DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Anne McDonald.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/00407/FPH	Single storey rear extensions. Works to existing detached double garage to facilitate conversion into habitable space and erection of front carport. (Amended plans received 23/10/18).	Ventersdorp Barrington Road Letchworth Garden City Hertfordshire SG6 3TH

Submitted Plan Nos

01; 02D; 03C

1.0 Policies

LP28 House Extensions

LP57	Residential Guidelines and Standards
LP58	Letchworth Garden City Design Principles
XD1	Sustainable Design
XD2	Hse Extns,Replacement Dwells,Outbuilding
XD3	Protecting Living Conditions

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 There is a fairly extensive planning history for extensions to the property. Please see the site history sheet.

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 The application was advertised with a site notice and with neighbour notification letters when the original application was received and when the amended plans were received. Two replies have been received from neighbour's to the original plans only.

3.2 Key points raised include:

- The proposed hydrotherapy extension is a very dominant building and would therefore have an impact on our property. The plans show a pitched roof that will be very visible from our property. Would there be the option for a flat or glass roof as per the dining room extension?
- We are concerned that the pool pumps will have adverse impact on us and what sort of levels of noise will these emit? Has the applicant any plans for noise reduction? Sound proofing of the building or the erection of an acoustic fence?
- There are also works to the garage. Do these involve the increase in the roof height of the garage?
- There looks to be a path erected in the garden but no details of this are included in the application.
- The hedge on the boundary appears to have been killed by the use of garden chemicals. The rear garden has trees that once and may still house bats. Are there any plans to renew the hedging which will assist with noise levels and privacy?
- The applicants have not consulted us on their plans prior to the application being submitted, and we are the house that will be most affected.

- The size of the hydrotherapy pool is very large and far larger needed than for one child. An internet search states: *"The size of the pools will vary from a small hydrotherapy pool of 6m x 4m; the minimum space required for each patient is 2.5m x 2.5m, so for example a 5m by 9m hydrotherapy pool would accommodate up to eight patients".*
- We suggest that this pool is for leisure by the family and not just for hydrotherapy purposes;
- the pool takes up a lot of the surface area of the garden to the detriment of the neighbours;
- our house and garden will be over shadowed and over looked. The view from the bedroom window at the front of the house, which is currently of the edge and rear garden of the application site and the back gardens of some properties on Willian Way, is an open and pleasant environment. This would not be the case if the extension were to be built according to the plan submitted.
- We recall that a bat a newt population was recorded in Ventersdorp garden and the construction works will scare any of these away. Birds nest in the hedges and these should be protected. It is important that this habitat remains undisturbed.
- Any fence erected along the side boundary to hide the pool would be an eyesore in its own right.

4.0 Planning Considerations

4.1 Site and Surroundings

4.1.1 Ventersdorp is a large chalet style bungalow positioned on the south side of Barrington Road. The property is positioned close to the frontage of the plot, with a large rear garden. There is a tall hedge along the front boundary with the road, and a detached double garage on the west side of the property. There are photos in Anite.

4.2 Proposal

4.2.1 The application is seeking full planning permission for:

- the erection of a car port type structure on the frontage of the property above the front door. This is just under 4.5m wide and 2.8m tall, with a flat roof. The structure is to have wooden posts for support and a clear Perspex type roof;
- the conversation of the garage into a part wheelchair and medical supplies store and part en-suite guest bedroom;
- single storey rear extension. This is in three parts. One is a single storey rear extension to the property to form a dining room. This is just over 5.2m deep and is in line with the side flank wall of the property and extends across to the living room wall. This is to have a flat roof with a large raised lantern style roof light. The next part is an enclosed link or lobby leading to (the third part) a single storey building forming a hydrotherapy pool. This joins onto the rear of the existing garage building, and externally extends 12.5m rear of the garage building. It is part 6m and part 8.55m wide, allowing for an enclosed plant room on one side. This is to have a flat, parapet style roof. Allowing for the slight increase in ground level of the garden, the maximum height of this rear of the garage building is 3.29m with it reducing down to just under 3m at the end elevation.

