DELEGATED FILE NOTE

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

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/01277/FPH	Single storey rear extension.	9 Baliol Road Hitchin Hertfordshire SG5 1TT

Submitted Plan Nos

03/03 01/03 02/03

1.0 Policies

1.1. **North Hertfordshire District Council Local Plan No. 2 with alterations**
Policy 28 – Housing Extensions
Policy 55 – Car Parking Standards
Policy 57 – Residential Guidelines and standards

1.2. **National Planning Policy Framework**
Section 12 – Achieving well designed places

1.3. **Emerging Local Plan 2011-2031 (Approved by Full Council 11th April 2017)**
D1 - Sustainable Design;
D2 – House extensions and replacement dwellings;
D3 – Protecting living conditions;
HS6 - Relatives and dependents' Accommodation
T2 – Parking

1.4. **Supplementary Planning Document**
Vehicle Parking at New Development September 2011

2. Site History
N/A

3. Representations
Local residents:
No response.

4. Planning Considerations

4.1. **Site and Surroundings**
The application site is a late nineteenth century semi-detached town house that appears to be the end of a run of similar dwellings. It is two storey, unlisted and outside a conservation area.

4.2. **Proposal**
The application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing poor rear extensions, and the erection of a longer single storey full width extension.

4.3. **Key Issues**
Design:
There is an existing single storey part width extension to the earlier two storey outrigger, and a poor quality lean-to to the rear of the dwelling. The immediately adjacent dwellings to either side have a range of asymmetrical rear extensions and therefore the rear of this run of dwellings does not have any consistency.

The proposal seeks to demolish the existing poor quality extensions, and erect a 10.4m deep (6m deeper than the existing extensions) single storey extension, which would project beyond the existing outrigger. The removal of the existing extensions is a welcome alteration, and while the proposed extension would be very deep, it would not project much further (approximately 3m) beyond the ones to the adjacent dwellings. In addition the gardens to the rear of the dwellings are of a significant size and will not be overwhelmed by the scale of the extension.

The proposal is to be formed of brick, with three rooflights to the sloping roof, and bifolding doors to the rear. It is considered the proposed materiality is acceptable, and would relate well to the host building. It is on balance considered to be acceptable in design terms.

Amenity:
To the east, no. 10 has an existing brick rear extension which is built up to the boundary wall. This extension has a deep-pitched sloping roof, and has glazed bricks which face onto the application site. Beyond this rear extension there is a timber trellis and brick boundary wall. Although the extension to this elevation would be high-measuring up to a height of 3.7m to the eaves, it is considered given the existing brick wall and boundary treatment that there would not be a material loss of light or increased sense of enclosure. There would be no windows facing to this elevation and therefore would not be a resulting loss of privacy.

To the west elevation, no.8 is set in slightly from the boundary- approximately 1m. There is an existing single storey rear extension which has windows to the side that would face onto the location of the proposed extension. The proposed extension would measure 2.5m on the boundary with no. 8, however there is an existing high boundary wall between the two properties and given these windows to the side of no. 8 have a poor outlook – to the existing extension to no. 10, and that there would be a 1m gap and that the windows are east of the application site it is considered there would not be a loss of light. While there may be an increase in a sense of enclosure, as stated above these windows have already been compromised by the extension to no. 10 and therefore it is considered the proposal would not result in a materially unacceptable situation.

The proposed rooflights facing towards no. 8 would be in the sloped roof, above 2.5m in height and therefore would not result in a loss of privacy. The fenestration to the rear of the extension would be located beyond the rear of the extension to no. 8 and therefore would not result in a loss of privacy to this dwelling.

On balance, it is considered the proposal would not result in an unneighbourly situation and accords with Policy D3 of the emerging Local Plan.

Car 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. 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  Tom Rea Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 13 August 2018	