

ITEM 06

COMMITTEE REPORT

Reference:
16/01820/FUL

Site:
1 Floral Bungalow
Hunters Chase
Hutton
Essex
CM13 1SN

Ward:
Hutton East

Proposal:
Demolition of existing conservatory and rear element, construction of a single storey rear extension to include rooflights. Fenestration alterations to include removal of front door and create new side entrance.

Parish:

Referral from Councillor Hossack who has no concerns with this application. He considers the Green Belt planning policy and restrictions on Hunter Chase are too stringent. He further considers this is a modest development to an existing small bungalow that is unsuitable as a family home

Plan Number(s):
S01; L01REV A; L02;

Applicant:
Mr Cook

Validated:
5 January 2017

Case Officer: Mr David Cutner

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension that would extend a maximum of 6 metres beyond the rear of the existing dwelling with dual pitched roof to contain 2 roof lights. The proposed extension would have an eaves height of 2.4 metres and a maximum height of 4 metres.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

The property is sited on a quiet and secluded side road within the area known as 'Haverings Grove', described within the adopted local plan as the most "established" of the Borough's areas of former plotlands. The area is still dominated by modest bungalows although some have been extended, and in the main, the area has an open sporadic plotland character. No.1 Floral Bungalow is part of a semi detached pair of bungalows that have a closely matching design and footprint.

The site is situated in the Green Belt as defined in the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 16/01390/S192: Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for a proposed use or development for a single storey rear extension. -Application Refused
- 16/00859/FUL: Demolition of existing conservatory and construction of a single storey rear extension including roof lights. -Application Refused

4.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Detailed below is a summary of the consultation responses, if any received. The full version of each consultation response can be viewed on the Council's website via Public Access at the following link: <http://publicaccess.brentwood.gov.uk/online-applications/>

None received

5.0 SUMMARY OF NEIGHBOUR COMMENTS

This application has been advertised by way of individual neighbour notification letters and public site notice which has been displayed nearby. No responses have been received.

6.0 POLICY CONTEXT

The starting point for determining an application is the development plan, in this instance, the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan (BRLP) 2005. Applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Relevant material considerations for determining this application are the following RLP policies, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) 2014.

RLP Policy:

GB1 – New development (within the Green Belt)
GB2 – Development Criteria (within the Green Belt)
GB9 – Haverings Grove
CPI - General development criteria

NPPF Sections:

Chapter 7 - Requiring Good Design

Chapter 9 – Green Belt

7.0 ASSESSMENT

A previous application for a similar single storey rear extension, application 16/00859/FUL, was refused. The main difference between the previous application and the current application is the proposed extension is now sited on the boundary with No 2 whereas before it was set 1 metre away from the boundary, but it now does not extend as far to the rear of the host dwelling.

The main issues are the impact of the development on the Green Belt, the impact on the character and appearance of the area, and the impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and parking.

Green Belt

The site is situated within the Green Belt. Chapter 9 of the NPPF states the government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. New buildings in the Green Belt are inappropriate development unless they fall within one of the exceptions set out in paragraph 89 of the NPPF. The exception of most relevance to this application is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

The NPPF does not define how proportionality should be measured, however it is reasonable to assess increases in footprint, floor space, volume, bulk and mass and their relation to the original dwelling as a consideration.

Although adopted some years before the Framework, Local Plan Policies GB1 and GB2 are broadly compliant with its aims and objections and therefore carry material weight. Local Plan Policy GB9 attempts to restrict the height and habitable floorspace of extensions to existing dwellings within the area but is more prescriptive than the Framework and therefore carries limited weight. It is noted however the intention of that policy was to retain openness to the area which accords with the national policy Framework.

Planning records show that the dwelling at 1 Floral Bungalows has benefited from a conservatory to the rear, and that the current single storey rear element is a replacement of a previous rear element with a similar size and siting. The original floor space of the property is approximately 54 square metres. The proposed extension would bring the total floorspace up to 81 square metres, an increase of 50% to the original building. For comparison, the existing property has a floor space of 63 square metres. This is considered to be a disproportionate addition to an original building in the Green Belt and would represent inappropriate development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The applicant has not demonstrated any very special circumstances that would clearly outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Greenbelt by way of the proposed development. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies GB1 and GB2 of the BRLP and the provisions of the Framework.

Design, Character and Appearance

The proposed development would be at the rear of the dwelling and therefore would not be visible from a public vantage point. The proposed design and materials are in keeping with the character of the area and the host dwelling. Accordingly the proposal is compliant with Policy CP1 (i) and (iii) of the BRLP.

Impact on Neighbour Amenity

The proposed extension virtually abuts the boundary with No.2.

The proposal would comprise an extension of six metres along the boundary. The neighbouring property has a single storey projection to the rear of a similar depth as what is proposed here, but is set away from the boundary. The neighbouring property has a window, which serves a bedroom, on the rear elevation between the proposed extension and the existing rear projection. Officers consider that the combination of the six metre projection along the boundary and the resultant narrow gap between the proposal and the existing rear projection would in effect create a 'tunnelling effect' and would result in an overbearing effect on the neighbours window, severely affecting the neighbours outlook from this rear window. The proposal therefore would create a harmful impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring residents of No 2 and it would be contrary to Policy CP1(ii) of the BRLP.

Other matters

Local Ward Councillor Hossack considers the Green Belt policy is too stringent on Hunters Chase and that the proposal is a modest development on a small bungalow which is unsuitable as a family home. Nevertheless, the site is within the Green Belt and the development plan and the Framework does not differentiate between different parts of the Green Belt. The Council's policies and the Framework must be applied evenly across the Borough's Green Belt. The proposal represents a 50% increase on the original size of the dwelling and officers have already considered this represents a disproportionate increase to the original dwelling. With regard to the existing dwelling, the current accommodation consists of two bedrooms a lounge, kitchen and bathroom which can adequately serve as a small unit of accommodation. The proposal does not provide any additional rooms, it provides a larger bedroom, lounge and kitchen.

Additional harm has been identified in that the proposed extension would detrimentally impact on the neighbours living conditions. While there is no 'in principle' objection to the extension of the building it should overcome the fundamental issues set out above.

8.0 CONCLUSION

The proposed development represents a disproportionate increase to the host dwelling and therefore it is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Furthermore the proposal by reason of its size and siting would result in a loss of outlook and create an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property No 2. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies GB1, GB2, and CP1 of the BRLP and the provisions of the Framework. The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Application be REFUSED for the following reasons:-

- 1 The proposal extension, due to its size would amount to a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling. As such it would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt that would have materially greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the original dwelling, to the detriment of the open and rural character of the locality. The proposal therefore conflicts with Brentwood Replacement Local Plan Policies GB1 and GB2 and the provisions of the Framework as regards development in the Green Belt.
- 2 There are no matters in support of the application that would clearly outweigh the harm the development would cause through inappropriateness and harm to the openness of the Green Belt, within which the site is located. Therefore, no very special circumstances exist to justify the grant of planning permission for the inappropriate development.

3. The proposed development by reason of its size, siting and close proximity to the boundary with No 2 Hunters Chase, would harm the living conditions of the neighbouring residents by reason of its loss of outlook from their rear bedroom window and an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy CP1(ii) of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan and the provisions of the Framework.

Informative(s)

- 1 The following development plan policies contained in the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 are relevant to this decision: CP1, GB1 and GB2, the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and NPPG 2014.
- 2 The drawing numbers listed above are relevant to this decision
- 3 The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development. Details of the pre-application service can be found on the Council's website at www.brentwood.gov.uk/preapplicationadvice

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online: www.brentwood.gov.uk/planning