**DELEGATED FILE NOTE**

**CASE OFFICER:** ...Heather Lai.....

| APPLICATION REFERENCE | BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT | APPLICATION SITE |
|---|---|---|
| 18/01376/FPH | Single storey side and rear extension. Roof extension to provide first floor accommodation. | 2 Traherne Close<br>Hitchin<br>Hertfordshire<br>SG4 9DS |

**Submitted Plan Nos**

DP 965/01A; DP 965/02A; DP 965/03

**1.0 Policies**

## 1. Planning Policy

### 1.1. North Hertfordshire District Council Local Plan No. 2 with alterations

Policy 28 – Housing Extensions
Policy 55 – Car Parking Standards

### 1.2. National Planning Policy Framework

Section 7 – Requiring good design

### 1.3. Emerging Local Plan 2011-2031 (Approved by Full Council 11th April 2017)

D1 - Sustainable Design;
D2 – House extensions and replacement dwellings;
D3 – Protecting living conditions;
T2 – Parking

### 1.4. Supplementary Planning Document

Vehicle Parking at New Development September 2011

## 2. Site History

**88/01389/1:** Single storey rear extension. Approved

## 3. Representations

3.1. Neighbouring residents:

1 objection; 1 support:
No. 1, the adjoining property has raised no objection to the works.
No. 3 to the north east has objected on loss of privacy to both their property and their rear garden. They also consider the value of their property will be reduced.

## 4. Planning Considerations

### 4.1. Site and Surroundings

The application site is a single storey semi detached property located on the western side of Traherne Close. It benefits from a large rear garden, and a sizeable front garden. There is an existing single storey garage to the side of the property which is separate, but physically connected by a large existing fence and gate, with a tiled, pitch roof above. To the rear is a poor quality semi-solid, semi-glazed single storey extension which was approved in the 1980s (see site history).

### 4.2. Proposal

The application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension, and the erection of a single storey side and rear extension. A roof extension including a dormer window and rooflights is also proposed to provide loft accommodation.

### 4.3. Key Issues

**Design:**

4.3.1. Policy 28 suggests that house extensions are generally acceptable providing they are "...sympathetic to the existing house in height, form, proportions, window details and materials..." and "...pitched roofs are used where appropriate..."

4.3.2. The application seeks permission for the raising of the roof height to erect a side dormer window, which would wrap around to be partially visible from the front elevation. Four small rooflights would be installed to the roof, one each facing north, south, east and west.

4.3.3. At ground floor level the existing poor quality rear extension, which does not relate well to the dwelling would be demolished, and a single storey solid wraparound extension would be erected. This would be formed of brick to match the host dwelling, with 2 no. aluminium bi-folding doors to the rear, and a pitched roof to match the host building, which will allow for additional loft level accommodation.

4.3.4. The proposed raising of the roof is considered acceptable in design terms; while it will add additional bulk to the dwelling, and will unbalance the pair of dwellings, to the front elevation the only visible manifestations will be a minor extension to the side of the roofslope and part of the glazed dormer. However, owing to the size of the roof extensions to this north elevation, the existing garage and side gated area, and the set back of the host building from adjacent no. 3, it is considered the additional bulk will not have a materially adverse impact in design terms, and there is no public harm.

4.3.5. To the side and rear elevations, the roof level extensions will be visible from limited private views, with the north facing dormer extension set behind the existing garage and proposed side extensions. Therefore public views of it will be limited. To the north side elevation, the erection of the dormer window and the raising of the roof will be the most significant roof level extensions. However, it is considered the extension represents a well designed extension that will relate well to the host building in terms of scale, design and materiality and is therefore considered acceptable.

4.3.6. No objection is raised to the installation of four small rooflights to each side of the roofslope which are to be well positioned and proportioned.

4.3.7. The proposed wraparound extension is considered acceptable in design terms; it will represent an improvement on the existing situation with the poor quality extension. The only increase in the footprint of the dwelling will be the extension to the side, which will be an infill segment to fit between the house and the garage. Owing to its position between the two existing structures and its position towards the rear of the property, there will be very limited private visibility to the side extension. In addition the closest dwellings to the rear have a blank wall facing the site. Given the size of the plot, it is considered the extension is not excessive in scale and will relate well to the host building.

