DELEGATED FILE NOTE

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

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/00642/FPH	First floor side extension	Oak Tree Cottage Hexton Road Lilley Luton Hertfordshire LU2 8NA

Submitted Plan Nos

1.1 RevA; 1.2 Rev00.

1.0 Policies

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

Policy 2 – Green Belt
Policy 3 – Settlements in the Green Belt
Policy 28 - House Extensions
Policy 30: Replacement or Extension of Dwellings in the Countryside
Policy 55 - Car Parking Standards

1.2 **National Planning Policy Framework.**

Section 7 - Requiring good design.
Section 9 – Protecting Green Belt land

1.3 **Emerging Local Plan 2011-2031 (Approved by Full Council 11th April 2017).**

SP5 – Countryside and Green Belt
D1 - Sustainable Design;
D2 – House extensions and replacement dwellings;
D3 – Protecting living conditions;
T2 - Parking

1.4 **Supplementary Planning Document**

Vehicle Parking at New Development September 2011

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 None relevant.

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **Local residents**
No representations received.

3.2 **Lilley Parish Council**
No response received.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

4.1.1 Oak Tree Cottage is a semi-detached residential property. It is situated on the east side of the road towards the northern end of Lilley. Lilley is quite a linear village and extends quite far north beyond the small core of the village towards Hexton. Lilley is washed-over by Green Belt.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 First floor side extension. The extension is proposed to have a hipped roof and

would be positioned above the existing garage. The front wall of the extension would be set behind the front of the host dwelling and would extend to the same width and depth as the main house. The extension is proposed to be rendered and have roof tiles to match.

4.3 **Key Issues**

4.3.1 The key issues for consideration are as follows:
--Whether the proposal would be acceptable in Green Belt policy terms.
--The acceptability of the design of the proposed extension and its resultant impact on the character and appearance of the area.
--The impact the proposed development would have on the living conditions of neighbouring properties.
--The impact that the proposed development would have on car parking in the area.

4.3.2 Green Belt
Paragraph 89 of the NPPF states that:
"A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:
--the extension or alteration of a building provided it does not result in disproportionate additions over and beyond the size of the original building;"

In my view, the proposed extension would be a fairly significant addition when considering the size of the original property. However, I do not consider that the extension scheme proposed would be disproportionate in relation to the host dwelling, particularly given that the footprint of the extension already exists. It is my view that the proposed development would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Policy 2 of the DLP takes the view that *"Except for proposals within settlements which accord with Policy 3, or in very special circumstances, planning permission will only be granted for new buildings, extensions, and changes of use of buildings and of land which are appropriate in the Green Belt, and which would not result in significant visual impact."*

Firstly I would suggest that an extension to an existing dwelling in the Green Belt is appropriate in principle so therefore the acceptability of these proposals is to be judged by its visual impact. The proposed development would have some public visibility but it is unlikely to have a significant visual impact. Moreover, an extension to this property is not likely to have a harmful impact on the character, appearance or openness of the Green Belt. I therefore conclude that significant visual impact is unlikely to result.

Given the above considerations it is my view that the proposed development would be compliant with the national and local planning policy regarding development in the Green Belt.

4.3.3 Policy 28: 'One metre rule'
The flank wall of the proposed extension would be set the requisite 1 metre from the flank boundary.

4.3.4 Policy 28 & Policy 30: Design and appearance
Policy 28 suggests that house extensions are generally acceptable providing they are *"...sympathetic to the existing house in height, form, proportions, window details and materials..."* and *"...pitched roofs are used where appropriate..."*

Policy 30 states: "*For existing dwellings anywhere in the countryside outside excluded or selected villages, the Council will normally refuse proposals for their replacement or extension if a materially greater impact would result. A landscaping scheme related to the surrounding will be expected. Also extensions will normally be refused if they result in a size, scale and design out of keeping with the original building and give the effect of a new dwelling."*

In my view the proposed extension would have an acceptable relationship with the host dwelling in terms of its size and design and would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area. The extension would be quite large but I do not believe that it would give the effect of a new dwelling.

The proposed development would be compliant with the relevant local and national planning policy regarding house extensions and design.

4.3.5 Impact on the living conditions of neighbouring properties

The key issue for consideration is the impact that the proposed development would have on the living conditions of the adjoining and adjacent properties.

The proposed extension would be set away from the boundary with the adjacent property to that side and given the distances involved it is unlikely that the proposal would have a significant impact on the living conditions of this property.

Other neighbouring properties would not be affected by the proposal.

4.3.6 Car parking

The proposed development would not trigger the requirement for additional car parking to be provided within the application site.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 In the absence of material planning reasons to the contrary it is my view that planning permission should be **GRANTED.**

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. 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  Tom Rea Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 12 April 2018	