

Item No. 15

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/12/00914/FULL
LOCATION	Hatch Farm, Hatch Common, Hatch, Sandy, SG19 1PS
PROPOSAL	Single storey side extension
PARISH	Northill
WARD	Northill
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllr Mrs Turner
CASE OFFICER	Nicola Stevens
DATE REGISTERED	19 March 2012
EXPIRY DATE	14 May 2012
APPLICANT	Mr Maudlin
AGENT	Richard Beaty, Building Design Ltd
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	The applicant is related to a Central Bedfordshire councillor.

RECOMMENDED DECISION **Full Application - Granted**

Site Location:

The site is located on the eastern side of Hatch Common within open countryside. It appears to be part of a larger farm complex, with farm buildings to the north and east, and open fields to the south and west. The building has a two storey dwelling 'Paws Cottage' attached on the eastern side of the building.

The Application:

The application seeks full consent for a single storey side extension.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

National Policies

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012)

**Regional Spatial Strategy
East of England Plan (May 2008)**
ENV7 Quality in the Built Environment

Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Adopted November 2009

CS14	High Quality Development
DM3	High Quality Development
DM4	Development Within and Beyond Settlement Envelopes

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Design Guide for Central Bedfordshire & DS4 Residential Alterations & DS7 Movement Streets and Places Adopted Jan 2010

Planning History

None relevant

Representations: (Parish & Neighbours)

Northill Parish Council	No comments received
Neighbours/Site Notice	No comments received

Consultations/Publicity responses

IDB	No objection, on the understanding that the applicant will set finished floor levels no lower than those existing and resilience and resistance techniques are incorporated in the construction. In the event that ground conditions are not suitable for soakaway drainage any direct discharge into nearby watercourse will require the Boards prior approval. A suitably worded condition should be attached.
Environment Agency	No comments received

Determining Issues

The main considerations of the application are;

1. Principle of development
2. Visual impact
3. Residential amenity
4. Other issues

Considerations

1. Principle of development

The application site lies outside the settlement envelope of nearby Northill or Sandy as defined in the Core Strategy and is located in open countryside. There is a general policy constraint at both national and local planning policy for new development in the open countryside. However, this proposal is for the enlargement of an existing dwelling. NPPF states that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside (para 17) and states in paragraph 56 that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively

to making places better for people. Paragraph 64 of the same document states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy states that all proposals for new development including extensions will be appropriate in scale and design to their setting. The enlargement of this dwelling may be acceptable in principle provided that other planning policies which will be discussed below.

2. Visual impact

The property is a large two storey dwelling (considered to be early Victorian) constructed of orange brick with a slate roof. It has an existing single storey flat and pitched roof extension to the side which would be demolished. It also appears to have a two storey addition to the rear which is a separate dwelling.

It is proposed to erect a fairly large single storey side extension to create a utility room, kitchen and dining room enlarging the ground floor living accommodation. The extension will measure approx 5.4m wide, 8.9 deep, 2.6m to the eaves and 4.4m (at the highest point). Two rooflights are proposed on the side and one on the rear of the extension. As it would be to the side of the dwelling it would be clearly seen in the streetscene.

The Council's design document "A Guide for Development (2010) – Design Supplement 4 (Residential alterations and extensions)" states that "*The proposed extensions should not dominate the existing building: in other words they should normally be subservient, and appear as additions in a 'supporting' role. The existing building should not be dominated by the bulk or volume of the extension*".

The extension would only be stepped back from the main front elevation marginally (approx 0.1m) but being single storey would be stepped down from the main ridgeline and therefore be subservient in appearance. Whilst the design is not considered ideal with a flat roofed section providing a rather awkward relationship with the main dwelling, the removal of the attractive ground floor sash window, and the hipped roof partly obscuring the first floor windows, on balance it is not considered it is sufficient to warrant refusal. This is because given the width of the extension which is similar to that existing (at 5.1m) the flat roof does provide separation from the main hipped roof element of the extension which matches the main roof of the dwelling, the dwelling is not listed and the main ground floor window is already obscured from the streetscene by the existing extension, also the roof materials will match the main house being slate, clements rooflights are normally of a traditional pattern in relation to Victorian properties and fairly flush with the plane of the roof, and cambridgeshire white reclaimed facing brick is proposed which would match the existing single storey extension. Given the above, overall it is not considered the extension would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

3. Residential amenity

Paws cottage adjoins the application site and has a first floor bedroom window and ground floor living room window on its rear elevation nearest the boundary. There is a 1.8m fence with trellis along the shared boundary where the extension is proposed.

Whilst the existing extension is offset from the boundary, the single storey extension the subject of this application would be sited on the boundary measuring approx 5.4m in depth and 2.6m to the eaves. The flat section of the roof immediately adjoining the house would be 3.5m tall increasing to 4.4m where fully hipped. Given the orientation and proximity to the boundary there would be some loss of light later in the day for the ground floor living room window at Paws Cottage, but given the large size of that window, its distance from the boundary and the design of the extension including the roof it is not considered there will be any undue loss of light.

The extension would be blank sided with only a rooflight so there will be no loss of privacy.

Although it will be 5.4m long on the boundary given that it will be single storey and given the shape and height of the roof it is not considered there would be any undue overbearing impact. As such the relationship is considered satisfactory in this context.

No other surrounding properties will be unduly harmed due to the distances involved.

4. Other issues

Sufficient private amenity space will be retained.

There would be no increase the number of bedrooms as a result of this proposal. On site parking remains unchanged.

The site falls within flood zones 2 and 3. The Environment Agency has not objected to the proposal. The IDB have no objection provided the generic details in the Householder Flood Risk Assessment are provided which could be conditioned. It is not considered a condition on the method of surface water drainage is required as this is covered by separate legislation, however a note to applicant could be attached.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be Approved subject to the following:

- 1 The development hereby approved shall be commenced within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 which is designed to ensure that a planning permission does not continue in existence indefinitely if the development to which it relates is not carried out.

- 2 All external works hereby permitted shall be carried out in materials to match as closely as possible in colour, type and texture, those of the existing building.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the completed development by ensuring that the development hereby permitted is finished externally with materials to match/complement the existing building(s) and the visual amenities of the locality.

- 3 Development shall be implemented in accordance with the details set out in the Flood Risk Assessment.

Reason: To ensure that adequate surface water drainage is provided and that existing and future land drainage needs are protected.

- 4 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers [12.02.OSmap, 12.02.02, FRA].

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Reasons for Granting

The proposal would not have a negative impact on the character or appearance of the area or an adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and is acceptable in terms of highway safety therefore by reason of its site, design and location, is in conformity with Policies CS14, DM4 and DM3 of the Core Strategy and Management Policies, November 2009; National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012); Regional policies in the East of England Plan (May 2008) and the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy (March 2005). It is further in conformity with the technical guidance Design in Central Bedfordshire, a Guide for Development, 2010.

Notes to Applicant

- . You are advised to note the comments of the Internal Drainage Board as set out in the enclosed letter.

DECISION

.....
.....
.....
.....