DELEGATED FILE NOTE

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

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/01294/FPH	First floor rear extension and single storey side extension.	7 Meadow Way Codicote Hitchin Hertfordshire SG4 8YL

Submitted Plan Nos

001 P2 002 P1 003 P1 004 P1

1.0 Policies

LP28 House Extensions

LP55	Car Parking Standards
XD1	Sustainable Design
XD2	Hse Extns,Replacement Dwells,Outbuilding
XD3	Protecting Living Conditions
XT2	Parking

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 7 – Requiring good design

Supplementary Planning Document

Vehicle Parking at New Development September 2011

2.0 **Site History**

07/01741/1HH: Part two storey and part single storey rear extension (as amended by drawing no. AT/214/01 A received on 22nd August 2007).

3.0 **Representations**

Parish Council:

No objection.

Local residents:

No formal objections, one neighbour confirmed whether extensions within 1m of the boundary/ adjacent property were allowed.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

The application site is a post-war two-storey end of terrace dwelling located within the parish of Codicote, Hitchin. It is unlisted and located outside a conservation area.

4.2 **Proposal**

The application seeks planning permission for a first floor rear extension and single storey side extension.

4.3 **Key Issues**

Design:

The application site is on the eastern end of a four-dwelling terrace, and is adjacent a similar four-dwelling terrace to the west. There is an existing full width single storey rear extension at ground floor level, and several properties along the host terrace also have rear extensions. It is proposed to erect a first floor extension to the rear, which would project to the rear built line of the existing ground floor extension. To the side, a full length single storey side extension with a sloping roof is proposed.

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..."

The first floor rear extension would be 3.6m, resulting in a depth of 9.6m at ground and first floors. While this would add additional bulk, making no. 7 more prominent than the other dwellings along the terrace it is considered it would not result in such a significant amount of bulk to make the proposal unacceptable in design terms. It is considered the combined ground and first floor rear extensions would remain subservient to the host dwelling, and the upper floor would be formed of an appropriate materiality. In addition it would have a pitched roof which would sit below the main roof pitch, and would project north to south, rather than east to west like the main roof slope does, and would therefore read as an addition. It is proposed to update the fenestration to the rear elevation; the existing double doors would be replaced with wider bifolding doors, and a casement window would be replaced with a larger projecting box window. The proposed glazing is considered appropriate and would provide well designed contemporary fenestration to the rear elevation.

To the side, the full width single storey extension would slope down towards the boundary wall and would have three rooflights in the roof. It would be set in from the side boundary by approximately 0.9m. The side extension would be formed of brick to match the host building, with metal framing to the glazing.

The two extensions, and the alterations at ground floor would read as three separate, but materially similar extensions that relate well to the host building.

Amenity:

To the rear, the proposed extension would result in a two-storey, 3.6m projection beyond the principal wall of the host terrace. The closest affected property would be no. 5 which adjoins to the west on this elevation. At first floor level, the middle of the closest affected window would be on an angle of less than 45° from the extension, but would be more than 25°. Given that the extension would be to the west of the site, on a north facing elevation it is considered there would not be a material loss of light caused by the 3.6m extension.

The erection of a 3.6m extension, which would have a blank wall next to the upper floor window of no. 5 would result in a sense of enclosure. However given the length of the rear gardens to the terrace, it is considered this would not result in a materially unacceptable and unneighbourly situation.

At ground floor level there is a rear extension to no. 5 which projects approximately 3m, so is set in slightly from the rear extension to no. 7. As such it is considered there would not be a material loss of light or increased sense of enclosure to this level. There are no windows proposed to the side of the first floor extension, only to the rear and therefore it is considered there will not be a loss of privacy resulting from the first floor extension. At ground floor level, there are existing high boundary walls to both sides of the site and therefore the alterations to the existing fenestration will not result in a loss of privacy.

To the side, the proposed single storey extension would measure 2.8m next to the boundary wall, and it is set in by approximately 0.9m. A 2m gap between the side extension and the adjacent property, no.9 would be retained. No. 9 is adjacent to the east, and there is significant vegetation and a trellis fence to the boundary. Policy 28 of the saved Local Plan, and Policy D2 of the emerging Local Plan states that side extensions at first floor and above which leave a gap of less than 1m to the side boundary are likely to be refused on amenity grounds. However the proposed extension is single storey, at ground floor level and leaves a gap of just under 1m. As such, it is considered the proposed extension would not result in an unneighbourly arrangement.

Owing to the proposed height of 2.8m next to the boundary, the significant boundary treatment to the side elevation and the detailed design of the proposed single storey extension, it is considered there would not be a material loss of light, privacy or an increased sense of enclosure to adjacent no. 7. While there is a door proposed to the side of the side extension, this is for access to the side/rear of the property, and is in an area that could reasonably be accessed by the occupants now.

The closest properties which abut the rear of the site (which front onto Hill Road and Heath Lane) are at a distance from the rear of the host dwelling and therefore it is considered the proposed side and rear extensions will not result in a material amenity impact.

It is considered the proposals are acceptable in amenity terms and no objection is raised.

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

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

5.0 **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  Simon Ellis Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 13 July 2018	