

**4/03254/15/FHA - LOFT CONVERSION INCLUDING ROOF ENLARGEMENT AND SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION.
5 EGGLETON DRIVE, TRING, HP23 5AJ.
APPLICANT: MR WALL.**

[Case Officer - Tineke Rennie]

Summary

The application is recommended for approval.

The principle of appropriate residential development is encouraged in this location. The roof alterations and single storey side extension are of a minor scale that will not be harmful to the character of the area or the overall streetscene. The proposal will not result in any loss of amenities to neighbouring properties. The proposal therefore accords with Policies CS4, CS11, CS12 of the Core Strategy and saved Appendix 7 of the DBLP 1991-2011.

Site Description

The application site is situated within the residential area of Tring and comprises a two-storey detached dwelling. The property was built in the early 2000s. The development of which this forms part of is accessed from Nathaniel Walk and comprises of chiefly detached and substantial 4-5 bed properties, although there is a split row of townhouses at its eastern end. The dwellings are based on three slightly varied designs but predominantly feature front facing gables with hipped and pyramid roof forms. Loft conversions have been granted permission for two of the group of seven dwellings.

The dwellings are located opposite an Ecological Park that was formed as part of the original housing development comprising dense vegetation around a lake. The verdant dense vegetation screens the frontages of the dwellings of Eggleton Drive from wider public viewpoints.

Proposal

The proposal is for a loft conversion and enlargement of the roof space (to create new en-suite bedroom and attic space) and an enlargement of the side ground floor bay window from 1.0m depth to 2.0m depth. Within the applications the applicant has followed through with the plans for the hipped roof form (as advised by the case officer in pre-application discussion ref. 4/01595/15/PRE).

The proposal is a revision to the planning application ref. 4/02296/15/FHA that was refused by the Development Control Committee on 8th September 2015 on the grounds that: "the roof extension fails to integrate with the streetscape character, and fails to respect adjoining properties in terms of scale, height and bulk, contrary to Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy."

The applicant has subsequently amended the proposals to address the concerns raised by the Committee by reducing the proposed height of the eaves on the flank elevations from 2.8m to 2.2m so that the chimney no longer needs to be raised; the width of the ridge from 7.6m to 6.2m; and the number of veluxes proposed.

Further amendments have been made during the course of this application which includes further reducing the number of velux windows so that only three are proposed to the front elevation. The rear extension has also been removed from the proposals and replaced with a minor increase in depth to the side bay window that serves the breakfast area. A total depth of 2.0m is now proposed so that the bay window will have a total external projection area of 6.4m².

Referral to Committee

The application is referred to the Development Control Committee due to the contrary views of Tring Town Council.

Relevant history

4/01644/01/FUL - 23 DWELLINGS AND PROVISION OF ECOLOGICAL PARK
4/02296/15/FHA LOFT CONVERSION INCLUDING ROOF ENLARGEMENT AND SINGLE
STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION
Refused
08/09/2015

4/01595/15/PRE LOFT CONVERSION
Unknown
01/06/2015

Policies

National Policy Guidance

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

Adopted Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages
CS8 - Sustainable Transport
CS9 - Management of Roads
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS13 - Quality of Public Realm
CS28 - Renewable Energy
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction
CS30 - Sustainability Offset Fund
CS31 - Water Management
CS32 - Air, Water and Soil Quality
CS35 - Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policies 10, 58, 99

Appendices 3, 5 & 7

Summary of Representations

Comments received from local residents:

The following comments were received from the residents of 3 Eggleton Drive on 21st December 2015:

We wish to formally object to the development proposed and we have several concerns about the impact of the proposed planning application.

Once again we are not against a loft conversion as long as it does not involve a house elevation / modification of the house external appearance. The changes proposed are still minimal in comparison to the previously declined requests and we are firmly opposing the proposed planning request as it will result in a building completely out of character in the context of a harmonious purpose built Linden estate.

Our concerns expressed in previous e-mail remain current.

“Eggleton Drive” - Dundale Park is a Linden Homes, prestigious lakeside development on a single track Private Road ending in a cul-de-sac. This development features similar design houses to create a beautiful context.

Having had sight of the proposed the drawings and simulated photos on display at the meeting at Tring Town council on 14th December 2015 we believe it is imperative that any modification of the external appearance of the houses of this estate is constructed in keeping with the existing properties.

