DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Sam Dicocco.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/00640/FPH	Part two storey part single storey rear extension, single storey front porch extension and ancillary works.	203 Baldock Road Letchworth Garden City Hertfordshire SG6 2EJ

Submitted Plan Nos

Location Plan; PA01; PA02; PA03; PA04; PA05; PA06; PA07; PA08; PA09; PA10; PA11; PA12; PA15;

1.0 Policies

LP28 House Extensions

LP55	Car Parking Standards
LP57	Residential Guidelines and Standards
SECT7	Requiring Good Design
XD1	Sustainable Design
XD2	Hse Extns,Replacement Dwells,Outbuilding
XD3	Protecting Living Conditions
XT2	Parking

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 None.

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 None.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

4.1.1 The site lies within the settlement of Letchworth Garden City. The surrounding area is predominately residential in character, albeit with a fuel garage station adjacent to the site. Baldock Road is characterised by two storey dwellings with evidence of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings in the vicinity of the site.

4.1.2 The site hosts a two storey detached dwelling in a reasonably sized plot. The dwelling is set back approximately 9m from Baldock Road, a spacing which is reflected along the length of dwellings on this side of the street. The dwelling hosts a steep pitched roof with gabled side elevations. The eaves height of the roof is relatively low for a two storey dwelling, so the first floor windows are accommodated to the front by two small

pitched roof gable fronted half dormers, and to the rear by two flat roof half-dormer windows.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 The application seeks permission for the erection of a two storey rear extension, rear veranda and front porch. The two storey rear extension would host two depths. The two storey rear addition would extend approximately 4.8m along the west flank wall of the dwelling. The addition would then step in approximately 5.4m where it would then extend a further 2.2m in depth. This results in the addition extended approximately 7m along the east flank wall. The open veranda would extend a further 1.5m from the deepest part of the addition, having an equal depth along the width of the building. The front porch would host a pitched roof with open gabled front elevation with timber detailing.

4.2.2 The roof detailing above the two storey additions is unusual. The additions along the flank walls would host tiled pitched roofs with gabled rear elevations. These roofs would be subordinate to the main dwelling, approximately 0.5m below the ridge height of the main building. The eaves height to the rear would be raised by approximately 0.9m, but the ridge height of the main building would remain the same. The central roof pitch joining the roof pitches at either side would host a pitched roof with two roof lights either side and host a greater ridge height, meeting the height of the main part of the dwelling. This part of the addition would host a fully glazed rear gabled elevation. The veranda would host a gentle pitch lean-to roof.

4.3 **Key Issues**

4.3.1 Residential extensions in urban areas are considered acceptable if they are sympathetic to the existing house, maintain the character of the sites surroundings, and respect the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining properties. In regards to extensions remaining sympathetic to the existing dwelling, the considerations are the additions height, form, proportions, window detailing and materials.

4.3.2 The form of the extensions, presenting front and rear facing gabled elevations not dissimilar to the gabled sided and fronted existing dwelling, would be sympathetic to the existing dwelling in relation to form. The window detailing would also be sympathetic, presenting consistent Georgian glazing to the front and first floor rear elevation. The exceptions to the windows being sympathetic are the ground floor rear full length glazed bi-fold doors and the bespoke full height glazing in the central first floor rear gabled elevation. The materials to be used in the extension would match those present in the existing dwelling.

4.3.3 In regards to the height of the extension, the central pitched roof with gabled rear facing elevation would match the ridge height of the existing dwelling. The two pitched roofs either side would remain subservient to the existing ridge height of the building. For this reason, it is considered that, for the most part, and where visible, the extension would appear sympathetic to the existing dwelling in regards to its height.

4.3.4 The addition would not in all measurable aspects remain sympathetic to the existing house in regards to proportions. The extension would increase the size of the dwelling by approximately 85%. The two storey rear extension, not including the veranda, would not be considered sympathetic to the existing dwelling in terms of its proportions. Notwithstanding this, it is accepted that rear extensions may not be sympathetic to the existing house in some factors and not cause harm to the character of the sites

surroundings or the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining premises by reason if it's siting and discernibility from the public realm.

4.3.5 Notwithstanding the extensions siting, it would be apparent from public vantage points along both Baldock Road and Radburn Way through the neighbouring plot to the east which contains a fuelling garage. The two storey extension along the east flank wall of the property would be 7m in depth. This is approximately equal in depth to the existing dwelling. The addition would be visible and appear overly dominant of the existing building. It is understood that the plot is deep, and the resultant building would not fill the site, however, the plot size is not identifiable from public vantage points, and the resultant building would appear over-developed and extended in a disproportionate fashion, contrary to policy 28 and 57 of the Saved Local Plan.

