

**4/01658/15/FHA - TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION, REPLACEMENT WINDOWS AND DOORS, RENDER TO WALLS.  
3 YORK CLOSE, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 9HX.  
APPLICANT: Ms Judith Eary.**

---

[Case Officer - Patrick Doyle]

## **Summary**

The application is recommended for approval. The extensions are considered to have an acceptable impact upon the street scene where two storey extensions are prevalent, the west elevation which although appears large in plan form will rarely be visible in its entirety at street level and neighbouring no.2 helps break up the view of this elevation, from the front the two storey addition is a subservient coherent addition to the dwelling, with enough visual variation to break up perceived mass and bulk.

## **Site Description**

The site comprises of a two storey detached dwelling on the north side of York Close, a quiet cul de sac with sloping topography downhill from west to east. The property benefits from attached garage and front drive with parking for two gardens and large front and rear gardens.

The area is characterised by similar two storey detached dwellings of circa 1970s style with a mixture external materials in the area including upvc, painted render, brick and hanging tile cladding.

## **Proposal**

The proposal is for a two storey side extension which also projects beyond the rear elevation of the property at two storey level and to the front at ground floor level with a porch area which also reconfigures the existing porch area. The two storey element is to be slightly inset from the front elevation. The extension is to have a multi-hipped roof form which marries with the existing roof over the two storey element of the proposals. The ground floor front projection is to have a mono-pitched roof form which returns to the front of the front plane of the house.

Two windows are proposed in the first floor west side elevation serving an en suite and landing area. There is a door proposed at ground floor level in the west side elevation which serves a utility room and a patio door in the east side elevation at ground floor level in the proposed rearward projecting element of the extension.

A 1m gap is to be retained to the side which widens the existing distance by approx. 300mm between the side of the property and the shared boundary with no. 2.

The proposed materials include anthracite powder coated aluminium framed windows and patio doors, interlocking tiles to match existing roof and ivory cream render to external walls.

## **Referral to Committee**

The application is referred to the Development Control Committee due to the contrary views of Kings Langley Parish Council who object to the proposal based on the impact

upon the street scene.

## **Planning History**

None

## **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

### Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

Accessibility Zones for the Application of car Parking Standards (July 2002)  
Planning Obligations (April 2011)

## **Summary of Representations**

### Kings Langley Parish Council

The Council objects to this application on the grounds that by its design it would have a detrimental impact on the street scene at this location.

### Response to Neighbour Notification

*4 York Close - Comment*

We do not have a problem with proposed development at No 3 York Close.

### *14 York Close - Obj*

Following inaccuracies in the application:

#### Application Form

In section 8 – Parking. The agent omitted to state that the proposal would also reduce the length of the existing car hard standing by 1500mm.

#### Plans and Drawings – 5.12.2015

The distance from the side of this property to the neighbours boundary has not been given. The actual dimension is 800mm.

This drawing does not indicate the extent of the existing materials used on each elevation. To fully understand the proposal the current appearance needs to be indicated.

#### Proposed Plan – 5.12.2015

A dimension of 1000mm is given from the wall of the property to the neighbours boundary. This dimension is actually 800mm. Either the dimension given is incorrect or the proposal is to construct the two story side extension 200mm further away from the boundary than the current single story building.

This drawing does not indicate that the proposed extension forward of the front of the property would reduce the length of the existing car hard standing by 1500mm.

This drawing does not indicate the extent of the new materials that would be used on each elevation. To fully understand the proposal this needs to be indicated to show the difference from the existing materials.

#### Proposed Floor Plan – 5.12.2015

The dimension indicating the distance the proposed two story building extends out from the back of the property has been omitted. This dimension is 4000mm, the same as the ground floor plan.

Again, a dimension of 1000mm is given from the wall of the property to the neighbours boundary. This dimension is actually 800mm. Either the dimension given is incorrect or the proposal is to construct the two story side extension 200mm further away from the boundary than the current single story building.

Grounds for objection:

#### Visual Intrusion

The proposal to render over all the existing fascia's, currently comprising of the original facing bricks and hanging tiles, and then paint this Ivory White would be a visual intrusion affecting the whole of the close.

All properties in the close are finished in subtle facing bricks, either red Tudor or light dapple. No property has completely covered the existing facing bricks and hanging tiles in painted render.

This proposal would be completely out of character with the other properties in the close and even in the surrounding area.

What is wrong with leaving the existing facing bricks and hanging tiles that are in perfect condition and match the other houses in the close?

#### Adequacy of Parking

The proposed works will reduce the existing off road parking arrangements. Converting the existing garage to a habitable room and reducing the length of the existing car hard standing by 1.50 metres will result in only sufficient off road parking for one, perhaps two vehicles. There are already four or five vehicles associated with this property and with the proposed additional bedroom there is likely to be more.

#### Overdevelopment

The existing size of the property and its close proximity to neighbouring properties cannot justify the large scale of the proposed extension.

#### Proposed Deviations from Planning Portal

The proposal is to cover all elevations, currently facing brick and hanging tiles, in painted render.

Planning Portal states - *"materials used in exterior work to be similar in appearance to those of the exterior of the existing house"*.

