

DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Andrew Hunter.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
24/02517/FPH	First floor rear extension over existing rear extension to include gabled roof. Insertion of rooflight to existing rear roofslope. Front canopy, alterations to fenestration, external cladding and replace front boundary wall.	Maran Cottage 145 High Street Codicote Hertfordshire SG4 8UB

Submitted Plan Nos

RLS-01.1 RLS-02.1 RLS-03.1 RLS-04.1 Location Plan

1.0 Policies

D1	Sustainable design
D2	House exts, replcmnt dwellings outbuild
D3	Protecting living conditions
HE1	Designated heritage assets
HE3	Non-designated heritage assets
SECN12	Achieving well-designed places
SECN16	Conserve + enhance historic environment
SP13	Historic environment
SP9	Design and Sustainability

2.0 **Relevant Site History**

2.1 74/00492/1 - Extension to existing cottage – Approved 09/07/74.

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **Neighbours** – The following comments were received from No. 151 High Street in support:

- ☐ No objections.
- ☐ Our cottages are Grade II listed.

- ☐ The side path between us and No. 149 is ours as well as providing access to 153 and 155.

3.2 **Archaeology** – No comments to make.

3.3 **Conservation Consultant** – The scale of the two-storey rear extension would be excessive scale, both in height and depth, in a prominent location within the street scene and would have an overbearing impact on No. 145 and also the adjacent listed properties. This prominence would be increased by the use of black timber which would increase the degree of harm.

There are no objections to the replacement of the existing rear windows which are of modern materials and poor quality. The front timber windows appear to be of a historic type and their loss could impact the historic interest and character of the host dwelling and replacement with UPVC windows with applied glazing bars even where the design is 'heritage style' not be supported.

The existing front boundary wall is not of historic interest and its replacement with an appropriate low wall of matching brick is acceptable in heritage terms.

The proposed rear rooflight and rear sliding doors appear large but would not be visible in the street scene and based on the more modern appearance of the rear elevation currently, there is no objection to these features.

The existing flat door canopy is in keeping with the existing dwellinghouse and is appropriate to the dwellinghouse. The larger projecting canopy as proposed, would not be in keeping with the character of the property due to its scale and design and the existing should be retained or replaced like for like.

The proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the adjacent listed buildings, contrary to Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. With regards to the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 the level of harm is 'less than substantial' as per paragraph 215. 'Great weight' should be given to the heritage asset's conservation as per paragraph 212. In accordance with paragraph 216, a balanced judgement will be required as to the effect on No. 145 as a non-designated heritage asset.

(Full comments on file)

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

4.1.1 The site is a two storey detached dwelling with a pitched roof. The locality has a predominantly residential character although there are two shops nearby. No. 151 High Street that adjoins the site to the SE is a Grade II listed building, as are Nos. 153-157 in the same terrace.

4.2 **Proposal**

- 4.2.1 The proposal is for a first floor rear extension with a pitched roof, black wooden cladding to the resulting two storey rear projection, a pitched roof canopy to the front door, a new rear rooflight, rebuilding a front elevation wall and alterations to openings. The number of bedrooms will not be increased.
- 4.2.2 The plans also show external alterations to a detached garage in the site. however these are proposed under separate pending application 24/02680/LDCP.

4.3 **Key Issues**

- 4.3.1 The key material considerations are design and heritage, and impacts on neighbour amenity.

Design and heritage

- 4.3.2 The Council's Conservation Consultant (CC) has considered that the application property should be a non-designated heritage asset, as stated here in their comments:

No.145 is clearly of historic character and appears on maps dating back to the nineteenth century. It has patterned historic brickwork, including darkened flared bricks in a pattern which matches those at the Grade II listed No 151-157 High Street, which is mentioned in the Historic England listing. The building also has attractive prominent chimneys, timber windows and is prominent within the street scene. On this basis, it is likely to meet the criteria for 'Local Interest' set out by NHDC and should be considered a non-designated heritage asset and assessed on this basis as per paragraph 216 of the NPPF 2024.

