

Committee date	Wednesday 8 January 2020
Application reference Site address	19/00639/FULH - 29 Orchard Drive
Proposal	Erection of rear and side extension (Amended Plans dated 31.10.19)
Applicant	Mr And Mrs Bulleid
Agent	Mrs Laura Clark
Type of Application	Householder
Reason for committee Item	6 objections
Target decision date	16.12.19
Statutory publicity	None
Case officer	Alice Reade, alice.reade@watford.gov.uk
Ward	; Park;

1. Recommendation

Approve subject to conditions as set out in section 8 of this report.

2. Site and surroundings

- 1.1 The application site comprises a two storey, semi-detached property in a street of similar properties. The property has not been previously extended and benefits from 35m rear garden.
- 1.2 The ground level changes result in a shallow slope away from the rear of the property. The site is not located in a designated conservation area or other Article 2(3) land and is not subject to an Article 4 direction.

3. Summary of the proposal

3.1 Proposal

- 3.2 Erection of a part rear, part side single storey extension. The rear extension has three steps down from internal floor level to outside ground level.

The proposed rear extension is 3.5m in depth and 8.2m wide. The side and rear extension adjacent to No. 27 Orchard Drive has a relative depth of 8.7m and is setback from this boundary by 1m (refer Drawing No. 31 Rev C). The maximum height will be 3.6 with an eaves height of 3.3m.

The rear extension is proposed to have bi-fold doors, fenestration to match

and obscured windows along the east flank, and a roof light. The proposed enlargement will be constructed in materials to match and will provide a larger kitchen and living area.

3.3 Conclusion

3.4 The site is in a residential area where the buildings have been subject to extensions and alterations and the principle of extensions is therefore considered acceptable.

3.5 The scheme has been subject to a number of revisions to overcome the planning officer's concerns with the depth from the original rear wall of the proposed extension.

3.6 Subject to conditions as set out in the report, the proposed extension is not considered to have a significant impact on the amenities of the adjoining occupiers. The scale and design of the proposed extension is considered appropriate for this site and it will have an acceptable visual impact on the character and appearance of the area.

4. Relevant policies

Members should refer to the background papers attached to the agenda. These highlight the policy framework under which this application is determined. Specific policy considerations with regard to this particular application are detailed in section 6 below.

5. Relevant site history/background information

5.1 None

6. Main considerations

6.1 The main issues to be considered in the determination of this application are:

- (a) Scale and design
- (b) Impact on surrounding properties

6.2 (a) Scale and design

1. Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31 seeks high quality design in all new development. Paragraph 8.2 of the Residential Design Guide (RDG) states that extensions must respect the character and scale of the host building. Among other things, it states that an extension should

complement the size, shape and character of the existing property and should normally be subordinate to it. An extension should have a roof form, pitch and angle that respects that of the host property.

2. In this instance the proposed extension would be sited at the rear and side of the dwelling, and partially visible from Orchard Drive. As such, it would not detract from the character and appearance of the application property.

Paragraph 8.5 of the Residential Design Guide states (RDG), amongst other things, that rear extensions should not exceed a depth of 3.5 metres for a semi-detached house, when measured from the rear elevation of the original dwelling. The proposal would be fully compliant with this guideline. It would be comparable in terms of its height, depth and width to the extensions of neighbouring properties, it is not clear from the drawings whether the existing boundary treatments, fencing and hedging would remain but in an urban environment the visual impact of the 3.5m depth would be of an acceptable nature.

It would respect the character and scale and roof form of the host building and would appear as subordinate to the main house. It is set in 1m away from the boundary with No.27 as per guideline 8.5 b).

3. Paragraph 8.7 a) b) c) d) of the RDG states, amongst other things, that single storey side extensions should be parallel to the existing building, subordinate to the original house, it should be no wider than a third of the overall width of the extended property and be set back at least 1m from the principal building line. The proposal would be compliant with these guidelines.

When seen in this context the proposed enlargement is considered to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the surrounding properties in scale and design.

6.3 (b) Impact on surrounding properties

The adjoining properties affected by the proposed extension would in this case be No.31 and No.27 Orchard Drive.