The proposal is to extend 1.85 metres in front of the properties principle elevation towards the road.

Planning Portal states - *"extensions forward of the principle elevation or side elevation of a house and fronting a highway are NOT permitted development"*.

The proposal is to erect a two storey extension 1.00 metre, or less, from the boundary line and less than 2.00 metres from the adjacent property.

Planning Portal states - *"If extension is within two metres of a boundary maximum eaves height should be no higher than three metres to be permitted development"*.

The proposal is to erect a two storey extension along the entire side of the property.

Planning Portal states - *"side extensions to be single storey with a maximum height of four metres"*

The proposal is to erect a two storey extension extending 4.00 metres from the back of the property.

Planning portal states - *"Extensions of more than one storey must not extend beyond the rear wall of original house by more than three metres"*.

The Planning Portal guidelines are intended to indicate what is deemed to be excessive and inappropriate development of a property. The fact that this proposal is in breach of at least five of these guidelines indicates that this is an excessive and inappropriate development.

Due to the above points we request that this Planning Application is rejected.

*16 York Close - Obj*

#### Adequacy of parking

The property enjoys an integral single garage and space on the asphalt drive for two vehicles parked end on. Thus, the conversion of the garage to living accommodation will leave capacity for just two off street spaces. This is contrary to the Dacorum Borough Local Plan policies Appendix 5 parking provision, which states that for C3 residential use, 3 off street car parking spaces are required within the curtilage of a 4 of

more bedroom dwelling.

Furthermore, section A5.13 states that a car parking space should be no less than 4.8m by 2.4m. In the case of double end on parking, the allocated space should have a length of at least 10m. It is not clear from the drawings submitted that this is achievable in light of the proposed front extension.

#### Design, appearance and type of materials – Quality of Development

Policies CS11 and CS12 require all development proposals to be of a high standard. It states that development will not be permitted unless it is appropriate in terms of a number of criteria.

These include design and materials on the development itself and in relation to adjoining properties and in context of longer views (the street scene). The proposed development should respect the townscape and the general character of the area and avoid harm to the surrounding neighbourhood and adjoining properties. Any new development or extension should make a positive contribution and enhance the environment.

York Close is a development of 16 detached houses built in 1968/69 enjoying a rural street setting. There are 4 main house designs featuring either tudor red or dapple light brickwork with coloured concrete tiled or small white painted timber/PVC relief panels and coloured concrete tile roofs. Window frames and doors are white painted timber, white PVC, stained mahogany hardwood or more recently grey colour painted aluminium. These materials were common to the period in which the houses in York Close were built. Over the years, a number of front, side and rear extensions have been approved and constructed using these same materials, both complementing and enhancing the street scene.

The proposed two storey side and rear extension to within 1 metre of the boundary will dominate the view from 2 York Close. This 2 storey rear extension will restrict light into the garden of 2 York Close and beyond.

The bulk and massing of the proposed extensions are totally inappropriate for this property and the enhancement of the street scene.

The choice of Ivory Cream coloured render to the WHOLE outside (ie. all elevations) is not in keeping and will not blend sympathetically with any of the surrounding houses. It will have a strong and irregular visual impact and will intrude on the presently attractive and pleasant street setting. Furthermore, without regular maintenance its colour can stain and deteriorate.

My question is “why cover perfectly adequate external brickwork that has weathered perfectly for nearly 50 years with render?” Render is normally associated as a cheap covering of inferior quality materials.

It is quite clear that the covering of the existing face brickwork does not respect or enhance the general character of the area or satisfy the quality standards set by the Dacorum Borough Local Plan policies.

#### Design – Legal Bedroom Size

The minimum legal size of a bedroom is 70 square feet and a minimum width of 7ft (2.15metres)

There are no bedroom dimensions given on the application. From scaling of the drawings supplied with the planning submission, it would appear that the two new bedrooms over the old garage measure only 2.00 metres wide, some 150mm or 6 inches short of the legal minimum. This is without taking into account the thickness of the plaster or dry lining.

Furthermore, the en suite to the new bedroom in the rear extension does not conform to the legal minimum. Again, scaling from the drawing, this room measures 2.2metres by 1.1metre (2.42 square metres). The requirement is 5.2 square metres (2.6 x 2.0m). The proposed en suite is half the size of the minimum requirement.

Both new bedrooms and ensuite appear too small and do not meet requirements. The only dimensions shown on the drawings are the 1000mm between the side extension and the boundary with 2 York Close. The Case Officer will need to establish for himself the true dimensions and that the planning application meets all legal requirements, policies and guidelines.

Design – Overdevelopment

The existing building plot cannot sustain extensions of these dimensions, locations and materials. The proposal is a clear case of overdevelopment.

## **Considerations**

### Policy and Principle

Core Strategy policy CS4 encourages appropriate residential development in Towns and Large Villages as does policy 9 of the DBLP. The basis of determining this application is therefore centred on whether the proposal is held to be in accordance with Core Strategy policy CS12 and DBLP Appendix 7 - Small Scale House Extensions.