4.3 Key Issues

- I have no objection to this application.

- Regarding the single storey rear extension to form the dining room; this is screened in views from the neighbours by the existing living room and garage and will have no impact on any of the neighbours. Furthermore, given that it is at the rear of the property and is screened in views from the road by the existing bungalow, it will have no impact in views or in the context or setting of the Conservation Area.
- With regards to the works to the garage, as this property has the benefit of its full permitted development rights and is not a listed building, the works to the garage in my view do not need planning permission.
- Turning to the hydrotherapy pool building, this has been subject to extensive negation from the Heritage Foundation who objected to the original application. The building now has a lower parapet style roof, and has been reduced in depth and moved forward on the site so that it is now immediately rear of the garage building. The result of this change is to reduce the depth and height of the structure in the rear garden to reduce any impact on the outlook and amenities of the neighbours.
- The family who live at the house have a child with a disability and this pool building is for therapy for this child to try to keep him having some mobility for as along as possible.
- In my view, given the size of the rear garden, and the 'fall back' position where if the pool building was detached from the house it could be constructed as permitted development, I have no objection to this pool building in this instance. It has been sited on the side of the garden away from the ends of the rear gardens of the houses in Willian Way, and short of the side flank wall of the neighbours at numbers 1 and 2 Cloisters Cottages. I therefore can conclude that as proposed, even though neighbours will see the bulk of the building in views across their gardens, that the pool building would not have any real adverse harm on the outlook or amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.
- I note concerns raised by neighbours that the building seems very large and could be of the size to be used by swimming groups at weekends. This is not proposed as part of the application, and in the event that the pool were to be used in such a way, this would be a breach of planning control and the matter could be investigated.
- With regards to noise from the pool building, the plant room is within a room and noise from this should be minimal and is away from neighbouring occupiers. I note that on one side of the pool building, a bi-fold door is proposed and that splashing noise from the building could be heard from outside of the site. However, given that this is for a building to be used ancillary to the main dwellinghouse, and any noise from the pool building will be ancillary to the main dwellinghouse, I do not consider that this is an issue that could justify the refusal of the application, or that the noise from this would be so offensive or loud to neighbour's to cause a real noise issue.
- With regards to impact in the context of the locality, I note that it is a large building. It will be substantially screened in views by the existing dwelling at the front, and by the existing side hedge alongside the side boundary track. However, the bulk / length of the building will be visible in sections through / over the hedge. However, given that this is set back from the main street scene and is a fairly low structure in height, I cannot conclude that there will significant or material harm or impact on the setting or context of the Conservation Area, contrary to S.16 of the NPPF2.
- I also have no objection to the car port at the front. This is a light weight 'temporary' style structure. It is to provide a 'rain cover' over the car to allow the disabled child to stay dry getting in and out of the car. In my view it will not have a significant or material visual impact on the frontage of the house or in the street scene, and will have a neutral impact in the setting and context of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, due to the light weight nature of this structure, in the future this could be easily removed from the frontage of the house with a new owner or if no

longer needed by the current owner. For all these reasons I find this unobjectionable.

- The forms state that the external materials are to match the house, with the exception of the car port roof, and this is considered to be acceptable.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 The application is considered to comply with the necessary provisions of the existing and emerging local plan policies and will not have undue adverse harm on the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

4.5 **Alternative Options**

4.5.1 None applicable

4.6 **Pre-Commencement Conditions**

4.6.1 N/A

5.0 **Recommendation**

5.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

   Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the details specified in the application and supporting approved documents and plans listed above.

   Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with details which form the basis of this grant of permission.

Proactive Statement:

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted proactively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted proactively 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.

Signed  Tom Rea Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 13 November 2018	