Please see our concerns with the above proposed planning application as we believe this will have an adverse effect on the residential amenities:

Over-development: The changes of the roof are still dramatic and change radically the scale of the property. This is set to become a 3 storey house in the context of 2 storey properties. The submitted photos are of the roof of townhouses which are not adjacent to Nr 5. I.e Nr 5 Eggleton Drive is not adjacent to any townhouse. Townhouses are designated 3 storey buildings which are a feature of the end of the street.

Loss of Light: this will be as a consequence of the elevation of the building and will affect nr 4 and nr 6 properties. The side of nr 5 will then look as a tall industrial building overlooking the neighbouring properties. The 2 side windows will definitely affect the neighbours' privacy.

Not in keeping with the street scene: The proposed development looks ugly, it is over-bearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity. The proposed development will affect negatively the desirability and will ruin the character and appearance of the existing properties. Mainly a gigantic mushroom sticking out from the roof area and covered in Velux windows. Not to mention “Velux” windows also on the front of the house. The ones on the back of the house we are concerned that they are at a height the

neighbours will be overlooked.

We do not object to the loft conversion providing it is carried out in keeping with the other properties (i.e. Nr 4 and nr 7 Eggleton drive).

Visual impact of the development Number 5 sits forward of nr 1-4 and nr 6, so it becomes the first property to expose its flank elevation. The extend of the brickwork in a relatively blank elevation will be unappealing and dramatically magnified. The design and the layout of the proposed front elevation (i.e. height of gable ends) is totally out of character in the context of "Eggleton Drive" - Dundale Park Linden Homes

Development and will have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the street. It is an ugly design and not in keeping with the same design of house No 6 (next door) and is not in keeping with the other houses in the road. It doesn't matter how much these gable ends are reduced in height they look awful in the first place. This is not a loft conversion but a creation of an additional storey.

Phase 2 family room at rear of property: the additional chimney stack planned as part of this extension will look unsightly and spoil the view of the other houses which will no longer share the character of a similar design and features. We also notice there will be hardly any garden left.

Traffic Generation/ Parking Issues: Eggleton Drive is single track Private Road with minimal parking facilities. No cars can be parked along the road unless in 2 bays. There are 2 bays along the road which are to be kept only for visitors (max 2 cars for each bay). The only permanent parking facilities for people living at Eggleton Drive are the garages attached at each single home and the drive in front of the garage of each house. The parking capability of each house is of max 4 cars (2 in the garage and 2 parked on the drive). If 2 cars are parked on the drive, the cars parked in the garage cannot be moved (i.e. at least one car parked on the drive needs to be moved to allow the cars parked in the garage to leave the premises generating annoyance, noise and fumes). There is no other parking facility allocated to Eggleton Drive. Hence if bays are occupied by permanent residents other residents will have difficulty in accommodating visitors.

The proposed planning will increase the number of double bedrooms to at least 7, increasing the number of people living in the house hence very likely the number of cars owned. If this planning permission goes ahead this will create a case for all the other houses getting a similar planning application approved hence the increase the vehicular access of Eggleton Drive way beyond the road capability. May I remind the panel that Eggleton Drive ends in a cul de sac (Kay Close) hence any vehicle accessing the road need reversing to leave the area.

The worst case scenario will be cars obstructing an emergency vehicle which very serious consequences to people and properties.

In the planning application they compare the size of Nr 4 roof to theirs and other houses in the street stating it is 80% of the bulk of No 4 and it will be because the house roof is of a completely different design and their house is smaller than Nr 4 so this statistic isn't relevant. The pictures that have been submitted of the 2 front elevations is misleading because the camera has taken the picture from the ground fairly close to the house (a sort of insect's view) pointing up to the roof so it is shadowing the proposed changes which can hardly be seen from this angle of the

camera lens

In summary, we are very concerned that if this is granted permission what is going to happen in the road with other future planning requests and developments because there will definitely cause a loss of the road's current beauty and character.

Comments received from the residents of 6 Eggleton Drive

The following comments were received on the 20th December 2015 following the submission of revisions:

The proposed changes are **minimal** in comparison to the previously declined planning requests. The proposed plans for a loft conversion results in a house that is out of character / not in keeping with the other houses along Eggleton Drive. As such we remain firmly against this latest planning request from No 5 Eggleton Drive and our concerns are expressed again as follows.