- 4.3.3 I do not disagree with the assessment of the building, with the caveat that this does not apply to the rear elevation and single storey rear projection as these are more modern and lack the detailing and aesthetic qualities of the front of the building.

- 4.3.4 The CC has commented on each element of the scheme, not raising objections to the replacement front wall, rear rooflight and replacement rear windows and doors. These would have similar impacts to the existing and are acceptable.

- 4.3.5 It's proposed to replace the front windows, and the CC has stated:

The front timber windows appear to be of a historic type and their loss could impact the historic interest and character of the host dwelling and replacement with UPVC windows with applied glazing bars even where the design is 'heritage style' not be supported.

- 4.3.6 The CC has raised concerns over the replacement of the front windows, to UPVC white windows in black frames. The new windows would differ in appearance and would appear more modern than the existing windows, which do appear more historic and are unusual in this part of Codicote due to them being black in white frames.

- 4.3.7 The proposed new windows would be considered to not be as sympathetic to the character and appearance of the building than the existing, as they would be constructed

of modern materials, would have bulkier frames and glazing bars, and would reverse the window and frame colours.

- 4.3.8 A significant material consideration in respect of the proposed front windows is that their replacement to the windows proposed can be carried out as permitted development, as the proposed new front window would be similar in appearance to the rear openings of the dwelling which are white windows and doors, some of which are in black frames. The glazing bars would be bulkier than those of the front windows, however these are not considered harmful. Due to the permitted development fall-back position, there are no objections to the front windows.

- 4.3.9 The CC has raised these concerns relating to the proposed front door canopy:

The existing flat door canopy is in keeping with the existing dwellinghouse and is appropriate to the dwellinghouse. The larger projecting canopy as proposed, would not be in keeping with the character of the property due to its scale and design and the existing should be retained or replaced like for like.

- 4.3.10 The proposed front canopy is on the larger side, however it's not considered that it would be so large as to be detrimental to the dwelling, would not project beyond the front steps of the dwelling, and would be comparable to other nearby front door canopies nearby up the High Street to the NW. A similar canopy could also be potentially built under permitted development. The proposed front door canopy is considered acceptable.

- 4.3.11 The CC has also raised concerns over the proposed first floor rear extension and new black wooden cladding, which are the most significant elements of the proposal. The CC has stated:

The scale of the two-storey rear extension would be excessive scale, both in height and depth, in a prominent location within the street scene and would have an overbearing impact on No. 145 and also the adjacent listed properties. This prominence would be increased by the use of black timber which would increase the degree of harm.

- 4.3.12 The existing single storey rear projection that the proposed extension would be built on is not original and was built at some time after planning permission 74/00492/1. There would therefore be a cumulative impact of rear extensions to the dwelling. The proposed rear extension would however maintain the depth and width of the existing rear projection, with a ridge height lower than the main ridge. The size of the cumulative extension is not considered disproportionate to the dwelling, and would be considered to be of a design in keeping with its character and appearance.

- 4.3.13 The resulting two storey rear projection would be clad in black timber, which is not a material in use on any of the elevations of the dwelling which are of bricks. The existing single storey extension is however of brown bricks that differ noticeably from the red bricks of the original dwelling, with the extension appearing darker than the original dwelling. The proposed use of black timber cladding would maintain a darker appearance of the rear extension, with the proposed cladding not considered harmful to the character and appearance of the main dwelling due to its darker colour and rear location.