4.3.6 The design and access statement provided uses the Letchworth Design Guide (2000) to support the depth of the proposed development. It is agreed that the rather dated guidance does state that rear additions up to 5m could be acceptable so long as the addition is not within 4m of the closest neighbouring house. The guide continues to state that such developments should not be visually prominent from any public space. As discussed above, the 7m deep two storey addition would be visually prominent from public vantage points and dominate the existing dwelling in terms of its proportions.

4.3.7 The adjoining property to the east is a fuelling garage. It is not considered that any potential impact in terms of scale of built form and loss of light would impact the use of the neighbouring site. The host dwelling is sites slightly eschew to the street, resulting in the rear of the dwelling facing slightly to the west at the rear. By reason of the separation distance and existing single storey additions to the neighbouring dwelling to the west, it is not considered that the proposed extension would appear unduly dominant or cause loss of light. A first floor bedroom window is proposed within the west facing flank wall. The proposed window would be within 7m, and face two clear glazed first floor windows within the opposing flank wall of No.201 Baldock Road. The first floor side facing window has clear capacity to impinge the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property. As the proposed side facing window would serve a bedroom, a condition requiring obscure glazing and that the window be un-opening unless 1.7m above the finished floor level of the room which it serves would be unacceptable in terms of the living conditions of the occupier of the proposed bedroom.

4.3.8 No block plan has been provided within the application showing the proposed development. Using the supplied site location plan and imposing the dimensions of the proposed two storey addition and veranda, the first floor addition would be within 1m of the shared boundary with No.201 Baldock Road not including any eaves overhang or guttering. More worryingly, the proposed veranda would not be a significant distance from the boundary, possibly encroaching upon the neighbouring site.

4.3.9 Whilst there would remain space at first floor level due to the spacing left by No.201 Baldock Road, it remains likely that the plot on which No.201 Baldock Road sits could carry further built form. It is considered likely that the plot could be redeveloped or the dwelling extended in the future, and as such, it is considered that the depth of the two storey addition and proximity to the boundary could prejudice the extent to which the neighbouring property could extend to the same extent without reducing the spacing at first floor level to an unacceptable level. The first floor spacing between buildings on Baldock Road is considered to contribute to the character of the sites surroundings, and spacing of less than 2m at first floor level between detached premises would be considered harmful to the street scene.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 The addition, by reason of the plots relatively open context, as well as the size, scale and proportions of the addition, would fail to remain sympathetic to the existing dwelling. The resultant extension would appear disproportionate and overly dominant of the dwelling, harming the spacious layout and form of residential development in the sites surroundings. Furthermore, the proposed works would result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.201 Baldock Road in terms of privacy, and insufficient information has been provided in the application to assess the likelihood of the development prejudicing the ability of No.201 Baldock Road to extend or redevelop to the same extent without harming the character of the sites surroundings. As such, the proposal fails to accord with the provisions of the local development plan, specifically policies 28 and 57 of the Saved Local Plan, paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies D2 and D3 of the 2011-2031 Proposed Submission Local Plan.

5.0 **Recommendation**

5.1 That planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed extension, by reason of its size, scale and proportions would fail to remain sympathetic to the existing dwelling in regards to proportions. The sites relatively open context would result in the disproportionate additions appearing overly dominant of the existing dwelling, harming the spacious layout and form which characterises the sites surroundings. Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided to assess the likelihood of the development prejudicing the ability of No.201 Baldock Road to extend or redevelop to the same extent without harming the character of the sites surroundings by reason of spacing of the development at first floor level from the shared boundary. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with policies 28 and 57 of the Saved Local Plan, paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy D2 of teh 2011-2031 Proposed Submission Local Plan.

2. The extension would result in a clear glazed first floor window in the west facing flank wall. This window would give direct views into two existing clear glazed first floor windows within the adjoining premise to the west, No.201 Baldock Road, resulting in direct overlooking afflicting the levels of privacy afforded to the occupier of the neighbouring dwelling. No conditions could acceptably eliminate the harm to the living conditions of the occupier of the adjoining property, and as such, the proposal fails to accord with policy 28 and 57 of the Saved Local Plan and policy D3 of the 2011-2031 Proposed Submission Local Plan.

Proactive Statement:

Planning permission has been refused for this proposal for the clear reasons set out in this decision notice. The Council has not acted proactively through positive engagement with the applicant as in the Council's view the proposal is unacceptable in principle and the fundamental objections cannot be overcome through dialogue. Since no solutions can be found the Council has complied 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  Simon Ellis Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 24 April 2018	