

## UTT/13/1428/HHF (Hatfield Heath)

(Referred to Committee by Cllr Lemon Reasons: Overbearing building and overshadowing impact on neighbouring properties)

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of shed to rear of existing garage

**LOCATION:** Rosemary Cottage, Stortford Road, Hatfield Heath

**APPLICANT:** Mr K Sullivan

**AGENT:** N/A

**EXPIRY DATE:** 30 July 2013

**CASE OFFICER:** Chris Tyler

---

### **1. NOTATION**

1.1 Within development limits.

### **2. DESCRIPTION OF SITE**

2.1 The application site comprises a detached two storey dwelling with detached single garage located along the Stortford Road amongst other dwellings varying in size and design. The garage and porch have a flat roof design. There is off street parking to the front of the dwelling. The site is located on level ground with neighbouring properties and is bound by hedging to the front and side elevations. The rear garden is bound by close board fencing and mature vegetation.

### **3. PROPOSAL**

3.1 The application proposes the erection of the shed/ storage building to the rear of the existing garage. The shed would have a footprint of 6.2m by 3.5m, eaves height of 2.3m under a pitched roof of 3.7m. The external materials would comprise of feather-edge weather boarding over a brick plinth and a plain tiled clay roof.

### **4. APPLICANT'S CASE**

4.1 None.

### **5. RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

5.1 N/A.

### **6. POLICIES**

#### **6.1 National Policies**

National Planning Policy Framework

#### **6.2 Uttlesford District Local Plan 2005**

Policy S3 – Other Developments  
Policy GEN2 - Design  
Policy H8 - Home Extensions

## **7. PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS**

7.1 None received.

## **8. CONSULTATIONS**

8.1 N/A.

## **9. REPRESENTATIONS**

9.1 Nine neighbours were notified. Consultation expired 27.06.13. 1 letter of objection

9.2 Principle objection to the siting of the proposal.

9.3 The proposal would create overshadowing effect.

9.4 An over development of the site would be created.

## **10. APPRAISAL**

The main issues to consider in the determination of the application are:

- A Whether the proposed works would be of an appropriate design and scale, (ULP Policies S3, H8 and GEN2).
- B Whether the proposal would adversely affect amenity value of neighbouring residents (ULP Policy H8 and GEN2)

### **A Whether the proposed works would be of an appropriate design and scale**

10.1 Policy H8 of the adopted Local Plan states that extensions will be permitted if their scale and design respects the original building. Similarly, Policy GEN2 states that the proposal must be compatible with the scale, form, layout, appearance and materials of surrounding buildings and development should respect the scale, height and proportions of the original house.

10.2 The principle of development in this location is accepted and the proposed shed has been designed to be subservient to the host dwelling. This proposal would be in keeping with the character of the dwelling and will not have a dominating or detrimental impact on the character of the dwelling or surrounding buildings. The building would be located wholly to the rear of the dwelling and there would have no adverse impact on the character of the street scene. In addition, the scale is considered to be acceptable, given the scale of the existing dwelling and the size of its curtilage, the site is capable of accommodating the proposal providing sufficient amenity land. The SPD indicates that the choice of materials is important. The external materials are traditional and are used on the existing property therefore the proposed materials considered to be acceptable

### **B Whether the proposal would adversely affect amenity values of neighbouring residents**

10.3 With regards to neighbouring amenity, it is considered that there is no significant detrimental impact on amenity with regard to overlooking. The proposal will not include any windows or doors that will overlook the neighbouring property. The neighbouring dwelling of Fourshaws has an existing side addition which is in close proximity to the site boundary. Whilst located adjacent the side boundary, the scale and height of the

proposal is not excessive. The eaves height is 2.3m and the roof pitches away from the boundary. As such the proposal would not result in any harmful overshadowing or be unduly overbearing.

## **11. CONCLUSION**

The following is a summary of the main reasons for the recommendation:

The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the relevant Uttlesford Local Plan policies and the application is recommended for approval.

## **RECOMMENDATION – CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

### **CONDITIONS**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this decision.

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.