We do not object to the loft conversion providing it is carried out in keeping with the other properties in our beautiful development such as the work undertaken at number 4 and plans for No 7.

1) **Over development** - The changes to the roof are very dramatic and change the scale and proportion of the property completely to dominate the house. The design of the loft extension does not increase the height of the existing roof or extend beyond the exterior walls but it does increase the ridge line by 4.6m and introduces a half gable hipped gable at 2.4m high.

2) **Loss of light** - The development will impact on our quality of light, and could cast shadows over our garden at times. The end gables will look very tall and dominate the appearance of our house and number 4 and we feel the side of the house will look like the side of a tall warehouse.

3) **Not in keeping with street scene** - The proposed development looks ugly, over-bearing, out of character and proportion in terms of its appearance compared with existing properties on the development. The number of velux windows (even though 2 have been removed on the front elevation from the last application) draw attention to what is already a large expanse of roof. Velux windows do not feature significantly in the area and particularly not on the street elevation (Front of the house). Houses number 5 and 6 (ours) have been designed and built as a matching pair in the road and for number 5 to alter the design, fabric and elevation of the building of such large significance as proposed will have a large impact on the look of the house against the other houses in the road and our development.

4) **Phase 2 family room at rear of property** - We do not object to this, however we do object strongly to the additional chimney stack planned as part of this extension as it will look unsightly and spoil our view from our garden and will no longer share the character of a similar design and features in the area.

5) **Visual impact of the development:** we agree with the views of our neighbours at No 3's, i.e. *"Number 5 sits forward of nr 1-4 and nr 6, so it becomes the first property to expose its flank elevation. The extend of the brickwork in a relatively blank elevation will be unappealing and dramatically magnified. The design and the layout of the proposed planning permission is totally out of character in the context of "Eggleton Drive" - Dundale Park Linden Homes Development and will have a negative impact on*

the visual amenity of the street.”

We can see that the new planning application has been amended to reduce the impact the previous application had and we feel the changes are **very insignificant** and have not changed much from the original planning application. We do not object to the loft conversion or the family room providing it is carried out in keeping with the other properties on the development.

Comments received from residents 4 Eggleton Drive:

The following comments were received on 21st December 2015 following the submission of revisions:

We live at No 4 Eggleton Drive (next door to No 5) and we have viewed the revised proposed planning request. It looks as though the changes proposed are minimal in comparison to the previously refused planning request (1st Application) and the roof extension still fails to integrate with the streetscape character and fails to respect adjoining properties in terms of scale, height and bulk. The proposed changes are as follows:

1. **Height of gable ends reduced** – This is the part we object to strongly because it is an ugly design and not in keeping with the same design of house No 6 (next door) and is not in keeping with the other houses in the road. It doesn't matter how much these gable ends are reduced in height they look awful in the first place.
2. **Height of chimney no longer requires to be changed** – Noted and so it should be to be kept in keeping with the other houses in the road
3. **Width of ridge reduced** – See point 1. Not by much at all to affect the overall look.
4. **Number of Velux windows reduced** – Our complaint is Velux windows do not feature significantly in the area and particularly not on the street elevation. It is not the quantity of them, they just will look awful on the front of the house. The ones on the back of the house we are concerned that they are at a height where we will and the neighbours will be overlooked.

In the planning application they compare the size of our roof to theirs and other houses in the street stating it is 80% of the bulk of No 4 and it will be because the house roof is of a completely different design and their house is smaller than ours so this statistic isn't relevant. The pictures that have been submitted of the 2 front elevations is misleading because the camera has taken the picture from the ground fairly close to the house pointing up to the roof so it is shadowing the proposed changes which can hardly been seen from this angle of the camera lens.

Phase 2 family room at rear of property - We do not object to this, however we do object strongly to the additional chimney stack planned as part of this extension as it will look unsightly and will no longer share the character of a similar design and features in the area.

In summary, we are very concerned that if this is granted permission what is going to happen in the road with other future planning requests and developments because there will be a high risk of losing all the roads current beauty and character. The proposed loft conversion (which is a conversion of a 2 storey house into a 3 storey

house, not a loft conversion) results in a house that is out of character / not in keeping with the other houses (this house currently matches No 6) along Eggleton Drive. As such we remain firmly against this latest planning request from No 5 Eggleton Drive and our concerns are expressed in a previous e-mail (copy below) which remain current. We are also concerned with the increase in the number of bedrooms that this may also have an impact with an increase in the number of cars and parking in our road.

