

ITEM NUMBER: 5g

20/00571/FHA	Single Storey Rear Extension	
Site Address:	22 Deaconsfield Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9HY	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr And Mrs Butler	
Case Officer:	Sally Robbins	
Parish/Ward:		Apsley And Corner Hall
Referral to Committee:	Applicant is a member of staff at the Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The site lies within a well-established residential area of the town of Hemel Hempstead wherein residential extensions are acceptable in accordance with Policy CS4. Deaconsfield Road and the surrounding streets are varied in their character with many properties having been extended and altered in a variety of ways over the years. Many surrounding properties including the adjacent property No. 20 already features single storey rear extensions and whilst not as deep, they are considered to have a similar overall impact to the 5m deep extension being proposed. The extension would not be visible from public vantage points so will successfully integrate into the street scene and would not adversely affect the residential amenities of adjacent properties or highway safety.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 No. 22 is located to the south-eastern side of Deaconsfield Road in Apsley and comprises a semi-detached residential dwelling with associated parking and gardens.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 Householder planning permission is sought for the construction of a single storey rear extension. Measuring 5m in depth by 3.5m in height the extension will comprise a flat roof with larger central skylight.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications (If Any): None

Appeals (If Any): None

6. CONSTRAINTS

Parking Accessibility Zone (DBLP): 4

CIL Zone: CIL3

Former Land Use (Risk Zone): Industrial Estate, Frogmore Road/Ebberns Road, HH

Former Land Use (Risk Zone): Garage, St Albans Hill, Hemel Hempstead

LHR Wind Turbine

Parish: Hemel Hempstead Non-Parish

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Yellow (45.7m)

Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Hemel Hempstead)

Town: Hemel Hempstead

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)
Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;
The quality of design and impact on visual amenity;
The impact on residential amenity; and
The impact on highway safety and car parking.

Principle of Development

9.2 The application site is located within the town of Hemel Hempstead wherein residential extensions are encouraged in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy 2013. Moreover a slightly lower 3m deep single storey rear extension could be constructed without the need for planning permission under Class A permitted development rights. Given no comments or objections have been received from neighbours it is also important to note that it is likely that a 6m deep rear extension (also slightly lower than proposed) could also have been constructed without the need for prior approval or planning permission under the Householder Prior Approval (HPA) process. This is a material consideration that should be afforded weight.

The extension is acceptable in principle subject to a detailed assessment of its impact.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.3 The size, scale and design of the extension is acceptable and would harmonise well with the parent property. It aligns with the southern side elevation of the existing dwelling and is located to

the rear, such that it would not be readily visible from public vantage points. There would be only very slight glimpses between No. 22 and 20 (given No. 20 is single storey and lower) but only from directly in front. Given it would not alter the character or appearance of Deaconsfield Road street scene, it would comply with Policy CS11 and CS12.

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.4 The extension would not cause significant harm to the residential amenities of surrounding properties with regard to light, privacy or visual intrusion.

9.5 To the south No. 20 Deaconsfield Road is a single storey bungalow, which is set back from and on slightly lower ground than the application site. No 20 already boasts a 4.5m deep rear extension, which given the set back of the original property means it would continue to extend further to the rear than the 5m deep extension currently proposed. Given the two rear extensions would sit parallel to each other, and that of No 20 would continue to extend further, the proposed extension would not be visible from any of the rear facing windows or doors of No. 20. It could not therefore appear dominant or intrusive. There are no windows proposed to the side of the proposed extension and as such there would be no loss of privacy or overlooking.

9.6 Consideration has been given to the fact that the proposed extension would extend directly in front of a side facing bedroom window of No. 20. Although this will cause some loss of light and be visible (particularly as it is on lower ground), the loss of light would not be significant enough to warrant a refusal and there is already limited aspect to this bedroom. The bedroom window is located in the original building of No 20 and was inserted when the rear extension was constructed (due to the loss of the rear facing window). The proposed extension would be sited directly in front of this window. However, whilst the extension would be higher at 3.5m, there is an existing 2m high fence directly in front of the window which already restricts light levels and reduces aspect. The extension would appear 1.5m higher than the fence but would be set 1m further away (2m from the window). Whilst light levels would be reduced to a habitable room, this is a bedroom which is principally used for sleeping and as such the appearance of a single storey extension would not appear unduly overbearing or significantly harm outlook. The main habitable rooms of No. 20 are served by windows to the front and rear elevations and the proposed extension would have no impact on these. Given the existing layouts there is a degree of overlooking to this bedroom window from the immediate garden area of the application property which would be lost as a result of the works. Privacy to that bedroom would therefore be improved.

9.7 In relation to the impact of the extension on the bedroom window of No.20 it is important to note that an extension in the same position but higher at 4m could be built without the need for planning permission provided the eaves were 3m (as it is within 2m of the boundary). It is considered that this would have a greater adverse impact in terms of light levels and aspect than the 3.5m flat roof extension currently proposed. A degree of open aspect would remain above the flat roof extension as currently proposed.

9.8 To the north the proposal would extend 5m further to the rear than the other half of the semi-detached dwelling; No. 24. As such the development would have an impact on this neighbour in terms of loss of sunlight. However, this is considered to be mainly limited to afternoon sunlight in the months of the year when the sun is lower in the sky. Therefore this harm is not so significant as to warrant refusal, especially as a 3m deep rear extension could be constructed without the need for planning permission. It is further noted that the rear gardens of this section of Deaconsfield Road are generous in their length, such that there would be sufficient garden beyond the flank wall of the proposed extension. This would ensure that the proposed development does not become overbearing on No.20, whilst ensuring no significant loss of daylight to their rear facing windows and doors. Finally, it is noted that no comments have been received from this neighbour. Consequently, the proposed extension (subject to it being slightly lower) would have been lawful through the householder prior approval procedures.

9.9 No objections have been received from neighbours and it is concluded that there would be no significant harm to the residential amenities of adjacent properties. The proposal complies with Policy CS12 in this regard.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.10 The proposal does not alter the parking or access arrangements nor does it introduce additional bedrooms. There would be no harm to the safety or operation of adjacent highways.

Other Material Planning Considerations

9.11 Contamination

There are potentially contaminative land uses in the wider area (garage and industrial estate) but given the distance of the application site from these sources and the fact the site is within an already built up residential street there are unlikely to be any issues in relation to land contamination and no conditions are required.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.12 No comments or objections received.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.13 The proposed development would not be CIL liable.

10. RECOMMENDATION

10.1 That planning permission/listed building consent be granted.

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

1. **The development hereby permitted shall begin 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:**

DRG NO. 02

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 development hereby permitted shall match the existing building in terms of size, colour and texture.**

Reason: To make sure that the appearance of the building is suitable and that it contributes to the character of the area in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

Informatives:

1. 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 (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
8	0	0	0	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments