage forecourt which could accommodate up to three cars with relative ease. This is sufficient for a dwelling of this size in this location and would not give rise to any adverse highway issues.

9.6.2 There would be no material impact on parking.

The proposal would comply with Policies CS12 and saved Policy 58.

#### Archaeology

9.7 The site is situated within an Area of Archaeological Significance. The County Council have been consulted and given recent works to neighbouring sites (which noted no finds) it is considered that the development is unlikely to have a significant impact on heriteg assets so no comments are made.

#### CIL

9.8 The proposal would not be CIL liable (under 100sqm).

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

#### Conditions

No	Condition
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 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 in accordance with Policy 12 of the Core Strategy 2013.
3	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:</p> <p>BR PA 03A BR PA 02C BR PA 01B</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p> <p>Article 35;</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 and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.</p>

## Appendix X

### Consultation responses

#### Berkhamsted Town Council

##### Objection

The proposed Juliet balcony would cause both overlooking and loss of amenity. The Committee also question whether the rear extension breaches the acceptable 45°degree rule.

Appendix 7 v (ii); Appendix 3 v (i) and (ii)

#### Historic Environment Advisor - Archaeology

Archaeological monitoring of groundworks for extensions to the neighbouring property No. 144 Bridgewater Road, in 2009, noted no archaeological finds, features or deposits. In this instance therefore I consider that the development is unlikely to have a significant impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest, and I have no comment to make upon the proposal.

## Appendix Y

### Neighbour notification/site notice responses

No Comments Received