DELEGATED FILE NOTE

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

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/00815/FPH	Two storey front extension, with rear dormer window and rooflights.	15 Palace Gardens Royston Hertfordshire SG8 5AD

Submitted Plan Nos

L1709-PL01; L1709-PL02; L1709-PL03

1.0 Policies

2.0 **Site History**

There is no recorded planning history for this property following the development of the road in 1987.

3.0 **Representations**

Neighbours:
None received.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

The application site is 15 Palace Gardens, a large, detached, chalet bungalow style property on the east side of the road. There is a detached double garage in the front garden, plus driveway parking and a lawn area with a large mature cypress tree in front of the property. The bungalow has a wide footprint across the site, being close to both its side boundaries. The house has a brickwork finish with a pantile roof. Palace Gardens is a 1980s build road comprising large, detached properties. Most are houses, although there are some bungalows in the road.

4.2 **Proposal**

Two storey front extension, with rear dormer window and rooflights.

4.3 **Key Issues**

Layout and design

Palace Gardens has a mix of both two storey houses and chalet bungalows in the road, with two storey houses being the most common and neighbouring this site on both sides. As such, there is no in principle objection to the proposed extensions.

The Council's design policies seek a minimum of 1m to be retained between the first floor side flank wall and the boundary of the site, to protect spacing between properties in the street scene. Following advice at pre-application stage, there is a minimum distance of 1.6m between the side of the extension and the side boundary, and 3m to the side wall of no. 11 Palace Gardens. Furthermore it is noted that the existing garage on site has a closer relationship to the dwelling at no. 11. As such, it is considered that the relationship of the proposed extension to no. 11 is acceptable, and would not result in the two dwellings being read as attached.

While the proposed two storey extension would result in significant bulk to the front of the dwelling, given the scale of the host building, the existing garage and the proposed materiality of the extension it is considered in this context that a two-storey extension would not look incongruous to the site or the wider streetscene.

The proposed extension is to be formed of brickwork to match the host building, with concrete pantile tiling to the roof. No details regarding the materiality of the proposed doors and windows has been included in the application documents, however a condition requiring materials to match existing has been recommended. The proposed extension is to have a dormer to the roof at first floor to match the design of the host building, and an additional dormer and roof light are to be installed to the rear roof slope to enable a larger footprint to the

first floor of the dwelling.

The proposed works are considered acceptable in design terms.

Amenity

The proposed extension will be within 3m of the side wall of no. 11. However this is a blank flank wall that is partially obscured by vegetation to the boundary wall. There are to be no windows to the rear elevation of the extension, facing towards the side of no.11. As such, it is considered the extension will not result in a material loss of light or privacy to no.11, or an increased sense of enclosure.

The proposed extension would be 12m from the side boundary with no. 17, and the dwelling at no. 17 is set back beside the host building at the application site. Therefore it is considered the erection of a two storey extension would not be a material loss of privacy or light or an increased sense of enclosure to no. 17.

To the rear, no. 15 has a long back garden, and backs onto the rear of sites on Kneesworth Street. It is considered owing to the relationship of no. 15 to sites to the rear that the erection of an additional dormer roof extension, and a rooflight to the rear roofslope that there would not be a material loss of privacy to dwellings to this elevation.

The proposal is considered acceptable in amenity terms and will not result in a material loss of amenity to surrounding dwellings.

Parking

This is unchanged and an off street parking provision of at least two spaces for a house with two or more bedrooms meets the Council's car parking requirements.

Other considerations

The site is outside of the Royston Conservation Area. The whole of Palace Gardens is covered by TPO designation. The proposed works are not considered to impact any trees covered by the TPO, owing to the proposed location of the extension, which is an area of hardstanding.

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.

3. The materials used in the extension must match those of the host building.

   Reason:To ensure that the development will have an acceptable appearance which does not detract from the appearance and character of the surrounding area.

Proactive Statement:

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted proactively through early engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage 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: 7 June 2018	