DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Tom Donovan.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/01430/FP	Extension to existing agricultural outbuilding.	Sperberry Hill Bungalow Sperberry Hill St Ippolyts Hitchin Hertfordshire SG4 7NZ

Submitted Plan Nos

SHB/01A SHB/05 SHB/06

1.0 Policies

1.1 **North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No.2 with alterations**

Policy 2 - Green Belt
Policy 55 – Car Parking Standards

1.2 **National Planning Policy Framework**

Chapter 7 - Requiring good design
Chapter 9 - Protecting Green Belt land
Chapter 11 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.3 **North Hertfordshire Draft Local Plan 2011-2031**

The policies of relevance in this instance are as follows:

Strategic Policies
SP5 - Countryside and Green Belt
SP9 – Design

Development Management Policies
T1 – Assessment of transport matters
D1 – Sustainable design
D3 – Protecting living conditions

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 None relevant.

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **Public Notice/ Local Residents**
No representations received.

3.2 **St Ippolyts Parish Council**
No objection.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

4.1.1 The application building is located at the far end of a field situated at the rear of Sperberry Hill Bungalow.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 Extension to existing single storey agricultural building. The extension is proposed to measure 6m in width and 9.25m in depth. The roof is proposed to continue the existing pitched roof across and would have a gable projection.

Facing materials to match the existing.

4.3 **Key Issues**

4.3.1 The key issues for consideration are as follows:
--Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness (if it is found to be so), and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations.;
--The effect on the character and appearance of the area;
--The effect on the living conditions of neighbouring properties.
--The effect on the safe operation of the highway.

4.3.2 Green Belt: Inappropriate development
Policy background
Paragraph 89 of the NPPF (the Framework) states that new buildings in the Green Belt are inappropriate development, with certain exceptions including the extension or addition of an existing building provided it is not a disproportionate addition above the size of the original building. Policy 2 of the saved Local Plan states that development will be granted for proposals that are appropriate in Green Belt and which do not result in 'significant visual impact'. Emerging Policy SP5 largely defers to the provisions of the Framework.

4.3.3 *The Framework*
In my view the proposed extension would not be a disproportionate addition to the existing building. In line with bullet-point of paragraph 89 of the Framework the proposal would therefore not be inappropriate development. As the proposal would not be inappropriate there is no requirement to consider the impact that the proposed development would have on the openness or purposes of the Green Belt.

4.3.4 *Saved Local Plan*
Policy 2 of the Saved Local Plan states that permission will be granted for proposals that are ‘appropriate’ in the Green Belt and if ‘significant visual impact’ would not result. In line with the conclusions made in paragraph 4.3.3 of this report, it is deemed that the proposal would not be inappropriate development and would thereby be appropriate. The extension to the building would be relatively modest and therefore significant visual impact would not result.

4.3.5 *Emerging Plan*
The Emerging Plan has yet to be adopted but the Examination in Public has been undertaken and the site is proposed to remain in the Green Belt. Policy SP5 is largely consistent with the aims of the Framework and therefore I consider that the proposal is not inappropriate development in accordance with the provisions of SP5 and the Framework.

4.3.6 Visual impact
The application site is not in a particularly visually sensitive area. In any case, as the proposed extension is not considered to be a disproportionate addition, I do not consider that it would cause any visual harm.

4.3.7 Impact on neighbouring properties
The site is some distance from the nearest residential properties and therefore I am satisfied that neighbouring properties would not be negatively affected by the proposal.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 The proposal would be acceptable in planning terms and therefore it is my recommendation that planning permission is **GRANTED**.

4.5 **Alternative options**

4.5.1 Not applicable.

5.0 **Recommendation**

5.1 Planning permission is **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. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. 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  Simon Ellis Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF

Date: 13 July 2018	