# Report to District Development Control Committee

# Date of meeting: 5<sup>th</sup> October 2010



Subject: Planning Application EPF/1237/10 – 41 London Road, Stanford Rivers - Side extension to bungalow and loft conversion including 3 rear dormer windows (Amended application)

Officer contact for further information: K Smith Ext 4109 Committee Secretary: S Hill Ext 4249

**Recommendation:** 

That the Committee agrees the recommendation to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

(1) The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this notice.

(2) Materials to be used for the external finishes of the proposed extension, shall match those of the existing building.

(3) A line of ridge tiles shall remain across the full width of the roof of the main dwelling. As shown on the approved plan (50210/03 rev.D) the rear dormer windows shall be located below the ridge tiles.

### **Report Detail**

1. This application was reported to Area Plans East on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> August 2010. Members of that Committee sought clarification of the Council's Green Belt policy and referred the application to the District Development Control Committee for determination.

#### **Planning Issues**

2. The report that was prepared for the Area Planning Committee is attached.

3. With regard to clarification of the relevant Green Belt planning policies, applications for residential extensions are considered against policy GB2A of the adopted Local Plan and Alterations, which identifies 'a limited extension to an existing dwelling' as an appropriate development within the Green Belt. This policy basis differs from that which was applied to the extant planning permission for a similar development in April 2009 (which was also subject to Policy GB14A but was not saved in the July 2009 review of the Local Plan Alterations).

4. When the extant planning permission (EPF/0432/09) was granted, some consideration was given to the volume of the existing garages, which were required to be demolished to facilitate the proposed extension. This formed part of the

Officer's assessment, as necessitated by the then relevant policy GB14A. As Members of Plans East correctly observed, had these garages been demolished prior to the consideration of that planning application, their volume would not have been taken into consideration in the calculation.

5. The garages have now been demolished. However, this current planning application must be considered in relation to all material considerations, at this time. Planning Policy is clearly a relevant consideration and as discussed above, policy GB2A identifies 'a limited extension to an existing dwelling' as an appropriate development within the Green Belt. Bearing in mind the loss of the garages, it may be argued (as advocated by the Parish Council) that the extension is no longer 'a limited extension' in relation to the *existing* dwelling. However, another material consideration is the extant planning permission, upon which development has commenced. This provides the applicant with a likely fall-back position, under which a very similar extension, of an equal size, could be constructed. In the Planning Officer's opinion, this fall back position provides justification for allowing this proposed development within the Metropolitan Green Belt.

### Conclusion

6. Should the Committee grant planning permission it should be subject to conditions requiring the commencement of the development within three years, the use of matching external materials and a condition requiring that a line of ridge tiles remain above the proposed dormer windows.