

## PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE SOUTH

8 FEBRUARY 2010

1.	<b>REGISTERED NUMBER:</b>	5/2009/2478/FULL
	<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr Leslie Wilson
	<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Part single, part two storey rear extension and single storey front extensions (resubmission following refusal of 5/09/1789)
	<b>SITE:</b>	56 Lakeside Place London Colney AL2 1PZ
	<b>DATE OF APPLICATION:</b>	21/12/2009
	<b>HISTORIC BUILDING GRADE:</b>	None
	<b>CONSERVATION AREA:</b>	No
	<b>DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW:</b>	Urban Area

**RECOMMENDATION GRANT**

### Background

No. 56 is a two storey detached property located at the end of a cul-de-sac, on the south side of Lakeside Place. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with a mix of detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings and two blocks of flats.

### The Proposal

The application proposes:-

- Single storey front extension, measuring a maximum of 3.9m in height, 4.5m in width and 4.5m in depth.
- Single storey rear extension measuring 1.8m in width, 2.1m in depth and 3.7m in height.
- Single storey rear extension, measuring 3m in depth, 8.15m in width and 3.8m in height.
- First floor rear extension measuring, 2m in width and 2.7m in depth.

The extensions will provide a bedroom (with ensuite) and lounge for relatives on the ground floor with the provision of additional accommodation on both ground and the first floor levels for the existing property. The application is a resubmission of a previously refused proposal (5/09/1789). The current proposal has been amended in the following ways:-

- First floor front extension omitted
- Rear balcony omitted
- Amendment to the proposed roof of the first floor rear extension

### Relevant Planning Policy

East of England Plan 2008

ENV 7 Quality of the Built Environment

St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994:

POLICY 12	Accommodation for Relatives, Dependants or Staff
POLICY 34	Highways Consideration in Development Control
POLICY 39	Parking Standards, General Requirements
POLICY 69	General Design and Layout
POLICY 72	Extensions in Residential Areas

### Relevant Planning History

5/94/0958 – Two storey side extension – Conditional Permission 05/08/1994.

5/83/1261 – Conversion of garage to kitchen and garage utility room extension – Conditional Permission 03/11/1983.

5/09/1789 - Two storey front and side extension and single storey side and rear extension – Refused 20/11/2009.

*‘The proposed front and rear extensions would, by reason of their size, scale, bulk, and design, be unsympathetic and incongruous to the existing building and the street scene. The proposed development would therefore have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity and character of the surrounding area contrary to Policies 69 (i) and (ii) (General Design and Layout) and 72 (i) and (ii) (Extensions in Residential Areas) of the St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.’*

*‘The proposed balcony would adversely affect the amenity enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 58 Lakeside Place at the rear of the site, resulting in loss of privacy. The proposal would not therefore achieve an adequately high standard of environment and would be contrary to the provisions of Policy 72 (v) & (ix) (Extensions in Residential Areas) of the St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.’*

#### Reason for Call-In for Determination by Committee

Councillor Gardner has called in the application if minded to grant for the following reason:

- Overdevelopment of the site

#### Representations

##### Adjoining Occupiers

Letters of notification were sent to No’s 46, 6, 52, 10, 4, 8, 44, 48, 50, 54 and 58 Lakeside Place.

No objections have been received. Any further representations will be reported at the meeting.

##### Consultations

None

#### Discussion

##### Previous Reasons for Refusal

The proposed front and rear extensions would, by reason of their size, scale, bulk, and design, be unsympathetic and incongruous to the existing building and the street scene. The proposed development would therefore have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity and character of the surrounding area contrary to Policies 69 (i) and (ii) (General Design and Layout) and 72 (i) and (ii) (Extensions in Residential Areas) of the St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.

The proposed balcony would adversely affect the amenity enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 58 Lakeside Place at the rear of the site, resulting in loss of privacy. The proposal would not therefore achieve an adequately high standard of environment and would be contrary to the provisions of Policy 72 (v) & (ix) (Extensions in Residential Areas) of the St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.

##### Design

The first floor front extension proposed under the previous application (5/09/1789) would have been a large and dominant addition to the front of the existing dwelling. The property has been previously extended at the side (5/94/0958), but the extension is barely noticeable as an addition when viewed from the street scene. The existing roof form of the property remains prominent, and the extension compliments the existing gable end roof form,

appearing as a subordinate addition to the original dwelling. The first floor front extension introduced a significant amount of mass and bulk, and the proposed hipped roof did not compliment the existing roof form (gable). Previously the proposed extension did not appear as a subordinate addition to the existing dwelling, altering its original modest appearance significantly. The first floor front extension has been omitted from the current proposal. The first floor rear extension aims to infill an area at the rear of the previous two storey side extension. The extension would be completely obscured from all public viewpoints. The previous application proposed an incongruous flat roof, at odds with the gable roof formation of the existing property, contrary to Policy 72 (ii) in that it would not be compatible with the existing dwelling. The roof form of the first floor rear extension has been altered under the new proposal to reflect the existing roof of the property. The first floor rear extension is now considered acceptable. As a result the first reason for refusal has been successfully overcome.

