

**4/00708/16/FHA - PART TWO-STOREY PART SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION.
15 PHEASANT CLOSE, TRING, HP23 5EQ.
APPLICANT: MR A MORGAN.**

[Case Officer - Martin Stickley]

Summary

The application is recommended for approval.

The principle of residential development is considered acceptable in the sites location within a town and residential area. It is not felt that the proposed works would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the dwelling and would not significantly detract from the streetscene. Furthermore, the development would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. Access and car parking is acceptable. Therefore, the proposal is acceptable in accordance with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework; Policies CS4, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy; and saved Policy 58 and saved Appendices 5 and 7 of the DBLP.

Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling located on the northern side of Pheasant Close, within the urban area of Tring. The surrounding area is primarily characterised by rows of terraced and semi-detached properties. The property has a front drive and a stretched rear garden, enclosed by close-boarded fencing.

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for a part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension.

Referral to Committee

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

Planning History

4/02682/03/FUL CONSTRUCTION OF TERRACED HOUSE
Granted
06/02/2004

Relevant Policy

National Planning Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Dacorum Core Strategy 2006-2031

NP1 - Supporting 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
CS31 - Water Management
CS32 - Air, Water and Soil Quality

Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011

Policy 58 - Private Parking Provision
Appendix 5 - Parking Provision
Appendix 7 - Small-scale House Extensions

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Character Area Appraisals
TCA12 - New Mill East

Summary of Representations

Local Residents

3 Ash Road, Tring, HP23 4JB

The property is very narrow and the proposed extension will block light to the kitchen and upstairs hallway. It will impact the garden by creating additional shade to the garden. The property will be overlooked with a loss of privacy to the garden. At present the upstairs consists of a hallway and bathroom, which has a frosted window. The proposal is for a bedroom with two windows with clear glass, clearly affecting the privacy of the garden. Additionally we are concerned the garden will look more like a backyard than a garden. Finally, we believe this is overall changing the original purpose of the terrace from 1 bed affordable housing. One additional two-bed house has already been added to the terrace and that has created parking issues with indeed the loss of our allocated parking space.

Tring Town Council

Tring Town Council recommend refusal of this application on the grounds that it was over development of the plot and would cause loss of privacy in the adjoining property.

Considerations

Core Strategy Policy CS4 encourages appropriate residential development in towns. The principle of an extension in this location is acceptable and should be considered primarily against Core Strategy Policies CS11: Quality of Neighbourhood Design, CS12: Quality of Site Design and saved Appendix 7 of the DBLP - Small Scale House Extensions.

Impact on Visual Amenity

An assessment of the impact of the proposed works has considered the impact on the appearance of the building. Under the development guidelines of the Residential

Character Area TCA12 (New Mill East), extensions should be subordinate in scale and height to the parent building. This is reinforced by saved Appendix 7 of the Local Plan (DBLP), which states that in terms of scale, development should not dominate the existing house. Saved Appendix 7 also suggests that extensions should be lowered to remain subservient to the parent dwelling. In this case, the agent has lowered proposed extension to remain a subordinate addition to the dwelling. Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy are primarily concerned with the quality of design but do emphasise the need for development to integrate with the streetscape character and respect the general character of the area. Guidance set out by Policy CS12 states that development should respect adjoining properties in terms of layout, scale and materials (amongst other things). The adjoining neighbour (15a Pheasant Close) has an existing single-storey and two-storey projection. The proposed extensions would mimic this neighbour in terms of the depth (at both ground and first floors). The single-storey part would project approximately seven metres from the rear wall. It should be noted that the applicant could apply for a six metre single-storey rear extension under the governments permitted development householder prior approval scheme.

In terms of design and materials, the proposed extension would harmonise with the parent building in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and saved Appendix 7 of the Local Plan. The proposed extensions are set back from the front elevation and views from the public realm are obscured. Given the location of works, it is considered that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the street scene.

Therefore, it is not considered that the proposal would detract from the character of the street scene in accordance with Policy CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy. In conclusion, it is not felt that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the building appearance or streetscene in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy, and saved Appendix 7 of the Local Plan.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Consideration has been given to the impact that the proposed extension would have on the adjoining 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. The application site currently has two directly adjoining properties, 13 and 15a Pheasant Close, neither of which have objected to the proposal. As mentioned previously, the neighbour at 15a Pheasant Close already has a two-storey rear projection, which the proposal would match in depth. The architect was approached regarding potential loss of light to the other neighbour. He confirmed that the two windows on the rear elevation of this neighbour serve a kitchen (ground floor) and a bathroom (first-floor). An additional plan was submitted representing the 45 degree line towards the neighbours groundfloor window. As the two-storey extension would not conflict with this guidance (saved Appendix 7 of the DBLP), it is not felt that the proposal could be refused on grounds of loss of light. One objection letter was received from 3 Ash Road concerned with loss of privacy and loss of garden space. Although this property is located over 800m away, the comments must still be considered. With regards to loss of privacy, it is not felt that the relationship with the neighbours would not be worsened as a result of this proposal in accordance with Policy CS12 and saved Appendix 7. In terms of loss of garden space, the proposal would reduce the amount of garden, however, considering what could be applied for under permitted development (six metres extension), it is not felt that the additional depth would warrant a refusal.

The applicant as recently brought an additional piece of the land to the rear, increasing the garden depth to an acceptable degree. The garden currently has a minimum depth of approximately 17 metres, which would be reduced to approximately 10 metres as a result of the proposal. The end of the garden has a triangular point, adding a further 3.75m (approx.) to these figures (to represent maximum garden depths).

Access and Parking

The need for and ability to provide additional off-street parking should be taken into account when considering proposals for extra bedroom accommodation (saved Appendix 5 of the DBLP). The application site currently provides one off-street parking space, leaving a shortfall of 0.25 for the existing one-bedroom dwelling. There are no parking restrictions on the road. The proposal would involve the creation of one additional bedroom, transforming the existing one-bedroom dwelling to a dwelling with two bedrooms. A dwelling of this size would generate a maximum requirement of 1.5 on site car parking spaces; 0.25 above the existing requirement for the existing one-bedroom dwelling on the application site. However, the site is located proximate (walking distance) to the local centre within Tring. Therefore, it is not considered that the shortfall of 0.25 car parking space would place undue stress on the surrounding road network. It follows that the parking arrangements are acceptable in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy 58 and saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION - That planning permission be **GRANTED** 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.

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

**APT/0316/104
APT/0316/105
APT/0316/106**

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

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) Order 2015.