Tring Town Council

Comments received from Tring Town Council following consideration of revisions to the scheme:

The Council recommended **refusal of** this application on the following grounds:

1. Eggleton Drive was an architect designed development as a whole concept. The scale of the proposed changes to No. 5 would be out-of-keeping with the original concept
2. The pre-application advice given to the applicant included a preference for dormer windows as being in-keeping with the street scene. The applicant did not follow this advice because its application would not generate the space required because of the internal layout of the dwelling. The use of gabled hip ends to achieve the goal means that the proposed development is effectively an additional storey not a loft conversion
3. The resulting scale of the proposed development is out-of-keeping with neighbourhood

Whilst the number of velux windows have been reduced, they are considered to be out of keeping with the street scene

Hertfordshire Ecology

Comments have not been received from Hertfordshire Ecology in relation to this application however the comments made on the previous application remain relevant and applicable to this application:

1. We have no bat records from Eggleton Drive itself but there are records from adjacent roads and properties. Furthermore bats will be using the adjacent Dundale wood and lake Wildlife Site, so it is clear bats are active throughout this area, and could potentially be using the roof space of the property.
2. The proposals themselves will have a significant impact on the existing roof, and will affect any bats that may be present.
3. Although the properties are relatively recent, this in itself would not preclude bats from using them – they have been known to roost even within modern warehousing. However, it is apparent from the available Google streetview that the roofs are in very good condition with little or no missing or gaps between tiles. Furthermore the soffits are also modern, in good condition and tightly fitting leaving little or no gaps of any

kind.

4. On this basis I consider that the potential bat access to the roof is most likely to be negligible and that it is therefore unreasonable for the LPA to require a bat assessment on this occasion.

5. However, bats and their roost remain protected and could still be unexpectedly discovered during the course of any works. Consequently **I advise that an informative is placed on any approval to the effect that:**

- *If bats or any evidence of them is discovered during the course of any works, works should stop immediately and advice sought as to how to proceed. This may be obtained from: A suitably qualified ecological consultant; Natural England: 0845 6014523; The UK Bat Helpline: 0845 1300228 or Herts & Middlesex Bat Group: www.hmbg.org.uk ;*
- I am not aware of any other ecological issues associated with these proposals for which I have any significant concerns.

Considerations

The site falls within the urban area of Tring wherein the principle of extensions is acceptable. The key issues to consider relate to the impact of the proposed works on the character and appearance of the original building and street scene, the impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties and adequacy of car parking.

Effect on appearance of building

Policy CS12 states that development should respect adjoining properties in terms of scale, height and bulk.

Converting the existing space via the inclusion of dormers has been the approach taken with Nos. 4 and 7 Eggleton Drive (resp. 4/1391/04 and 4/0683/14). However, it is recognised that this does not always maximise opportunities to increase living space and the concern of the applicant that part of the floor area would effectively be lost to the stairs in order to gain access.

The roof area would be increased outwards from the ridge line (by 5.3m) rather than upwards so that the existing ridge height is maintained. To support the increase in width of the ridgeline and the half-hip roof, the flank elevations have been increased in height from the eaves.

The applicant has taken on board previous concerns about the additional bulk at roof level that would be created as a result of this approach, and subsequently reduced the ridge width by 1400mm and lowered the eaves of the gabled hip ends by 600mm. As a result the reduction in bulk at roof level is much more proportionate to the size and scale of the dwelling.

It is also important to note the unusual pyramid design of the roof which features significant ridge height and therefore bulk at roof level; the proposals would increase this existing bulk to an extent that is not considered to be disproportionate to the dwelling.

The half hipped ends reduce the impact of the enlarged roof area and end elevations, keeping the extension more subordinate, maintaining the general character of the dwelling and not detracting from the appearance of the original building.

The increase in depth of the side projecting bay window by 1.0m is minimal and the extension is considered to be acceptable.

Effect on street scene

The properties that make up this development have a strong overall character given they were built at the same time to a broadly similar design and palette of materials. As a rule of thumb, the roofs tend to be large reflecting the substantial size of these properties. However, they display slight variations in terms of design particularly in respect of the roof form. A number of the properties exhibit the same broad bulk of roof as that proposed (e.g. Nos. 3 and 7 Eggleton Drive), especially the town houses. Thus what is proposed is not considered to be out of keeping with the character of houses in this locality.

