

# Agenda Item 7ii

2.

<b>REGISTERED NUMBER:</b>	5/2010/0057/FULL
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mathew Doherty
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Two storey side extension and roof alterations
<b>SITE:</b>	30 Highfield Lane Tyttenhanger St Albans AL4 0RQ
<b>DATE OF APPLICATION:</b>	18/01/2010
<b>HISTORIC BUILDING GRADE:</b>	None
<b>CONSERVATION AREA:</b>	None
<b>DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW:</b>	Metropolitan Green Belt

## RECOMMENDATION REFUSE

### Background

No. 30 is a semi-detached property with a hipped roof located on the south side of Highfield Lane. The property is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt with open fields to the rear and front of the dwelling.

### The Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of two storey side extension measuring 2.1m in width and 6m in depth. The extension will provide an additional bedroom and a reception room. The application is a resubmission. Three previous applications have been submitted two of which were refused and the third was made invalid due to an inaccuracy on the plans. The proposed extension has been reduced in depth from 6.6m to 6m from the previously refused application (5/09/0541).

### Relevant Planning Policy

East of England Plan 2008

ENV 7 Quality of the Built Environment

St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994:

POLICY 1	Metropolitan Green Belt
POLICY 13	Extension or Replacement of Dwellings in the Green Belt
POLICY 39	Parking Standards, General Requirements
POLICY 40	Residential Development Parking Standards
POLICY 69	General Design and Layout
POLICY 72	Extensions in Residential Areas

### Relevant Planning History

5/09/1634 - Two storey side extension – Invalid 07/10/2009.

5/09/0541 – Two storey side extension – Refused 08/05/2009.

5/08/1968 - Single storey front extension and side extensions – Refused 09/10/2008.

Both previous applications were refused for the following reasons:-

“The application site is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt wherein there is strict control over the extension and alteration of existing dwellinghouses. The proposed extension would amount to a disproportionate addition over the size of the original dwellinghouse when the amount the dwelling has already been extended is taken into account. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the open character of this rural Green Belt area contrary to the aims of Policies 1 (Metropolitan Green Belt) and 13 (Extensions or Replacement of Dwellings in the Green Belt) of the St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.”

“The proposed roof extension and alterations, by reason of its design and relationship to the existing property, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the property, its

symmetrical relationship with the adjoining property and to the street scene. It would thereby adversely affect the visual amenity of the area and be contrary to Policy 72 (i), (ii) and (vi) of the St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.”

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

Councillor Brazier has called in the application if minded to refuse for the following reason:

‘This is a minor application that will not impact on the Green Belt.’

#### Representations

##### Parish Council

Colney Heath Parish Council – notified 20/01/2010

No comments received. Any further representations will be reported at the meeting.

##### Adjoining Occupiers

No’s 28, 32 and 34 Highfield Lane, St Albans – notified 20/01/2010.

No comments received. Any further representations will be reported at the meeting.

##### Consultations

None

#### Discussion

The main issues are whether the proposal has successfully overcome the previous reasons for refusal and whether the proposal satisfies the criteria set out in Policies 69 and 72 respectively for general design and layout of extensions in residential areas and their impact upon the streetscene and neighbours’ amenity. It is also prudent to consider whether the proposal meets with the requirement set out in Policies 1 and 13 for development within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Revised Parking Policies and Standards adopted in January 2002.

##### Previous reasons refusal

Both previous applications were refused for the following reasons:-

*“The application site is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt wherein there is strict control over the extension and alteration of existing dwellinghouses. The proposed extension would amount to a disproportionate addition over the size of the original dwellinghouse when the amount the dwelling has already been extended is taken into account. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the open character of this rural Green Belt area contrary to the aims of Policies 1 (Metropolitan Green Belt) and 13 (Extensions or Replacement of Dwellings in the Green Belt) of the St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.”*

*“The proposed roof extension and alterations, by reason of its design and relationship to the existing property, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the property, its symmetrical relationship with the adjoining property and to the street scene. It would thereby adversely affect the visual amenity of the area and be contrary to Policy 72 (i), (ii) and (vi) of the St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.”*

##### Metropolitan Green Belt

The property lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt, where residential extensions are assessed against Policy 13 of the SADC District Plan Review 1994. Policy 13 states:

*“Any extended or replacement dwelling shall be modest in scale and visually well integrated with its rural surroundings and shall not harm the ecology, natural beauty and amenity of the countryside or nearby dwellings”.*

Specifically, Policy 13 (i) outlines:

*“Extensions to houses in the Green Belt including garages or outbuildings may be permitted unless the scale or visual impact upon the building as originally constructed...would create a building of significantly larger or different character”.*

The property has been the subject of a number of planning applications in the recent past. The floor area of the existing property has been extended by approximately 43%. A previous application 5/08/1968, was refused as the development would have led to an increase of 74% above the original floor area. A more recent application 5/09/0541 was refused for the same reason. The application proposed a smaller increase than that previously refused but still resulted in an increase of 69%, above the original.

The current application proposes a smaller increase than that proposed previously (5/09/0541) but still results in an increase of 67%, above the original. Although the proposed extension is smaller than that refused previously, its siting would be similar. The figures in Table 2 of the 2004 SPG Residential Extensions and Replacement Dwellings in the Green Belt provide guidance rather than strict limits; they do however give a good indication as to what is a disproportionate addition over the original dwellinghouse and what would create a building of significantly larger or different character.

