DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Anne McDonald.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/01341/FPH	Two storey side and rear extensions following demolition of existing single storey rear extension and attached garage. (Amended description). (Amended plans received 21/06/18 and 10/07/18).	503 Broadway Letchworth Garden City Hertfordshire SG6 3PT

Submitted Plan Nos

07D 01 02A 03 04 05 06 08 09 11B 05 10B option B window detail

1.0 Policies

LP28 House Extensions

LP57	Residential Guidelines and Standards
LP58	Letchworth Garden City Design Principles
SECT12	Conserving and enhancing historic enviro
XD2	Hse Extns,Replacement Dwells,Outbuilding
XD3	Protecting Living Conditions
XHE2	Heritage at Risk

2.0 Site History

2.1 There is a fairly extensive planning history for the site including works to trees and extensions to the house. Of significance is application 16/02682/1HH which granted two storey side and rear extensions to the property.

3.0 Representations

3.1 The application was advertised with site and press notices and individual neighbour notification letters. One reply has been received from the Chairman of the Sollershott Common Green Management Committee. This raises objection to the vehicle route to the new garage and states that the application has no legal right of way to enter the new vehicular access way to the proposed new garage. It states that a vehicle would need to pass over land that is owned by the Letchworth GC Heritage Foundation and formally managed under deed by the Sollershott Common Green Management Committee and that the applicant has been unwilling to recognise legal ownership and valid land rights.

4.0 Planning Considerations

4.1 Site and Surroundings

4.1.1 The application site is a large detached house positioned on the east side of the road. It is the last property on this side before the grassy track that leads to the 'field' area

rear of houses in Sollershott Way. The house has a roughly tri-angular shaped plot, as the rear boundary tapers, due to the grassy track running along the north side boundary. The mature trees and hedges along the front boundary of the property with Broadway has been largely removed, and a new lower level fence and yew hedge has been planted. As a result, there are now very clear views of the house from the road.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 The application is seeking planning permission for large scale extensions to the house. The works involve the demolition of the existing single storey side garage and single storey rear projections. The proposed plans show large scale two storey side and rear extensions and a single storey rear extension.

4.2.2 When submitted the application also sought permission for a detached double garage. I raised an objection to the location of this, and this has been deleted from the application and the description amended.

4.2.3 This proposal is seeking to keep the original two storey front elevation of the house, with the works rear of this. At ground floor level the works are 18.5m wide and are part 4.6m and part 6.3m deep. At first floor level the extensions are a maximum of 12.2m wide and part 5m and 8.5m deep. Ridged pitched roofs are proposed at two storey, and the ridge height of these have been amended to please the Heritage Foundation. At ground floor, the 'garden room' off the kitchen is to have a part mono-pitched and part raised lantern style crown room within. The rear of the single storey part of the proposal is to have a lean to style roof.

4.2.4 The house is within the Conservation Area, but is not a listed building. Its next door neighbour, no.501 is a listed building.

4.3 **Key Issues**

- I have no objection to the principle of these proposal. The planning history sets a precedent for large scale extensions to this house. The 2016 scheme proposed the demolition of part of the front elevation of the house, whereas, this proposal seeks to retain all of the front elevation, which given this is prominent and attractive house within the Conservation Area is an improvement.
- I note that the amount of floorpsace being added is considerable. However, given the property's unique position in the street scene, with the access to the Sollershott field next to the house providing wide spacing and setting around the house and distance to the neighbours, I consider that this house and plot can take sizable extensions in this instance without these causing harm in the locality or on neighbouring residential amenity.
- The two storey side extension is set behind the font 'turret' feature, with a hipped ended roof and a lower ridge height in comparison to the main house to make it appear a more subservient addition. Given that this is set back front the prominent front elevation by 6m and out looking onto the wide part of the side garden, I do not consider that this part of the proposal would appear unacceptable as a 'wing' onto the house.
- The part two storey and two single storey rear extension are again large extensions. However, due to the unique relationship this house has with its neighbours with large distances to the neighbour's, these proposals will not cause adverse harm by way of appearing over dominant or overbearing from the neighbours. Therefore, no objection is raised on this basis.
- Furthermore, as these are rear extensions only minimal views of the bulk of the two storey rear extension will be visible in views from Broadway. Most of the bulk of the

extension will be screened in views by the existing trees along the side boundaries. Therefore, these works will only have very minimal visual impact in the setting and context of the Conservation Area. As these are large extensions onto a large house, I do not consider these would negatively affect the setting or context of the house or Conservation Area.

- The closest neighbour is no.505. As the existing side garage is to be demolished, the gap to this neighbour is to be opened up. The single storey works on this side of the house are alongside the side flank wall of no.505 and will not cause any dominance or harm issues. The two storey part of the proposal will be visible in views from the garden of no.505. However, given that the two storey part of the rear extension is set in 12m off the side boundary with no.505, I cannot conclude that at this distance the rear extension would appear adversely over dominant or over bearing to the occupiers of no.505 when in their rear garden.
- I raised objection to the proposed garage both in terms of questioning the use of the right of way over the grassy track rear of the neighbours in Sollershott Way, and I considered the introduction of a 6.4m wide and 5m high garage in this frontage location would be contrary and harmful to the setting and character of Broadway. As a result, this part of the proposal has been deleted from the scheme.
- I note that the neighbour no.501 is a listed building. However, due to the wide gap between these two houses and the verdant boundary of no.501, I do not consider that these would will have any impact on the setting of the neighbouring listed building.
- The forms and plans state that the external materials are to be: clay plain tiles to match; rough cast render painted off white; red bricks to match; exposed timber painted black to match and rainwater goods cast iron and painted black to match. I have no objection to any of these materials.
- Regarding the windows, the amended plan received on 10/07/18 – elevations option B – shows that the new aluminium windows are to be in the extension only. These are to be white, aluminium windows with external leaded panes. Therefore in views when passing the property these windows will appear to match the original timber leaded windows in the front original part of the house to be retained, and no objection is raised to this.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 The application is considered to comply with the necessary criteria of the existing and emerging local plan policies and is recommended for conditional permission.

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. The Council acted proactively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. 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  Tom Rea Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 10 July 2018	