

## SUMMARY

The application seeks permission for the erection of a proposed single-storey side extension and first floor extension to the existing chalet bungalow, with associated adaptation of the frontage to provide access for the elderly (20/00857/FULH). The Case Officer recommends to the Development Management Section Head that the application be **refused** as set out in the report.

---

### 1.0 Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a detached chalet-style bungalow located within a predominantly residential area. The property features a dual pitched roof with front and rear facing gable ends and two side-facing dormers to each flank elevation. A single attached garage is sited to the east of the property and this has been built up to and abuts the neighbouring property to the east (i.e. No. 271 Gammons Lane).
- 1.2 The site is not located within a designated Conservation Area or other Article 2(3) land and is not listed.

### 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The proposed development involves the erection of a single-storey side extension and first floor extension to the existing chalet bungalow to form a 4-bedroom, two-storey dwellinghouse, with associated adaptation of the frontage to provide access for the elderly.

### 3.0 Relevant Planning History

- 3.1 10/00492/FULH - Erection of a two storey rear extension, enlargement and alterations to the roof incorporating dormer windows to the side, amendment to an approved application. CPP.
- 3.2 10/00243/FULH - Erection of a single storey and roof extension to rear and two flank dormer windows. CPP.
- 3.3 15/00438/FULH – Rearrange front driveway/stairs, form ramp access to existing house. CPP.

### 4.0 Relevant Planning Policies

#### 4.1 National Planning Policy Framework

The Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2019) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and seeks to make the planning system less complex and more accessible, to protect the environment and to promote sustainable growth. Particularly relevant sections are:

- Requiring Good Design
- Decision Taking

#### 4.2 Development Plan

In accordance with s.38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Development Plan for Watford comprises:

- (a) *Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31*;
- (b) the continuing "saved" policies of the *Watford District Plan 2000*;

- (c) the *Hertfordshire Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2011-2026*; and
- (d) the *Hertfordshire Minerals Local Plan Review 2002-2016*.

**4.3 Watford Local Plan, Part 1: Core Strategy 2006-2031**

The following sections are relevant to this case;

- SD1 Sustainable Design
- SS1 Spatial Strategy
- UD1 Delivering High Quality Design

**4.4 The Watford District Plan 2000 (Saved Policies)**

**4.5 Hertfordshire Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2011-2026**

**4.6 Hertfordshire Minerals Local Plan (Saved Policies)**

**4.7 Supplementary Planning Documents**

The following Supplementary Planning Documents are relevant to the determination of this application:

- Residential Design Guide, 2016*
- Watford Character of Area Study, 2011*

**5.0 Consultations**

**5.1 Neighbour Consultations**

Letters were sent to the following properties:

- 1 Burrow Close, Watford, WD17 4DS
- 271 Gammons Lane, Watford, WD24 5JP
- 275 Gammons Lane, Watford, WD24 5JP

One response was received, objecting to the proposals. The objection centres on the loss of privacy towards No. 1 Burrow Close and overlooking into rear garden area.

**5.2 Statutory Publicity**

No statutory advertisement was required for this application.

**5.3 Statutory Consultees**

| Name                  | Comments            |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| No consultations sent | No comment received |

**6.0 Appraisal**

**6.1 Main Issues**

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

- (a) Scale and Design
- (b) Impact upon Residential Amenity of Surrounding Properties

6.2 **(a) Scale, Design and Impact upon Host Property and Streetscene**

Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31 states that “new development should respect and enhance the local character of the area in which it is located”. Policy SS1 of the Watford Local Plan 2006-31 advises that “outside of the areas covered by specific policies, the emphasis will be on making sure that new development protects residential amenity, protects and enhances the character of the area, maintains and enhances the quality of our open spaces and green infrastructure and protects our built heritage”. These objectives are supported by the RDG which, in Section 3.1, advises that “extensions must respect the character and scale of the host building” and states that “size and shape” need to be considered.

At a national level, the revised NPPF makes clear that development should “add to the overall quality of the area” and “respond to local character and history and reflect the identity of local surroundings”. The NPPF also requires that developments be visually attractive as a result of good architecture. It also emphasises 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”.

