**DELEGATED FILE NOTE**

**CASE OFFICER:** ...Jo Cousins.....

| APPLICATION REFERENCE | BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT | APPLICATION SITE |
|---|---|---|
| 18/00374/FPH | Two storey side extension following demolition of existing detached garage, tow sotrey rear extension and single storey side extension (as amended by plans received 11 April 2018) | 8 Cambridge Road<br>North<br>Barley<br>Royston<br>Hertfordshire<br>SG8 8HN |

**Submitted Plan Nos**

PL.100 PL.101 PL.102 Rev01 PL.103 Rev01

**1.0 Policies**

LP6 Rural Areas Beyond the Green Belt

| | |
|---|---|
| LP28 | House Extensions |
| LP30 | Replace or Extension Dwellings Countrysi |
| LP57 | Residential Guidelines and Standards |
| SECT7 | Requiring Good Design |
| XCGB1 | Rural Areas Beyond the Green Belt |
| XD2 | Hse Extns,Replacement Dwells,Outbuilding |
| XD3 | Protecting Living Conditions |

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 Permission granted under reference 04/00343/1HH for an addition of a first floor to existing bungalow, a single storey side extension and two front bay windows.

2.2 08/01115/1HH – three front dormer windows, one rear dormer and a roof extension granted.

**3.0 Representations**

3.1 **Barley Parish Council** - objected to the plans as originally submitted but have raised no objection to the amended scheme.

3.2 The occupiers of **7 Cambridge Road** have raised the following objections to the plans as originally submitted:-

1. The proposed extension to the right hand side of the applicants property appears to be within 300-400 mm from the side of our property, this would totally eliminate access to the outside wall or the roof and gutters for maintenance and repairs. Concerned that the construction works so close to our foundations may cause considerable damage which we would be unable to repair as there would be no access to the side of the property

2. Loss of light to a roof light window which allows much needed light on to our landing. Overshadowing and loss of light to a conservatory.
3. Loss of views from our master bedroom at the rear.
4. Devaluation of our property.
5. Concerned that noise and vibrations from the swimming pool pumps will be within a couple of feet from our breakfast room.

We would probably be more in favour of the pool being built on the land to the right hand side of the applicants property which would be far more suitable.

3.2.1 No comments have been received as a result of re-consultation.

## 4.0 Planning Considerations

### 4.1 Site & Surroundings

4.1.1 This residential property is located on the eastern side of the road being the last house on this side of the road past the cross road junction with Picknage Road. The site is outside the conservation area and the selected village boundary.

4.1.2 The property is one and a half storey in height with dormers in the front and rear roof slopes and currently has a linear footprint across the site with a detached double garage at the northern side. The properties along this road are of a variety of designs and scale and some have been extended which has added to the diverse design of dwellings here.

### 4.2 Proposal

4.2.1 The application has been amended by the removal of a swimming pool wing along the southern boundary. The application seeks permission for the following:-

Two storey side extension following demolition of the garage - a maximum of 6.7m wide by 12.4m deep with the addition following the ridge of the parent building and a gable feature over the garage which would project forward by 2m. This addition would provide a double garage, entrance and utility area on the ground floor with a bedroom, dressing room and en-suite above.
Single storey side extension – 3.1m wide by 6.5m deep and set off the boundary with No.7 by700mm. This addition would have a pitched roof with a gable end facing No.7 and a slightly lower ridge than the parent building. The addition would provide a Gym area.

The resulting building would have 5 bedrooms with adequate parking existing to the front of the property.

Materials are shown to match the existing building. See submitted plans.

### 4.3 Key Issues

4.3.1 The key issues in this application are whether the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the character or appearance of the rural area beyond the green belt, whether it would be sympathetic to the host property and whether any neighbouring properties would be detrimentally affected. The applicant has made amendments to the scheme to mitigate its impact upon the neighbouring property.

4.3.2 With regard to the local plan, Policy 30 is clear:

***"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."***

The proposal extends this property to give the building a modern standard of accommodation. In the light of my concerns to the original scheme the applicant has provided amended plans which delete a large pool room (12.9m deep by 6.9m wide and approx. 5.5m high due to the slope to the garden) and of a now reflect similar additions in this locality and accord to the aims of Policy 30 in my view.

4.3.3 The proposals would not appear to give the sense of a new dwelling in this location. I do not consider that they would unduly consolidation the development of the village on its edge adjacent open countryside. With regard to the NPPF I feel that the scheme is acceptable and have set out my further considerations below.

4.3.4 Design

With regard to the overall appearance of the proposal, the scheme as amended, does make quite a significant difference to the design and impact of the addition upon the host property. The amount of development when compared to the present structure in terms of footprint is on balance acceptable. The changes, by deleting the pool room are significant and have improved the design impact to the rear elevation. The front elevation remains unchanged and overall the design mirrors the parent and would appear as a simple link to the existing garage maintaining the ridge height of the parent building and any public view and harm. The design would not in my view conflict with advice set out in the NPPF.

4.3.5 Residential Amenity

In terms of any impact upon adjacent residential property, 7 Cambridge Road is positioned to the south and would be the closest and most affected dwelling to the proposed development. The original submission including a large and high pool room would have had an impact on residential amenity given its proximity to the boundary. I would however note at this point that a detached pool room set 2m off the boundary and not exceeding 4m in height could be constructed under Class E of the GPDO as 'permitted development'.

The pool room has been removed from the current proposals and overall the design and layout of the amended scheme would not have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenities of the neighbouring property. The additions would not involve windows at first floor level that would directly face to the sides and therefore there would be no loss of privacy here.

4.3.6 Other matters

The application site has sufficient off-street parking to serve the development.

The amended plans satisfactorily overcome the objections the neighbour raised and those raised by the Parish Council.

I have considered the need for additional conditions and do not feel that it would be necessary to condition that material samples be provided given the age of the dwelling where a good match could be sourced in my view.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 In the absence of any material or sustainable grounds for objection I have framed a

favourable recommendation accordingly.

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<br><br>Simon Ellis<br><br>Determining Officer | Development Management<br>North Hertfordshire District Council<br>Council Offices<br>Gernon Road<br>Letchworth<br>Herts<br>SG6 3JF |
| **Date:** 30 April 2018 | |