- 4.3.14 The site for the proposed rear extension and cladding on its SE side elevation are however visible in the street scene due to the terrace of listed and non-listed dwellings to the SE being set further back from the road than the application property. The present rear extension to the dwelling is lower than the eaves of No. 151 (the closest dwelling of the terrace), and maintains a sky gap between it and No. 151.
- 4.3.15 The proposed first floor extension would essentially double the eaves height and reduce the sky gap with No. 151, resulting in the application property appearing more visually dominant against No. 151, as the eaves would be higher than the eaves of No. 151 and the roof ridge would also be higher than the ridge of No. 151.
- 4.3.16 The CC considers that the proposed rear extension would be prominent and would have an overbearing impact on the adjacent listed buildings, exacerbated by the proposed black timber cladding.
- 4.3.17 Given the close proximity of the application property to at least listed building No. 151 and its rear projection that would be extended, I do not disagree that there would be impacts on the setting of listed building No. 151 as a designated heritage asset. The impacts would be visual dominance of No. 151, which is considered harmful to its setting and significance.
- 4.3.18 The proposal would be considered to result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset under para. 215 of the NPPF. Also under that para., no public benefits are apparent, and the site already has an optimum viable use as a dwelling. In this respect therefore the proposal conflicts with S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Local Plan Policies SP13 and HE1, and Section 16 of the NPPF.
- 4.3.19 The external materials in the street scene of this part of Codicote High Street are predominantly bricks, and some smaller uses of painted render. There are also small amounts of tile hanging and exposed timbers.
- 4.3.20 A single storey side projection to No. 170 opposite the site to the SW has timber cladding as is proposed, and is in a more prominent location as it's sited on the side of No. 170 onto highway The Opening. Due to the mix of materials in this part of the High Street and as part of a nearby dwelling has black timber cladding, the proposed use of cladding is considered in keeping with the street scene.
- 4.3.20 However, for the reasons above, the proposal is considered harmful to the setting and significance of nearby listed building No. 151 High Street. The proposal does not comply with Local Plan Policies SP13 and HE1, and Section 16 of the NPPF.

Neighbour amenity

- 4.3.21 The altered openings will be on the front and rear, will not have greater impacts than the existing, and are acceptable. The rear rooflights will be at a high level and will not cause loss of privacy. The replacement front wall will be the same height as the existing and will not cause harm. The new front door canopy will be small and will not be harmful.

- 4.3.22 The proposed rear extension would be considered to be sufficiently far from neighbouring dwellings Nos. 10 and 13 to the NE and NW to not appear overbearing or cause loss of light.
- 4.3.23 The rear extension would be approx. 7.3m from the side boundary with the rear garden of No. 13. This is a relatively close distance, albeit some views of the rear garden of No. 13 would be obscured by an outbuilding in the garden of No. 13 near the site boundary. This part of Codicote is characterized by numerous dwellings with small rear gardens, and due to the above the impacts on the privacy and amenity of No. 13 are not considered harmful.
- 4.3.24 The rear extension also includes a first floor rear window, that would be approx. 6.7m from the rear boundary of the site with the rear garden of No. 10, and would not have screening that would be sufficient to block or obscure views from the new window. The window is proposed to be secondary to a bedroom, and if permission was to be granted it could be required to be obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m above the floor level of the bedroom. Impacts on the amenity of No. 10 are considered acceptable.
- 4.3.25 The other closest dwelling is No. 151 High Street. As this dwelling is to the south, the rear extension won't cause loss of light. There are no openings on the extension that could cause loss of privacy.
- 4.3.26 The front elevation of No. 151 contains one ground floor and one first floor window that are located centrally in that wall. The rear projection of the application property is oriented away from the front of No. 151. Due to this and the location of the front windows of No. 151, it's not considered that the extension will harm the amenity of No. 151. Impacts on amenity are therefore acceptable. The proposal complies with Policy D3 of the Local Plan.

4.4 **Conclusion**

- 4.4.1 In the absence of material planning reasons to the contrary it is my view that planning permission is **REFUSED**.

5.0 **Recommendation**

- 5.1 That planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reason:

1. The proposal by reason of its size, siting, scale, design, materials and visual impacts, will be harmful to the setting and significance of nearby listed building No. 151 High Street, Codicote. The proposal does not comply with Policies SP13 and HE1 of the Local Plan, and Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

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: 19 December 2024	