1. In respect of No. 31, this property is adjoined at ground level with the application property, and has no existing extensions. The proposed enlargement would marginally breach the '45 degree rule' when measured from the middle of the neighbouring ground floor windows. Paragraph 8.4.4 and paragraph 8.4.6 of the RDG states amongst other things that The Building Research Establishment Guidelines (BRE) 2011 provides guidance on acceptable and unacceptable impacts and sets out non-mandatory targets for

levels of daylight and sunlight within existing and proposed developments. The guidance states that experience has shown that single-storey rear extensions on semi-detached properties should be designed to a maximum depth of 3.5m, the degree of impact to the neighbours at No.31 would be within the acceptable tolerances, despite the minor infringement and would have no significant adverse impact on light or outlook.

2. In respect of No.27 the properties share a common boundary, this property's building line is forward of the application property the side flank comprises a garage and a kitchen door with obscure glazing. The nearest habitable room window is 5.5m away from the proposed enlargement no significant additional loss of sunlight, daylight and outlook would result to the occupiers.

On this basis, the proposed part rear, part side single storey extension is deemed acceptable in terms of residential impact and amenity.

7. Consultation responses received

7.1 There have been three rounds of neighbour consultations: on 4th June 2019, 23rd July 2019, 9th October 2019 due to drafting errors by the agent and revisions to the scheme.

7.2 Statutory consultees and other organisations

No consultations were required for this application.

7.3 Internal Consultees

No consultations were required for this application.

7.4 Interested parties

Letters were sent to 5 properties in the surrounding area. 6 letters of response have been received from 5 properties and 1 letter of representation was received in respect of the scheme. The main comments are summarised below, the full letters are available to view online:

Loss of light and tunnelling, over development, loss of privacy, drains and manhole location, fence panel and boundary treatments, negative changes to the front elevation of the property, drafting errors, patio construction, and loss of property value.

Objection comments	Officer response
Loss of light / tunneling	This is considered in Paragraph 6.2 and 6.3 of the report.
Over development	This is considered in Paragraph 6.2 of the report.
Loss of privacy	This is considered in Paragraph 6.3 of the report.
Drains and man hole location	This is not a material planning consideration there are controls outside the planning system, Thames Water would require the owners to enter into an agreement.
Fence panel / boundary treatments	This is not a material planning consideration, The Party Wall Act etc. 1996 provides control outside the planning system.
Negative changes to the front elevation of the property	The proposal is principally for changes to the rear of the property, the single storey side extension is set back 3.5m from the established front building line and set in from the site boundary and subordinate to the original dwelling in the street scene. It replaces a wider wood and corrugated plastic sheet lean-to structure and is considered to improve the appearance of the dwelling and is compliant with the residential design guide.
Drafting errors in the plans	Noted, revised and amended drawings correcting errors have been submitted.
Construction of a patio or decked area if this plan were to be approved.	This is not under consideration in this application and would be subject to additional planning permission if a patio or decked area exceeded 0.3m in height.
Loss of property value	This is not a material planning consideration.

8. Recommendation

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates shall be begun within a period of three years commencing on the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements 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. All the external surfaces of the development shall be finished in materials to match the colour, texture and style of the existing building.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the site, pursuant to Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan: Core Strategy 2006 - 31.

3. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority: Drawing nos.

019-_122 REVG-001 LOCATION LAYOUT
019-_122 REVG-002 SITE LAYOUT
019-_122 REVG-100 EXISTING GROUND FLOOR
019-_122 REVG-115 PROPOSED ROOF PLAN
019-_122 REVG-105 EXISTING ROOF PLAN
019-_122 REVG-003A BLOCK PLAN LAYOUT
019-_122 REVH-110C PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR
019-_122 REVH-300 EXISTING REAR ELEVATION
019-_122 REVH-301 EXISTING SIDE ELEVATION
019-_122 REVH-302 EXISTING FRONT ELEVATION
019-_122 REVH-310A PROPOSED REAR ELEVATION
019-_122 REVH-311C PROPOSED SIDE ELEVATION
019-_122 REVH-312A PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION
019-_122 REVH-313 PROPOSED PARTY ELEVATION

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 (and any order revoking and re-enacting that order) no additional ground floor windows or doors shall be inserted in the north-western side elevation or the north-eastern side elevation of the extensions hereby permitted.

Reason: To prevent overlooking and consequent loss of privacy to neighbouring premises.

5. Notwithstanding the approved plans, no permission is granted for any raised terrace/patio adjacent to the rear extension.

Reason: No details have been provided for a patio and therefore has not been assessed or consulted on.

Informatives:

1. Positive and proactive handling of application.
2. Building Regulations
3. Party Wall Act
4. Hours of Construction
5. Officer's report