The guidance given in the 2004 SPG suggests that extensions should be assessed against Table 1 in terms of location and visibility from public viewpoints and whether they close gaps, and then assessed against Table 2 in terms of how much of an increase in floorspace may be permitted.

The property is clearly visible from Highfield Lane and the footpath located at the rear of the site. The existing rear extension closes the gap between the subject dwelling and No. 32 Highfield Lane, but is set to the rear of the property a total of 17m from the street frontage, considerably reducing its impact. The proposed extension would infill this area at both ground and first floor and is located 0.8m from the existing building line at the front of the property. The proposed extension is deemed to have a significantly higher impact in closing this gap, and would have a considerable effect on the open aspect of the area. Taking account of the percentage increase and the significant changes in character, the proposed development is deemed to be contrary to the provisions within Policy 13 of St Albans District Local Plan Review 1994, PPG2 and the Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance – Residential Extensions and Replacement Dwellings in the Green Belt July 2004. The application has therefore failed to overcome the previous reason for refusal.

The combined increase of all the extensions would result in a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling and would not comply with Policies 1 and 13 of the District Plan or the SPG.

As the original floor area of the dwelling has already been extended by approximately 43%, any further extensions are likely to create a building of significantly larger or different character, and would be inappropriate development and therefore harmful to the Green Belt. The proposed extensions are therefore considered to be contrary to Policies 1 and 13 of the St Albans District Local Plan Review 1994. No special circumstances have been demonstrated to justify planning permission for any further extensions to the property.

Design

The proposed materials will match the existing building and the extension will not seriously diminish the amenity space around the original dwelling. The proposed side extension is considered to be acceptable on design grounds. The extension is set back from the front elevation of the property and incorporates an appropriate roof formation.

The roof extension however will be visible from Highfield Lane; and is considered to have a detrimental impact on both the character and appearance of the original building and the street scene. The existing roof formation is contrived and awkward in appearance, but matches the roof form of the adjoining property as both have constructed similar two storey front extensions. The proposal intends to address this strange roof formation but in doing so would unbalance the symmetrical relationship with the adjoining property, proving detrimental to its appearance and character, adding a significant amount of extra bulk when viewed from the street scene. Therefore the second reason for refusal has not been successfully addressed.

#### Impact on Neighbours:

The proposed extension is relatively small in scale and is set in 1m from the common boundary. The proposals will have no detrimental impact on the occupiers of the adjoining properties. Two new windows are proposed one serving an existing bathroom in the property and the other serving a new bathroom. Both windows are recommended to be obscure glazed to prevent any potential overlooking.

#### Car Parking Standards

The two car parking spaces provided are to be retained on the existing driveway. The proposals include the addition of one new bedroom totalling four. The parking arrangements are considered sufficient for a property of this size and nature and comply with Policies 39 and 40 of the St Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.

#### Comment on District Councillor Concern(s)

The resubmission fails to address both reasons identified under the previous application's refusal. The roof alterations are deemed detrimental to the appearance of the street scene in that they would unbalance the symmetrical relationship with the adjoining property. The issues regarding the extensions relationship with the surrounding area and the Green Belt have also not been resolved the extension is deemed to have a significantly higher impact in closing the gap between the subject property and No. 32 Highfield Lane, and would have a considerable effect on the open aspect of the area. The floor area of the original dwelling has already been extended by approximately 43%, the proposed extension would create a building of significantly larger or different character and would be inappropriate development and therefore harmful to the Green Belt. Therefore the application is recommended for refusal contrary to the provisions of Policies 1 (Metropolitan Green Belt), 13 (Extension or Replacement of Dwellings in the Green Belt), 69 (General Design and Layout) and 72 (Extensions in Residential Areas) (i), (ii) and (vi) of the St Albans District Local Plan Review 1994. which seeks to achieve a high standard of environment.

#### **Recommendation - REFUSE**

#### Reasons:

1. The application site is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt wherein there is strict control over the extension and alteration of existing dwellinghouses. The proposed extension would amount to a disproportionate addition over the size of the original dwellinghouse when the amount the dwelling has already been extended is taken into account. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the open character of this rural Green Belt area contrary to the aims of Policies 1 (Metropolitan Green Belt) and 13 (Extensions or Replacement of Dwellings in the Green Belt) of the St. Albans District Local

Plan Review 1994.

2. The proposed roof extension and alterations, by reason of its design and relationship to the existing property, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the property, its symmetrical relationship with the adjoining property and to the street scene. It would thereby adversely affect the visual amenity of the area and be contrary to Policy 72 (i), (ii) and (vi) of the St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.

Informatives:

1. This determination was based on the following drawings and information: Drawing numbers HL:01 and Design and Access Statement received 08/01/2010 and HL:02 Rev A and HL:03 Rev A received 15/01/2010.

**Drawing Nos:** Design and access statement, HL:01, 02, 03  
**O.S. Grid Reference:** 517652.38 206010.51  
**Decision Notice Code:** R1

**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/2010/0000/0000/520100057/520100057.pdf>

Section 65 Parties

The applicant

---