### Effect on appearance of building

The extension will harmonise with the original design with a subservient scale and be of coherent appearance and materials.

The side extension has a subservient multi hipped roof form which is set in and down and mirrors the existing dwelling house. The subservient additions and retention of a 1m gap will avoid a cramped appearance and retain access to the rear of the building. The side extension echoes the main dwelling and would help to retain an appropriate balance to the front and rear

The front porch will be an acceptable feature in the appearance in the front of the property adding a design detail and some visual interest breaking up the bulk of the structure. is small scale and does not dominate the appearance.

Whilst the rear extension will increase the scale and bulk of the appearance they are

subservient additions which accord with the appearance of the main structure which would have a non-harmful visual effect upon the appearance of the building. The mixture of roof forms of mono-pitch and hipped pitch roofs in this instance does not detract from the overall appearance of the property.

The matching tiles and painted white brickwork will be in keeping with the character of the property.

The window design is compatible with the remainder of the dwelling.

Overall the appearance of the property will be concordant with saved DBLP appendix 7 and policy CS12.

### Effect on Street Scene

The proposals will add to the bulk and amount of development in the street scene. Nonetheless the inset from the principle elevation and multi hipped roof will break the roof line retaining the essential characteristics of the street scene. The side extension will be non-dominant subservient addition to dwelling which will not dominate the street scene and co-ordinate well with the original design and context of the property and prevailing character of the street. The entire span of the extension will rarely be visible from public visible from public vantage points as the residential layout of neighbouring properties interjects and breaks up views of the property.

The ground floor front projection and remodelling of the porch is considered a visual improvement to the appearance of the property and therefore benefits the street scene.

There are other large scale extensions evident of the street scene and the character of the street is not of such outstanding quality that uniformity of style should be imposed, on the contrary some visual variation offered by the proposals will benefit the street scene. The proposed materials of matching tiles and ivory coloured render are not considered unacceptable there is mixed pallet of external materials in the street scene.

It is considered the proposal would preserve attractive streetscapes in accordance with CS11 and integrate with the streetscape character in accordance with CS12.

### Effect on Amenity of Neighbours

The layout and design of the property does not have any significant injurious impact upon neighbouring amenity.

There is a window at ground floor level in the side elevation of no.2 facing the proposed extension, this serves a garage and at first floor level two obscured glazed window serve a landing area and bathroom. It is considered any incidental loss of light to these windows serving non habitable rooms will not be detrimentally harmful to the no.2 and the proposals appear acceptable in accordance building research establishment guidance. The hipped roof form will allow sufficient light and will not have oppressive effect on outlook.

There are no windows proposed in the side elevation and the proposal is not considered to incur any more harmful effect upon privacy currently enjoyed by neighbouring properties. The windows at first floor level in the west elevation of the

proposed extension serve non-habitable rooms (a landing area and en suite) these will be conditioned to be obscure glazed and non-opening to prevent harmful overlooking.

The proposal would not unduly harm the amenity of neighbouring property in accordance Core Strategy policy CS11 and saved appendices 3 & 7

### Other Considerations

There would be sufficient on-site parking for this proposal. Policy 58 indicates a maximum of 3 parking spaces should be provided for a 4 bedroom plus property. The site currently has two onsite parking spaces (13m deep drive to the front of the property). Provision of two parking spaces would be considered appropriate in this instance due to the town location and access to local facilities and transport links, reducing dependency on the car. In addition the front garden is capable of being converted should the needs of the household require additional off street parking. On street parking conditions are light and a refusal could not be substantiated on the shortfall of one space off maximum provision on the basis of impact on highway safety. The proposal therefore accords with policy CS8, saved DBLP policy 58 and appendix 5.

No trees or landscape of significant value would be lost by virtue of this proposal and the proposal would accord with saved DBLP policy 99 and CS12.

Sufficient amenity space would remain post development in accordance with saved DBLP Appendices 3 & 7.

An acceptable CS29 checklist has been submitted this is considered to satisfy consideration of CS29.

Permitted development rights for alterations and additions to the roof under Class B would allow for exceptionally detrimental harm to the neighbouring amenity and the street scene due to harmful overbearing and bulky appearance of a hip to gable extension. In this instance removing permitted development rights are considered to meet the tests for conditions set out in the NPPF.

Some neighbour comments seem to be referencing planning portal guidance on permitted development rights this is not directly relevant to the determination of this application which is assessed against the local development framework and NPPF.

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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance**



**with the following approved plans:**

DBC/6/1/1  
DBC/6/1/2  
DBC/6/1/3  
CS29 Checklist

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

- 3 **The windows at first floor level in the side (west) elevation of the extension hereby permitted shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass to Pilkington level 3 and fixed shut below 1.7m above the finished floor level unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.**

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenities of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings in accordance with Core Strategy policy CS12.

- 4 **Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order amending or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within the following classes of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written approval of the local planning authority:**

#### **Schedule 2 Part 1 Classes B**

Reason: To enable the local planning authority to retain control over the development in the interests of safeguarding the residential and visual amenity of the locality in accordance with core strategy policies CS11 & CS12.

#### Article 31 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 2012.