

DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...William Thompson.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
24/02157/FPH	Part two storey and single storey rear extension. Alterations to fenestration	38 High Dane Hitchin Hertfordshire SG4 0BD

Submitted Plan Nos

PL.00 PL.002 PL.003 PL.004 PL.005

1.0 Policies

D1 Sustainable design

D2 House exts, replcmnt dwellings outbuild

D3 Protecting living conditions

T2 Parking

SECN12 Achieving well-designed places

SECN14 Meeting climate change,coastal,flooding

2.0 **Relevant Site History**

2.1 None relevant

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **Site and Neighbour Consultation** – No objection to the proposed works

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

4.1.1 The property is a semi-detached dwelling located on the north-western side of High Dane, Hitchin. The property has a front driveway and a long, thin rear garden with 3 outbuildings. There are a range of rear extensions and outbuildings along the road.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 Part two storey and single storey rear extension. Alterations to fenestration

4.2.2 Materials are set to match existing.

4.3 **Key Issues**

4.3.1 The key issues for consideration are as follows:

- The acceptability of the design of the proposed development and its impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- The impact of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring properties.
- Access and parking matters.
- The impact of the proposed development on the environment.

Design and Appearance:

- 4.3.2 Policy D1 of the Local Plan requires that development proposals respond positively to the site's local context. Policy D2 of the Local Plan requires extensions to houses to incorporate design that is sympathetic to the main dwelling in terms of its scale, form and orientation and does not harm the character and appearance of the locality around the site. These policies are broadly consistent with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4.3.3 The proposed rear extension would measure approx. 4.5m in depth, approx. 7.9m in width, approx. 3.3m in height for the single storey part and approx. 7.2m in height for the two-storey part. Therefore, the extension would be approx. 1.4m wider than the existing dwelling. In terms of layout, the northern section of the proposed extension, with no adjoining neighbour is two-storeys in height and would be set in from the boundary, by approx. 0.8m. The southern section of the proposed extension, which will have built form along and over the shared boundary with the adjoining neighbour, will extend approx. 1.5m from the dwelling as two-storeys and then approx. 3.0m as a single storey. Both two-storey elements would have pitched roofs. Existing properties in this section of High Dane are devoid of rear extensions of this scale; the only other examples of two-storey extension do not extend past the side elevation, have hipped roofs and do not extend as deep as approx. 4.5m. As such, the proposed extension would result in a disproportionate and unsympathetic addition to the existing dwelling and to the built form of the area. Despite being set off the boundary with the neighbouring property no.39 High Dane by approx. 0.8m the proposed extension would dominate properties on either side contrary to both local and national planning policies.
- 4.3.5 The materials for the proposed walls, roof, windows and rainwater goods will match the existing wall render, roof tiling, uPVC windows, including some windows being reused, and black rainwater of the existing dwelling with the exception of a roof light on the proposed roof of the single storey part. It is therefore considered that the proposed materials palette is suitably sympathetic to the existing dwelling.
- 4.3.4 In respect the streetscene, the proposed extension is to the rear of the property and the southern boundary line is obscured by a row of trees; however, the proposed extension would extend approx. 1.4m from the existing side elevation, so would be visible to public view through the gap between the application site and the neighbouring property no.39 High Dane; however, this would be of minor impact.
- 4.3.5 In my view, while the proposed materials palette is sympathetic to the existing dwelling and results in minor visual harm to the street scene, the harm caused by the massing,

built form and roof design to the character and appearance of the dwelling would be disproportionate and unsympathetic. As such, the proposed development does not comply with Policy D1 and D2 of the NHLP and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties:

- 4.3.6 A core planning principle set out in the NPPF is to always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. This principle is reflected in the provisions of Policy D3 of the NHLP.
- 4.3.8 Regarding no.37 High Dane, the adjoining neighbour, the proposed extension would extend just beyond the shared boundary line along the full depth of the extension; however, Certificate B has been issued.
- 4.3.7 Regarding no.39 High Dane, the non-adjoining neighbour, there would be an increased element of shading in the afternoon as no.38 is south-west of no.39; however, the rear elevation windows of no.39 are north-west facing and, therefore, do not experience the optimum amount of daylight. While the proposed extension is set in from the boundary by approx. 0.8m and approx. 4.2m away from the rear elevation of no.39, the depth and massing of the proposed extension is too large and would cause unacceptable harm in terms of visual impact and dominance.
- 4.3.9 There would not be an unacceptable reduction in privacy as the outlook from the proposed rear extension would be similar to existing given that there is 1no. proposed side elevation window, facing the non-adjoining neighbour, that will have obscured glaze; so, do not affect privacy and mitigates overlooking onto another property.
- 4.3.10 The NPPF at paragraph 139 (b) sets out that proposed development that offers 'outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings' should be given significant weight. The proposal does not fit in with the form and layout of the surroundings, does not complement or enhance the character of the street scene and therefore fails to meet the requirements of paragraph 139 b). Additionally, the proposed rear extension would be not be sympathetic to the host dwelling in form and scale and would cause a loss to existing residential amenity. As such the proposed development does not comply with Policies D1, D2 and D3 of the NHLP.

Highways and Parking:

- 4.3.11 The development does not include an increase in the number of bedrooms; therefore, regarding policy T2 of the NHLP, there would be no car parking issues arising from the development.

Environmental Implications

- 4.3.12 The proposed development is not large enough in scale to cause significant implications for the local environment in terms of carbon emissions and therefore would be generally in compliance with Section 14 of the NPPF.

Biodiversity Net Gain:

4.3.13 This is a form of development which is exempt from BNG Legislation, defined under article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 due it falling under the scope of the 'de minimis' exemption.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 The proposed development is considered unacceptable by virtue of Policies D1, D2 and D3 of the NHLP 2011-2031 and Section 12 of the NPPF.

4.5 **Alternative Options**

4.5.1 N/A

4.6 **Pre-Commencement Conditions**

4.6.1 N/A

5.0 **Recommendation**

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

1. The proposal does not fit in with the form and layout of the surroundings and does not complement or enhance the character of the street scene. The proposals therefore fail to meet the requirements of Policy D1 of the North Herts Local Plan and paragraph 139 of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Signed  Anne McDonald	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Determining Officer Date: 3 December 2024	