While the properties are built in a row, the road curves slightly and it is narrow. There are also a number of garages that extend forward of the building line. Eggleton Drive is also edged by a tall hedge line which screens it from the view of the Ecological Park on the opposite side of the road. These factors mean that any changes to the property will not be so visible/dominant as to detract from the general uniformity of the other houses.

The roof of the dwelling to the front elevation cannot be viewed from any distance further than the opposite side of the narrow road (approximately 13.5m). On this basis, any public viewpoint of the front elevation will be looking almost directly upwards towards the ridgeline. The gables of the two front projections dominate the view and obscure a significant proportion of the additional bulk created by the proposals.

The proposal includes a relatively large number of rooflights within the roof structure, however, with the removal of the lower level rooflight in the front elevation, as requested, these windows are placed in a symmetrical form and will not be so harmful to the appearance of the dwelling to justify refusal. Furthermore due to the obscured viewpoints of the roof as outlined above, the roof lights would not be so visible and dominant in the streetscene. It should be noted that in most urban situations that are not subject to an Article 4 Direction the insertion of rooflights is permitted development and falls outside planning control. There is no Article 4 Direction for this area.

The proposed extension to the existing side bay window would be well set back from the street scene and predominantly obscured by the 1.8m high close boarded timber fence and vegetation.

When considered in the context of the surroundings including the nearby three storey town houses, the proposals are not considered to be out of keeping or have an adverse visual effect on the streetscene.

It is recommended that the materials of the proposed extension match the existing dwelling. This will allow the proposed extension to harmonise with the original design and character of the house in terms external finishes (required by saved Appendix 7 of

the Dacorum Borough Local Plan).

Effect on amenity of neighbours

Policy CS12 states that regarding the effect on the amenity of neighbours, development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of privacy.

Visual intrusion & loss of privacy

Adequate spacing (of at least 23m) exists between the property and its rear neighbour on Nathaniel Walk, including landscaping at the shared rear boundary. There is reasonable spacing between its side neighbours because of the existence of existing garages on the side boundaries of adjacent properties. The additional development at roof level is contained within the existing footprint and consequently would not have any impact on the adjoining properties in terms of being overbearing or creating a sense of enclosure.

All velux windows at roof level will form part of the roof slope and are inset from flank walls. Due to the angled position of the velux windows combined with the distance separation between the dwelling and the adjoining properties to the rear and side there would be no significant impact in terms of visual intrusion and loss of privacy.

The single storey side extension is small scale and due to its height and separation between adjacent properties will not result in any loss of amenities.

Loss of light

The roof area will be increased but this will remain within the existing extent of the property (rather than extending beyond it and closer to the neighbours). In accordance with BRE guidelines there would be no breach of any daylight/sunlight angles that would result in any significant loss of light to adjoining properties.

The hipped gables will reduce some of its impact by allowing additional levels of light compared to a gable treatment.

Car parking and access

A new bedroom would be created by the development. There would be sufficient on-site parking for this proposal. The property is provided with a double garage which would allow for 4 cars to be parked off road. Policy 58 indicates a maximum of 3 parking spaces should be provided for a 4 bedroom (plus) property. The provision of three parking spaces would be considered appropriate in this instance to accord with Core Strategy Policy CS8, saved DBLP policy 58 and Appendix 5.

Ample space also exists on the road for off-street parking (without restrictions). This is considered to be a satisfactory parking arrangement. Therefore the proposal would not have any parking implications for the immediate area.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

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. Due to the small-scale nature of this application, it is not CIL Liabile.

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

- 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 and to accord with adopted Core Strategy Policy CS12.

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

Drawing No. 3 Rev 2;
Drawing No. 5 Rev 2;
Drawing No. 7 Rev 2.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Article 35 Statement

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage and during the determination process which lead to improvements to the scheme. 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.

INFORMATIVE:

If bats or any evidence of them is discovered during the course of any works, works should stop immediately and advice sought as to how to proceed. This may be obtained from: A suitably qualified ecological consultant; Natural England: 0845 6014523; The UK Bat Helpline: 0845 1300228 or Herts & Middlesex Bat Group: www.hmbg.org.uk ;