The proposed single-storey side extension would replace the existing attached garage structure and would provide for increased space to the living room and kitchen area. The proposed roof form of the side extension is shown to be sloping roof pitch with eave height to correspond to the eave height of the neighbouring property’s (No. 271) main roof. There is an existing garage structure to the eastern side of the application property and so there already exists an element of built form to the side of the dwelling which is absent from the other chalet bungalows on this row. The principle of its replacement with a single-storey side extension is considered acceptable. Notwithstanding, the Council’s Residential Design Guide states that side extensions should appear subordinate in terms of their height, scale and bulk and set back at least 1m from the principal elevation of the host dwelling. The proposed side extension would not be set back but, instead, would be flush to the principal building line of the host dwellinghouse, so would not read as a subordinate addition.

The proposals also seek permission for the addition of a first floor extension. This would have the effect of creating a two-storey dwellinghouse structure from the original chalet-style bungalow with a dual-pitched roof and front and rear gable ends. The proposed first floor extension would add a degree of bulk and massing which is considered to be out of proportion to the original dwelling. No.s 271 – 279 Gammons Lane are a row of similarly proportioned detached chalet-style bungalows which together give consistency to the character and appearance of this part of Gammons Lane, in terms of their scale, design and setting within their individual plots. The proposal would present as a large two-storey dwellinghouse, which would appear out of character in the street scene. As there is not a minimum 1m set-in from the side boundary on both sides of the property, the development appears cramped in the context of its immediate neighbours, particularly when combined with its proposed height. Overall, it is considered that the proposed replacement first-floor extension would detrimentally alter the character and appearance of the host property and would result in a prominent and incongruous form of development.

It is considered that the proposed development would not respect the character and appearance of the host property and wider area, in terms of its scale, massing, appearance and design and would not be in line with Policy UD1 of the Core Strategy and the Residential Design Guide.

### 6.3 **Impact upon Residential Amenity of Surrounding Properties**

The proposed development includes two windows to each side facing elevation at first floor level. These windows would serve the proposed staircase, dressing room and two bathrooms. There are no windows to the neighbouring properties which would be affected by these proposed windows. The proposal would result in the net addition of one window to the rear elevation at first floor. The existing rear-facing window serves a bedroom and the proposed floorplan would similarly be bedrooms at the rear of the dwelling. Consequently, it is considered that the proposed development would not harm the amenities of either neighbouring resident materially beyond that which currently exists.

The proposal would add another storey to the present dwelling, in effect creating a two-storey dwellinghouse on the site. The outlook of those properties to the rear along Burrows Close, particularly No.1, will differ from existing, but it is not considered that No.1 would be materially closed in by the proposals. A degree of overlooking would result towards the rear of No.1 Burrows Close by virtue of the proposed addition of a second floor level with windows to the rear elevation. The separation distance between the rear-facing building line of the application property and No. 1 Burrows Close, the closest neighbouring property to the rear, is approximately 17m, and the distance between the application property and the property boundary is approximately 11m which accords with the stipulations of the RDG. With regards to any resulting loss of privacy and overlooking to No.1 Burrows Close to the rear of the site from the application proposals, it is not considered that the proposals would result in a loss of privacy and overlooking to a materially harmful extent.

### 7.0 **Conclusion**

7.1 The proposed development by virtue of its scale, bulk and design would result in an overly dominant, cramped and incongruous form of development which would be out of keeping with this section of the streetscene and, thus, harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Therefore, it would be considered unacceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it is recommended that planning permission be refused.

### 8.0 **Human Rights Implications**

8.1 The refusal of planning permission will have a significant adverse impact upon the human rights of the applicants to develop their land. However, in this instance it is considered that the adverse impact of the development upon the human rights of the third parties outweighs the impact upon the human rights of the applicants.

### 9.0 **Community Infrastructure levy (CIL)**

The gross internal area of the proposed extensions is less than 100 square metres and therefore the development is not CIL liable.

### 10.0 **Recommendation**

That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

- (1) The proposed development by reason of its siting, design, bulk and massing would introduce an over-dominant and cramped form of development, out of keeping with the character of development within the street scene detrimental to the visual amenities of the locality. This would be contrary to Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy 2006-31.