

**7 DCCE2004/3188/F - TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION  
AT 18 HAROLD STREET, HEREFORD, HR1 2QU****For: Mr. & Mrs. French per Mr. A. Venables, 7 Emlyn  
Avenue, Whitecross, Hereford****Date Received: 19th August 2004****Ward: Tupsley****Grid Ref: 51611, 39398****Expiry Date: 14th October 2004**

Local Members: Councillors G.V. Hyde, Mrs. M.D. Lloyd-Hayes and W.J. Walling

**1. Site Description and Proposal**

- 1.1 The site is located to the south side of Harold Street and situated within the established residential area of Bartonsham. It is a semi-detached property with a single storey extension to the east elevation. Access and parking is provided within the large grounds to the front of the property. To the rear is a relatively small garden and neighbouring properties. The eastern side of the property provides an access road serving the rear properties and the TA Centre.
- 1.2 A previous application was received on the 2nd June 2004 for a two storey extension, was refused under the Scheme of Delegation to Officers by virtue of its scale and design and overbearing impact upon the neighbouring property.
- 1.3 This application seeks planning permission to alter the existing 'L' shaped single storey extension from 2.5 metres to 3.5 metres. The total measurement would be 5.7 metres x 3.5 metres. The first floor extension accommodates a further bedroom/ensuite measuring 4 metres x 3.5 metres.

**2. Policies****2.1 Hereford Local Plan:**

|              |   |   |
|--------------|---|---|
| Policy ENV14 | - | Design  |
| Policy H12   | - | Established Residential Areas – Character and Amenity |
| Policy H14   | - | Established Residential Areas – Site Factors          |
| Policy H16   | - | Alterations and Extensions                            |

**2.2 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft):**

|            |   |                            |
|------------|---|----------------------------|
| Policy S2  | - | Development Proposals      |
| Policy H18 | - | Alterations and Extensions |
| Policy DR1 | - | Design                     |

**3. Planning History**

- 3.1 DCCE2004/2016/F Proposed two storey extension. Refused 22nd July 2004.

#### **4. Consultation Summary**

##### Statutory Consultations

4.1 Environment Agency - no comment.

##### Internal Council Advice

4.2 Head of Engineering and Transportation - no objection.

#### **5. Representations**

5.1 Hereford City Council - observations awaited.

5.2 One letter of objection has been received from Carver Jones, Solicitors acting on behalf of Mrs. Wemyss of 20 Harold Street. The concerns raised can be summarised as follows:-

- The visibility from windows will be substantially diminished as will light to both her property and gardens.
- The proposal will inevitably diminish the value of our client's property.

The full text of this letter can be inspected at Central Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

#### **6. Officers Appraisal**

6.1 The key issues for consideration in the determination of the application are the scale of development in relation to both the existing dwelling and the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the effect of the proposal upon the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

6.2 In considering extensions to dwellings regard must be had to Policy H16 of the Hereford Local Plan which states that alterations and extensions should be in scale and in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling.

6.3 In this regard the extension is formed over the existing ground floor and has a lower roofline. The rear building line is set back 1.2 metres having a lean-to roof to the ground floor element which will remain subservient to the existing dwelling. In policy terms the scale and design of the extension is considered acceptable.

6.4 The concerns raised by the neighbouring property are noted. The distance between the two properties is approximately 10 metres and at present the neighbouring property lies at right angles to the application site. In the Officer's opinion there would be no detrimental impact on the loss of light issue particularly with the recess of the new extension. The proposed extension also has no window to the rear which omits any overlooking to the side of the neighbouring dwelling.

6.5 In summary, it is considered that the proposal accords with the relevant plan policy in terms of scale, design and impact upon the residential amenity. As such it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1. **A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).**

**Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.**

- 2. **The development shall be carried out in all respects strictly in accordance with the approved plans (drawing nos. 105.11A, 105.12A, 105.13A, 105.14A, 105.15A).**

**Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development.**

- 3. **B01 (Samples of external materials).**

**Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.**

- 4. **E17 (No windows in side elevation of extension).**

**Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties.**

- 5. **H10 (Parking - single house).**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway.**

**Informative:**

- 1. **N15 - Reasons for the Grant of Planning Permission.**

Decision: .....

Notes: .....

.....

**Background Papers**

Internal departmental consultation replies.