DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Richard Tiffin.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/00715/FPH	Part two storey part single storey side extension.	The Firs Church Lane Therfield Royston Hertfordshire SG8 9QB

Submitted Plan Nos

592/18/01; 592/18/02; 592/18/03; 592/18/04; OS

1.0 Policies

LP28 House Extensions

SECT12	Conserving and enhancing historic enviro
SECT7	Requiring Good Design
XD2	Hse Extns,Replacement Dwells,Outbuilding
XHE1	Designated Heritage Assets

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 Planning permission refused in 2003 for two storey rear extension.

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **Neighbours** – The occupiers of Rosedale Cottage have written in support.

3.2 **Therfield** PC – None received

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

4.1.1 The application property is a period detached cottage (unlisted) in the Therfield conservation area.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 The application proposes twin two storey extensions rearward off of a 'cat slide' style roof. These would not increase the footprint of the building but increase its mass and height above what is currently an effective storey and a half extension (the cat slide roof). The scheme also proposes a single storey side extension adjacent to No 2. .

4.3 **Key Issues**

4.3.1 The key issues in this case centre on the impact of the scheme on the reasonable living conditions of the neighbours at No 2 and more tentatively at Forge House to the rear and Greenside and Hope cottages to the north. Further, the degree to which the extension might harm the architectural integrity of the host and the character of the conservation area.

4.3.2 Further to the above, the scheme must in my view demonstrate it is materially different from that refused in 2003. In this regard the applicant has submitted the following statement:

"Thank you for sending over the drawing relating to the historic application for a two storey extension and subsequent refusal, this has been very helpful for me to understand the reasons for the refusal. The application in 2003 was for a full height two storey extension projecting approximately 4.2m from the historic rear wall of the building and approximately 4.9m wide with the ridge and eaves heights only very slightly lower that the existing. The hipped roof does reduce the impact of the roof height but overall the extension is overbearing and dominates the existing cottage.

When looking at alternative designs for this current application we have taken into account that the property is within the conservation area, and the importance of historic buildings that contribute to this.

A subsequent planning application in 2004 was granted for a single storey addition to the rear with a continuation of the existing roof pitch. With our current proposal we hope to increase the first floor accommodation on top of the existing footprint.

The design of the first floor element is subordinate to the host dwelling with ridge and eaves heights being considerably lower that the existing. The design does not dominate the existing cottage and the rear elevation relates well to the garden. We propose to use materials for the external elevations that blend and relate to the existing cottage.

I feel that the scheme submitted does overcome the reasons for the previous refusal in terms of mass, dominance and overlooking.

I understand that there is local support for this application and hope that you might also support it. "

.

4.3.3 In my view the applicant is right to draw attention to the full height nature of the two storey scheme refused in 2003. The submitted scheme would in my opinion read as subordinate reflecting better the scale of the modest host. The single storey extension would be similarly recessive in views from the street in my view and their would be no harm to the character of the conservation area in my opinion either wen viewed from the street or the rear in glimpses through from Pedlars Lane. Distances to other properties would be such as to obviate any material overlooking in my view.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 That permission be granted subject to standard conditions.

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  Simon Ellis Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 2 May 2018	