4.3.8. There is an existing high boundary treatment between the garage and the dwelling which has a pitched, tiled roof above it. This would be altered to have a front door in it, giving direct access from the new extension. However, aside from the alterations to the materiality of the door and the wall in this location, the scale, design and reading of the relationship of the dwelling and the garage will not change. It is considered this element of the proposal is acceptable in design terms.

4.3.9. It is considered the design, size and materiality of the extensions as well as their relationship to the host building are acceptable in this context and accord with Policy 28 and Policies D1 and D2.

**Amenity:**

4.3.10. No. 2 benefits from a modestly sized site, which is larger than most others on Traherne Close, and opens out towards the rear. The front of the property faces towards the east, and it adjoins no. 1 to the south east. The majority of the works are to the north/ north-west of the site, facing to the side and rear. Owing to the

proportions of the site, the host building is set slightly back, and on an angle from adjacent no. 3 which sits to the north-east. No. 3 has its front elevation facing south-east, and is positioned further forward than no. 2. To the rear is The Maples, a medium density Council estate, however there is a blank side elevation facing towards the application site.

4.3.11. The proposed single storey wraparound rear-side extension, and the roof level alterations including the side dormer will face towards the side of no. 3, but towards the rear of this dwelling. This side elevation is secondary frontage to no. 3, and includes obscure glazing to a door and one of the four windows.

4.3.12. While the objection relating to overlooking to no. 3 is noted, given the relationship between the two properties, including the gap between the two dwellings; that no. 2 is set further back on its site; and the proposed loft level dormer would be positioned towards the rear of no.3s building line; as well as the size and glazing of the windows at no. 3, it is considered the proposal would not cause such a material increase in overlooking as to result in unacceptable living conditions. In addition, the dormer window is to serve a staircase and provide sufficient head room in this location and will not serve in a habitable room.

4.3.13. Regarding the raising of the roof level to this elevation to facilitate the creation of loft level habitable space, given the distance at this position between nos. 2 and 3, that the increased height would be positioned towards the rear, and would result in a 1.4m increase to 2.6m roof height (the highest part of the existing roof is 2.8m), it is considered this would not result in a material loss of light or an increased sense of enclosure to the occupants of no. 3. In addition, the existing garage will partially obscure the roof level extensions when viewed from no.3.

4.3.14. To the front (east) elevation, the closest habitable properties are at some distance to the other side of Traherne Close and therefore the roof level extensions will not result in a loss of light, increased sense of enclosure or loss of privacy.

4.3.15. To the south elevation the application site adjoins no. 1 and the increased roof height will be contained within the existing roofslope and will therefore not result in a loss of light or privacy or an increased sense of enclosure.

4.3.16. To the rear, the closest habitable buildings are those located on The Maples. A blank flank wall faces towards the application site and therefore the roof level extensions will not result in a loss of privacy, light or an increased sense of enclosure.

4.3.17. To the side, the proposed single storey side and rear extensions at ground floor level will be contained between the garage and the host building, and to the rear will retain the footprint of the existing extension. As such, it is considered these extensions will not result in a loss of privacy or light, or an increased sense of enclosure to no. 3, or properties to the rear on The Maples. It is located to the opposite side to adjoining no. 1 and therefore, will not result in a loss of privacy or light, or an increased sense of enclosure.

4.3.18. On balance it is considered the proposals are acceptable in amenity terms.

**Parking:**

4.3.19. The proposed development would not trigger the requirement for additional car parking to be provided within the application site.

**Other:**

4.3.20. The neighbours' objection regarding a devaluing of their property is noted; however this is not a material planning consideration.

4.4. **Conclusion**

In the absence of material planning reasons to the contrary it is my view that planning permission should be **GRANTED.**

**5. Recommendation**

5.1. That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

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

   Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the details specified in the application and supporting approved documents and plans listed above.

   Reason:To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with details which form the basis of this grant of permission.

**Proactive Statement**:

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted proactively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

| | |
|---|---|
| Signed<br><br>Simon Ellis<br><br>Determining Officer | Development Management<br>North Hertfordshire District Council<br>Council Offices<br>Gernon Road<br>Letchworth<br>Herts<br>SG6 3JF |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date:** 9 July 2018 | |