The single storey front extension would be well screened from the majority of Lakeside Place. The dwelling is set at the end of a cul-de-sac overlooking the two blocks of flats (opposite) and an expansive car parking area. The extension could not be viewed from the street when entering Lakeside Place, and the materials and design respect that of the existing property. Although the depth at 4.5m is considered significant, the position of the extension, and the scale of the existing dwelling reduces its impact. The single storey front extension is therefore considered to be acceptable.

The single storey rear extension is modest in depth and has an appropriate roof form. It would be completely obscured from public viewpoints by an existing fence and would not impact negatively on the existing dwelling.

#### Impact on the Neighbours

The proposed extensions are well positioned in relation to surrounding properties, due largely to the location of the existing property. The single storey front extension would not impact negatively on neighbouring properties in regards to loss of amenity, light or privacy. The extension is located over 20m from Nos 8, 10 and 12 Lakeside Place and 18m from the flats opposite.

The single storey rear extension complies with Policy 72 (viii) in that it would not extend more than 3m from the existing rear elevation of the property along a party boundary. Furthermore there are no properties directly adjoining the boundary at this point. Therefore the proposed extension would not impact detrimentally on any neighbours.

The proposed rear balcony/terrace proposed under the previous application has been removed from the current application and therefore the resulting overlooking, and loss of privacy to the neighbours located to the rear of the site at No. 58 Lakeside Place has been addressed.

#### Proposed use

Policy 12 of the St Albans District Local Plan Review 1994 identifies the criteria concerning accommodation for relatives, dependents or staff. It is proposed to use an existing room and single storey front extension as an annexe for the relatives of the owner. Policy 12 states that such applications must:-

- Form an extension to the main dwelling;
- Retain primary pedestrian access through the main dwelling (although a secondary access may be permitted); and
- Comply with the criteria in Policy 72 (Extensions in Residential Areas).

The proposed annexe meets the criteria set out in Policy 12. Although a secondary access is provided it is obscured from the street, and could therefore not be viewed as the principal route of pedestrian access. The extension is considered acceptable in regards to Policy 72

as discussed previously and would form an extension to the existing dwelling. However should the application receive approval, a condition should be attached ensuring the annexe shall not be occupied as a self-contained dwelling.

### Car Parking Standards

The original garage was converted under a previous extension to the dwelling (5/1983/1261), as a result parking is provided on the driveway. The property currently provides 2/3 parking spaces, however as a result of the proposed front extension this will be reduced to 2. The extensions incorporate the addition of a fifth bedroom in the granny annexe, increasing the intensity of use on the site. A total of five bedrooms will be provided, requiring a maximum of 3.5 parking spaces (Policy 40, Residential Development Parking Standards). Lakeside Place is located in Zone 1 of the Revised Parking Policies and Standards 2002 for St Albans. As a result all proposals submitted are encouraged to meet the standards in Policy 40, however schemes slightly below the standards may be accepted. The existing provision of two spaces, plus the available on street parking on Lakeside Place, is considered to adequately cater for the proposed development and complies with Policies 39 and 40 of the St Albans District Local Plan Review 1994 and the Revised Parking Policies and Standards, January 2002.

### Comment on District Councillor Concerns

The proposed extensions have been significantly reduced in scale and size from the previously refused scheme. The first floor front extension has been removed and the roof form of the first floor rear extension has been amended sufficiently to replicate the existing roof form of the property. The rear balcony has been omitted from the new proposal and as a result the issues arising from its previous inclusion concerning loss of privacy and overlooking have been successfully addressed. In conclusion both of the previous reasons for refusal have been successfully overcome, and the proposed application is therefore considered acceptable.

### Conclusion

The proposed development is considered acceptable, as it is compatible with the style and form of the original building and with the scale and character of the street scene. There will be no adverse impact on neighbouring properties and car parking requirements are adequate. The proposal is in accordance with Policy 12 (Accommodation for Relatives, Dependants or Staff) Policy 39 (Parking Standards, General Requirements), Policy 40 (Residential Development Parking Standards), Policy 69 (General Design and Layout), Policy 72 (Extensions in Residential Areas) and Revised Parking Policies and Standards, January 2002 of the St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.

### **Recommendation - GRANT**

#### Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed only of materials, the type and colour of which match exactly those of the existing building .
3. The extension or building hereby permitted shall not be used at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling.

#### Reasons:

1. To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. To ensure that the finished appearance of the building is satisfactory. To comply with Policies 69 and 72 of the St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.
3. To ensure the Local Planning Authority retains control over any future development in

order to prevent loss of amenity to neighbouring properties. To comply with Policy 72 of the St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.

Informatives:

1. This determination was based on the following drawings and information: Drawing numbers D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7 and D8 received 18/12/2009.

**Drawing Nos:** D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7 and D8

**O.S. Grid Reference:** 517911.86 203532.72

**Decision Notice Code:** A1

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ( ACCESS TO INFORMATION ) ACT 1985**

**Officer : Andy  
Boothby**

**Link to application plans and information:**

<http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-applications/plan-images/2009/2000/2400/520092478/520092478.pdf>

Section 65 Parties

The Applicant